

The Bassetlaw Local Plan



Bassetlaw
DISTRICT COUNCIL
— North Nottinghamshire —

Statement of Consultation

Appendix 1 & 2

Appendix 1

This Appendix sets out the requirements of Regulation 22(1)(c)(i) to (iv). Namely:

- (i) which bodies and persons the local planning authority invited to make representations under regulation 18,
- (ii) how those bodies and persons were invited to make representations under regulation 18,
- (iii) a summary of the main issues raised by the representations made pursuant to regulation 18,
- (iv) how any representations made pursuant to regulation 18 have been taken into account;

1) Introduction

Since the decision was made in 2015 to commence work on a Local Plan document for Bassetlaw, the Council has undertaken several rounds of consultation under Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England). These consultations have been documented in the main body of this report and include the dates and brief summaries of the scope and content of each stage. In brief these are considered as being:

- Stage 1: Initial Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan- Setting the Direction for Bassetlaw's Future
- Stage 2: Draft Bassetlaw Plan- Part 1: Strategic Plan
- Stage 3: Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020 (January)
- Stage 4: Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan November 2020
- Stage 5: Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan: Focussed Consultation

Section 2 of this Appendix clarifies which bodies and persons were invited to make representations and examples of how that was undertaken.

The main body of the report summarises the number of responses received and highlights some of the pertinent comments. The issues raised during the consultation stages are contained in Section 3 and Appendix 1A below. This includes the response of the Council and identifies how comments were taken into account in the next stage of Plan preparation.

Section 4 sets out a conclusion on the efficacy of the Regulation 18 consultation process.

2) Who was consulted under Regulation 18 and how that was undertaken?

Upon publication at each stage of the Regulation 18 consultation, a formal letter/email was sent to all of the contacts held on the Local Plan database, to invite them to make representations on the consultation document (a copy of the letter is available to read in Schedule 1). A list of those who will be notified at Regulation 19 is available in Schedule 1. For Stages 1-3 consultation documents were made available electronically on the Council's website and were available to view at public

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

libraries and the Council offices. For Stages 4-5 and following national legislation regarding Covid-19 consultation documents were made available electronically on the Council's website.

In addition, the consultations were publicised using the methods indicated in Schedule 2, and included various techniques such as press adverts and articles, site notices, meetings, presentations etc.

3) Main Issues raised in Plan order including the Council response/action

The following tables in Appendix 1A list the responses raised by the Regulation 18 consultations. Where possible these have been organised by Local Plan Chapter including comments on key evidence where relevant (e.g. SA/SEA/HRA).

4) Conclusion

When the Council has met the requirements of Regulation 22(1)(c) (i) to (iv), it will be documented in the main body of the report. The consultations have been conducted in line with the requirements of the Statement of Community Involvement at each stage.

Schedule 1 and 2 been prepared in support of Appendix 1 as follows:

- Schedule 1: Details of the consultation database (individuals, groups, agents etc)
- Schedule 2: Details of the consultation methods undertaken (letters, press releases, etc).

Appendix 1A:

The following tables identify the issues raised through the responses received at each stage of the Regulation 18 consultations and sets out the changes that were made by the Council to address the consultation comments.

Initial Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan- Setting the Direction for Bassetlaw's Future (2016 Consultation)

Table 1: Number and proportion of technical, thematic and wider references contained within representations to the Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan

SUBJECT	SUBJECT TYPE	NO. OF REPS.	% OF REPS.
Spatial Strategy - Functional Clusters	Thematic	51	43.2
Site Specific	Wider	36	30.5
Spatial Strategy - Development Boundaries	Thematic	27	22.9

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

SUBJECT	SUBJECT TYPE	NO. OF REPS.	% OF REPS.
Infrastructure Provision	Thematic	26	22.0
Spatial Strategy - Criteria Policies	Thematic	25	21.2
Housing - Market	Thematic	25	21.2
Housing - Affordable/Specialist	Thematic	24	20.3
Neighbourhood Plans	Wider	21	17.8
Transport	Thematic	20	16.9
Site Submission	Wider	19	16.1
Spatial Strategy - Urban/Town	Thematic	18	15.3
Heritage	Thematic	18	15.3
Natural Environment	Thematic	18	15.3
Employment	Thematic	17	14.4
Spatial Strategy - New Village/Settlement	Thematic	15	12.7
Vision	Thematic	14	11.9
Objectives	Thematic	13	11.0
Spatial Strategy - Wider Rural	Thematic	11	9.3
Design	Thematic	11	9.3
Sub-Regional Devolution	Wider	11	9.3
Climate Change	Thematic	10	8.5
Open Space/Landscape	Thematic	8	6.8
Objectively Assessed Housing Need/ 5 Year Housing Land Supply	Wider	8	6.8
Rural Buildings	Thematic	7	5.9
DM Decision/s	Wider	7	5.9
Co-Operation / Consultation	Technical	6	5.1
Gypsies / Travellers	Thematic	6	5.1
Structure / Nature of the Document	Technical	5	4.2
Waste/Mineral Extraction	Wider	5	4.2
Town/Retail Centres	Thematic	4	3.4
Factual / Statistical Errors	Technical	1	0.8
Mapping / Diagram Errors	Technical	1	0.8

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

The following table includes the representations received during the consultation and the responses provided by the Council to address them. Where necessary, the Council's response identifies the changes which would be made for the following iteration of the Plan as a result of the submitted representations.

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/1	Agent/Developer/Planning Consultant	GR 1 Planning	In principle it is reasonable merge Everton and Mattersey into a wider north western cluster of rural settlements reflecting links shared across Bawtry and Harworth & Bircotes.	Look to adopt a 'North West Functional Cluster'.
IDBP/2	Individual	Individual	<p>There is no proposed loss of the development boundary around Retford, they are proposed to be replaced across some rural settlements with a criteria based approach to planning decisions. The nature of open space designation is varied and it is unclear to where exactly the respondent is referring. Land under formal park designations would be extremely unlikely to come forward for development.</p> <p>The Sandhills site is currently being managed outside of the Bassetlaw Plan process.</p> <p>Specific parking offences do not fall under the remit of any Local Plan. It is not reasonable for all new housing to be affordable, this would provide no market incentive for the delivery of housing in general.</p> <p>It is not reasonable or currently enforceable to ensure the instillation of solar panels on all new build housing, although this can be encouraged through design standards.</p>	Explore the principle of encouraging solar panels as a part of design policies in the emerging Bassetlaw Plan.
IDBP/3	Individual	Individual	The current application to join the Sheffield City Region as a full constituent member is being addressed outside of the Local Plan process. Although sub-regional housing and employment aspirations will need to be considered.	Retain watching brief on Sheffield City Region
IDBP/4	Individual	Individual	The current application to join the Sheffield City Region as a full constituent member is being addressed outside of the Local Plan process. Although sub-regional housing and employment aspirations will need to be considered.	Retain watching brief on Sheffield City Region

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/5	Individual	Individual	<p>The IDBP document was drafted to be as clear as possible, however it is reasonable to make it clearer how policies may relate to different areas of Bassetlaw. The emerging Bassetlaw Plan cannot influence planning decisions until it is formally adopted. Any new settlement site proposals will be addressed in more detail in the next stage of public consultation.</p>	Assess how emerging polices impact on different areas of the Bassetlaw and assure this is made clear.
IDBP/6	Individual	Individual	<p>Support for the proposed approach to Worksop and Retford is welcome as is the recognition that the IDBP is a well presented document. The Bassetlaw Plan will not be able to directly influence any decision of retail units to close or reduce operation hours how the document will look to promote thriving central shopping areas minimise vacancy rates. The wider strategic need for specialist housing, such as bungalows, will be addressed through further evidence however the increasing demand for this type of housing is recognised as Bassetlaw's population profile becomes generally older.</p> <p>Bus services will be explored through an infrastructure capacity study where any shortfalls in provision can be addressed with private public transport providers. It is reasonable to address links between rail and bus services.</p>	Look at the potential for more connectivity between bus service and Bassetlaw's railway stations as a part of wider infrastructure work.
IDBP/7	Individual	Individual	<p>Support for a new village/rural settlement extension is welcomed by the Council.</p> <p>Although the brownfield land first approach is recognised it is important to note that Bassetlaw is a predominantly greenfield area with around 96% of the District being classified as rural in character. As such new development over the life of the Bassetlaw Plan is likely to have some impact on greenfield areas. There is a clear and evidenced need for housing across Bassetlaw that takes into account demographic change and economic character of the District.</p>	Continue to assess the principle of a new village or rural settlement expansion in Bassetlaw.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/8	Organisation (please specify the name of your organisation)	Individual	<p>Any infrastructure provision for young persons would likely be case specific (e.g. play facilities), however blanket funding for a Nottinghamshire County Council function would not be a reasonable ask through any S.106 negotiation.</p> <p>In principle it is reasonable to accept Costhorpe forms a part of Carlton-in-Lindrick.</p>	Look to merge Costhorpe into Carlton-in-Lindrick within the 'Carlton & Langold Functional Cluster'.
IDBP/9	Agent/Developer/Planning Consultant	DWPS Chartered Surveyors	Relates to land at Poplar Farm, South Leverton (LAA 116). Any site allocations will be considered during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.	Begin the assessment of sites for possible allocation within the Bassetlaw Plan process.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/10	Individual	Individual	<p>Functional Clusters are intended to help understand and recognise the importance of access to shared rural services across Bassetlaw. Service access across the District's rural areas is not consistent and although some communities such as Blyth residents have access to all the defined primary services locally (i.e. a retail provision, GP surgery, primary school and post office facility) this is not the case in many other rural settlements. As such Functional Clusters of settlement should be seen as working collectively, including in cases where neighbouring rural communities are more reliant on settlements such as Blyth with better local service provision. Therefore it is not considered reasonable to separate any one settlement from a Functional Cluster solely based on individual access to a good range of rural services.</p> <p>Whilst recognising the wider importance of Retford as a rural-hub town in Bassetlaw the relationship identified between Blyth and Harworth & Bircotes reflects the relative proximity of the two settlements in relation to service accessibility. It is reasonable to explore this relationship further as during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan. However it is important to stress that the Harworth & Bircotes Functional Cluster is not intended to undermined the integrity of Blyth as a separate rural community.</p> <p>Transport impacts associated with proposed development will be addressed through individual planning applications or at the potential allocation phase of the Bassetlaw Plan.</p>	Explore functional connectivity between Blyth and Harwoth & Bircotes

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/11	Individual	Individual	<p>Functional Clusters are intended to help understand and recognise the importance of access to shared rural services across Bassetlaw. Service access across the District's rural areas is not consistent and although some communities such as Blyth residents have access to all the defined primary services locally (i.e. a retail provision, GP surgery, primary school and post office facility) this is not the case in many other rural settlements. As such Functional Clusters of settlement should be seen as working collectively, including in cases where neighbouring rural communities are more reliant on settlements such as Blyth with better local service provision. Therefore it is not considered reasonable to separate any one settlement from a Functional Cluster solely based on individual access to a good range of rural services.</p> <p>Whilst recognising the wider importance of Retford as a rural-hub town in Bassetlaw the relationship identified between Blyth and Harworth & Bircotes reflects the relative proximity of the two settlements in relation to service accessibility. It is reasonable to explore this relationship further as during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan. However it is important to stress that the Harworth & Bircotes Functional Cluster is not intended to undermine the integrity of Blyth as a separate rural community.</p> <p>Transport impacts associated with proposed development will be addressed through individual planning applications or at the potential allocation phase of the Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>Employment policies remain aspirational. Bassetlaw's local economy specialises around core sectors including distribution, manufacturing and distribution activity which tend to generate the need for larger facilities such as warehousing.</p>	<p>Explore functional connectivity between Blyth and Harworth & Bircotes</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/12	Agent/Developer/Planning Consultant	Pritchard Associates	Support for the proposed approach to rural Bassetlaw, specifically around the approach to sustainable growth, is welcomed.	Consider support for proposed approach to rural Bassetlaw in context of wider opinion
IDBP/13	Individual	Individual	The evidence provided detailing the functional relationship between Grove and Retford is welcomed by the Council. It is reasonable to re-examine this relationship and further the test the operation of the Retford & Villages Functional Cluster. The issues raised around public transport are helpful, the link between rural sustainability and public transport is being addressed separately in light of the general decline in private rural bus services	Explore again and test the functional relationship between Grove and Retford within the 'Retford & Villages Functional Cluster'. Consider removing Grove from this cluster if evidence suggest that this is reasonable.
IDBP/14	Landowner	Landowner	Any site allocations will be considered during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan. No site area attached as a part of the submission.	Begin the assessment of sites for possible allocation within the Bassetlaw Plan process.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/15	Agent/Developer/Planning Consultant	John Martin & Associates	<p>Support for the vision and objectives of the IDBP are welcomed by the Council. 2019 is the proposed adoption date for the Bassetlaw Plan and the document cannot be retrospectively dated before adoption although some baseline evidence may be retrospectively dated.</p> <p>The proposed 435 dwellings per annum OAHN target is fully addressed in supporting evidence, namely the report <i>How Much Housing Does Bassetlaw Need?</i> (2016). This document also explains the potential baseline for projecting this figure forward over the life of the Bassetlaw Plan which act as a point of comparison for the alternative housing need evidence outlined as a part of this submission.</p> <p>Support for a new village/rural settlement expansion is welcomed by the Council. Where the principle for this approach is established early screening of any sites will be carried out during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.</p>	Continue to assess the principle of a new village or rural settlement expansion in Bassetlaw.
IDBP/16	Parish Council	Shireoaks Parish Council	<p>Full support is given to neighbourhood plans across Bassetlaw and IDBP proposals intend to maintain settlement identity/separation through a detailed criteria approach as opposed to existing development boundaries. This includes managing any rural settlement growth in Functional Clusters so that it is sympathetic in character and form in relation to the existing settlement.</p> <p>The rural nature of Bassetlaw dictates that some car travel is necessary in order to access services and, as is often the case, employment opportunities. However one intention behind identifying Functional Clusters is to look to minimise the need to travel to access key rural services.</p>	<p>Address the requirement process for ecological surveys, particularly in relation to brownfield sites.</p> <p>Look for opportunities to build sustainable 'green' links with Sherwood Forest where opportunity may arise.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
			<p>Affordable and specialist housing delivery will continue to be a priority and the emerging Bassetlaw Plan. The document will establish more detailed requirements during the next stage of consultation government advice. It is unreasonable to discourage 3-4 bed dwellings as a matter of principle through planning policy.</p> <p>Ecological surveys are requested on a site-by-site basis dependent upon the proposed development, this includes proposals on brownfield sites, but detailed requirements can be refined through planning policy. It is reasonable to build sustainable links and connectivity with Sherwood Forest wherever possible through development shames as they come forward.</p>	
IDBP/17	Individual	Individual	<p>Support in principle for the holistic approach of the IDBP and document vision is welcomed by the Council.</p> <p>Previous or live development decisions, such as those relating to Harworth & Bircotes, are outside the scope of the emerging IDBP.</p> <p>It is reasonable to investigate agricultural land classifications in Bassetlaw as a part of the emerging document. Loss of any agricultural land in relation to major developments will be considered against all other factors within the decision making process.</p> <p>Bassetlaw has employment land need that operates alongside Doncaster and is essential in providing local employment opportunities and assuring the District secures a sub-regional economic role. In this context the duty-to-cooperate means looking to address strategic issues that impact on both local authority areas, not minimising Bassetlaw's economic development potential. Logistics and warehousing continues to be a strength area for the local economy which needs to be</p>	<p>Investigate further agricultural land classifications in Bassetlaw as a part of the emerging document and any site allocations.</p> <p>Explore specific design criteria for economic development proposals.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
			<p>recognised alongside other area of economic growth potential. It is reasonable to focus more on the design of business developments.</p> <p>The emerging policy criteria behind proposed Functional Clusters looks to specifically restrict settlement coalescence and are not intended to represent exactly the flows of people, rather to represent reasonable local opportunities to access key services.</p> <p>All highway impacts of proposed growth will be modelled and discussed with Nottinghamshire County Council.</p> <p>Both CIL and the rural affordable housing threshold will be reviewed as a part of the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.</p>	
IDBP/18	Landowner	Landowner	<p>Any site allocations will be considered during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan. No site area attached as a part of the submission.</p>	
IDBP/19	Elected Member	Elected Member	<p>General support of the IDBP is welcomed by the Council and in particular the functional links across north-east Bassetlaw's rural settlements. The intention is that all policy criteria associated with Functional Clusters will need to be met in replacing development boundaries.</p> <p>Affordable housing need and distribution will be considered in more detail during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan. All sites brought forward through the Land Availability Assessment process, including those owned by the Council, will be considered during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan which will look to allocate land for development. This next draft will allow comment on sites from Parish Council and Neighbourhood Plan groups.</p>	<p>Explore further the proportionate cap on individual development proposals across Functional Clusters of rural settlement considering the scale of impact on differing settlement types.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/20	Organisation (please specify)	Masterton Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	<p>Although the brownfield land first approach is recognised it is important to note that Bassetlaw is a predominantly greenfield area with around 96% of the District being classified as rural in character. As such new development over the life of the Bassetlaw Plan is likely to impact on greenfield areas to some extent.</p> <p>Support of the IDBP's approach to Neighbourhood Plans, overarching objectives of the document and criteria approach to managing growth across Functional Clusters is welcomed by the Council.</p> <p>It is reasonable to explore further the proposed 10% cap on individual rural settlement development proposals across Functional Clusters proportionately based on settlement size, including the 5% suggestion. The proposed 20% cap on overall development for each settlement in a Functional Cluster would take into account existing full-planning permissions, sites under construction at the time, any Neighbourhood Plan site allocations and all existing dwellings in the settlement.</p> <p>All sites brought forward through the Land Availability Assessment process will be considered during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan which will look to allocate land for development. This next draft will allow comment on sites from Parish Council and Neighbourhood Plan groups who are able to comment on all future development proposals.</p> <p>Access to local services and infrastructure is intended to be across the whole of any Functional Cluster, not just where development may take place. As such the core principle of Functional Clusters is based around a <i>shared</i> access to services within a reasonable travel distance.</p> <p>Affordable housing need and distribution will be considered in more detail during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.</p>	<p>Explore further the proportionate cap on individual development proposals across Functional Clusters of rural settlement considering the scale of impact on differing settlement types.</p> <p>Look at the relationship of strategic site allocations through the Bassetlaw Plan to any overall cap on settlement growth.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/21	Organisation (please specify)	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Concerns over lack of cross-referencing in relevant sections of the IDBP are noted and will be considered during the drafting of the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.	Under Biodiversity and Geodiversity policy areas consider inserting reference to the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006, particularly sections 40 and 41. In relation to open space policy consider referring to Natural England's Green Infrastructure Guidance and Natural England's Accessible Natural Greenspace (ANGSt) standards. Explore the addition of specific text to the Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople policy, specifically that 'the site would not lead to the loss, or adverse impact on landscape character and value, heritage assets and their settings, nature conservation or biodiversity sites'.
IDBP/22	Parish Council		The Core Strategy is being replaced due to changes in national planning policy and guidance. As such the emerging Bassetlaw Plan will be in a far stronger position to manage effectively the distribution and character of development across the District. The proposed 20% cap on overall development for each settlement in a Functional Cluster would take into account existing full-planning permissions, sites under construction at the time, any Neighbourhood Plan site allocations and all existing dwellings in the settlement. Impacts of any development proposals on existing transport, utilities and social infrastructure will be modelled during the next stage of drafting the Bassetlaw Plan. Neighbourhood Plans are recognised as an important part of the planning policy framework through the IDBP and will be supported as such through the emerging Bassetlaw Plan. The Sheffield City Region plays an important role in establishing sub-regional economic aspiration and involved in the delivery of some major site locally however Bassetlaw District Council retains all	Retain watching brief on Sheffield City Region.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
			planning powers and as such will continue to produce a planning policy framework for the District.	
IDBP/23	Individual	Individual	The proposed 6525 dwellings Bassetlaw Plan target is fully addressed in supporting evidence, namely the report How Much Housing Does Bassetlaw Need? (2016). The main emphasis for the Bassetlaw Plan is to address the delivery of this housing and relate this to factors such as the impact on social-infrastructure and demand for employment land. The policy criteria associated with the Functional Clusters are explicitly intended to prevent settlement coalescence, it is reasonable to explore more definition around this. Any proposed site allocations will be presented through the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan and available for comment in relation to Functional Cluster settlement growth caps. Social and physical infrastructure is funded by a combination of planning gain from developments, market led initiatives and public sector funding where available. It is reasonable to assess the position of Grove and Stokeham as a parts of separate cluster of rural settlements and analyse again their functional relationships with surrounding settlements.	Look to provide a definition around reasonable settlement gaps as a part of the Functional Cluster policy criteria. Further analyse the functional relationships associated with Grove and Stokeham.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/24	Landowner	Landowner	<p>Any site allocations will be considered during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan, including assessment of issues such as proximity to flood zone areas.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plans are recognised as an important part of the planning policy framework through the IDBP and will be supported as such through the emerging Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>How the Bassetlaw Plan accounts for employment land need will be fully addressed in the next stage of the document and supporting evidence.</p> <p>It is reasonable to include more reference to the Chesterfield Canal as an important historic asset to the District.</p>	<p>Begin the assessment of sites for possible allocation within the Bassetlaw Plan process.</p> <p>Complete the emerging employment land needs study and fully incorporate this into the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>Look at where the Chesterfield Canal can be incorporated more into any tourism policy areas.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/25	Organisation (please specify)	Sutton-cum-Lound Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	<p>The emerging IDBP identifies Neighbourhood Plans as an important part of the local planning policy framework and this will continue to be the case. In particular Neighbourhood Plans can promote the direction of local growth through allocations and/or provide a detailed insight into the character of local settlements which will assist in development management decisions. Where there is any conflict with the strategic policies of the Bassetlaw Plan on adoption with existing Neighbourhood Plans this will not make Neighbourhood Plans invalid but may mean some adjustments are made. Bassetlaw District Council will support any need for review and adjustment.</p> <p>It is reasonable to review the overall 20% development cap proposed for each settlement in a Functional Cluster based on settlement size and protonate impact. It is reasonable to look for ways to liaise better with Neighbourhood Plan groups over the coming years to assure joint understanding. The type of housing that may come forward across Functional Clusters will need to be negotiated in line with all relevant policy criteria and available housing needs evidence at the time of application.</p>	<p>Explore further the overall cap on development proposals across Functional Clusters of rural settlement considering the scale of impact on differing settlement types.</p> <p>Look for ways to encourage better understanding between the Planning Policy team at Bassetlaw District Council and Neighbourhood Planning groups as the Bassetlaw Plan emerges.</p>
IDBP/26	Individual	Individual	General support of the IDBP is welcomed by the Council and in particular references to increasing cycling opportunities.	N/A

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/27	Organisation (please specify)	Sustrans	<p>General support of the IDBP is welcomed by the Council and the suggested text changes will be considered during the next stage of drafting the Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>The Regulation 123 CIL list will be reviewed as a part of the Bassetlaw Plan process and it is reasonable that improvements to cycling and walking infrastructure are included as a part of this discussion.</p> <p>The principle of any new or extended settlement will be tested as a part of the IDBP consultation and any indicative sites outlined in the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.</p>	<p>Consider changing 'extensive' for 'emerging network of cycle and foot paths' in paragraph 2.11 (p. 14) and consider adding 'employment, education and service locations' to bullet point four of the Enhance Accessibility and Promoting Sustainable Travel proposed policy approach (p. 84).</p> <p>Assess the potential for cycling and walking improvements, possibly through CIL revision.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/28	Parish Council	Headon, Upton, Stokeham and Grove Parish Council/s	<p>The relationship between housing and employment growth is complex. This is because the range of skills/qualifications of new households may not always directly correlate with the demand of local employers. However the strategic importance of boosting employment opportunities across the District and assuring a sustainable working age population locally through housing growth will be recognised in the Bassetlaw Plan. It is also reasonable to test any employment land allocations against a commuter catchment area. The detailed character and range of employment land need will be explore further in the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>Functional Clusters are not intended to restrict rural communities into a certain patterns of service use but instead represent groups of settlement where there is <i>reasonable</i> accessibility to a range of key services. However the principle of looking at how Functional Clusters operate in relation to commuter flows is reasonable during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>Functional Clusters are not linked to public transport access as it is unreasonably restrictive to plan around, for example, rural bus services. However the importance of public transport to rural communities is appreciated. Therefore the Council will independently assess a range of methods to support rural public transport access through the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>The evidence detailing the position of Grove in relation to the Retford & Villages Functional Cluster is welcome. It is reasonable to re-examine the position of Grove in any Functional Cluster.</p> <p>Although the brownfield land first approach is recognised it is important to note that Bassetlaw is a predominantly</p>	<p>Look to build a methodology to assess the commuter catchment area of any proposed employment land allocations.</p> <p>Consider the nature of commuter flows in relation to Functional Clusters.</p> <p>Build rural public transport accessibility into infrastructure studies as a part of the Bassetlaw Plan process.</p> <p>Consider the role of Grove as a part of the Retford & Villages Functional Cluster.</p> <p>Explore defined policy parameters around the prevention of settlement merging.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
			<p>greenfield area with around 96% of the District being classified as rural in character. As such new development over the life of the Bassetlaw Plan is likely to impact on greenfield areas to some extent.</p> <p>The character, built form and integrity of all settlements within Functional Clusters underpins the rural policy criteria in the IDBP. It is however reasonable to offer policy parameters around the protection of settlement integrity and avoiding settlement merges.</p> <p>The sale of any private land for proposed development is outside the scope of the emerging Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>The detailed provision of affordable and specialist housing will be considered as a part of the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan alongside the ability to deliver on sustainable energy generation.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/29	Organisation (please specify the name of your organisation)	Headon, Upton, Grove and Stokeham Neighbourhood Planning Group	<p>The relationship between housing and employment growth is complex. This is because the range of skills/qualifications of new households may not always directly correlate with the demand of local employers. However the strategic importance of boosting employment opportunities across the District and assuring a sustainable working age population locally through housing growth will be recognised in the Bassetlaw Plan. It is also reasonable to test any employment land allocations against a commuter catchment area. The detailed character and range of employment land need will be explore further in the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>Functional Clusters are not intended to restrict rural communities into a certain patterns of service use but instead represent groups of settlement where there is <i>reasonable</i> accessibility to a range of key services. However the principle of looking at how Functional Clusters operate in relation to commuter flows is reasonable during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>Functional Clusters are not linked to public transport access as it is unreasonably restrictive to plan around, for example, rural bus services. However the importance of public transport to rural communities is appreciated. Therefore the Council will independently assess a range of methods to support rural public transport access through the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>The evidence detailing the position of Grove in relation to the Retford & Villages Functional Cluster is welcome. It is reasonable to re-examine the position of Grove in any Functional Cluster.</p> <p>Although the brownfield land first approach is recognised it is important to note that Bassetlaw is a predominantly</p>	<p>Look to build a methodology to assess the commuter catchment area of any proposed employment land allocations.</p> <p>Consider the nature of commuter flows in relation to Functional Clusters.</p> <p>Build rural public transport accessibility into infrastructure studies as a part of the Bassetlaw Plan process.</p> <p>Consider the role of Grove as a part of the Retford & Villages Functional Cluster.</p> <p>Explore defined policy parameters around the prevention of settlement merging.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
			<p>greenfield area with around 96% of the District being classified as rural in character. As such new development over the life of the Bassetlaw Plan is likely to impact on greenfield areas to some extent.</p> <p>The character, built form and integrity of all settlements within Functional Clusters underpins the rural policy criteria in the IDBP. It is however reasonable to offer policy parameters around the protection of settlement integrity and avoiding settlement merges.</p> <p>The sale of any private land for proposed development is outside the scope of the emerging Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>The detailed provision of affordable and specialist housing will be considered as a part of the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan alongside the ability to deliver on sustainable energy generation.</p>	
IDBP/30	Individual	Individual	General support of for the thematic policy proposals in the IDBP is welcomed by the Council. It is reasonable to explore a local connections policy criteria in relation to Wider Rural Bassetlaw and assess the use of criteria to manage development proposals in these areas.	Assess the potential of a local connection criteria in relation to Wider Rural Bassetlaw and rural buildings policy areas.
IDBP/31	Individual	BDC Development Team	DM comments for internal use only.	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/32	Parish Council	Blyth Parish Council	<p>Functional Clusters are intended to help understand and recognise the importance of access to shared rural services across Bassetlaw. Service access across the District's rural areas is not consistent and although some communities such as Blyth residents have access to all the defined primary services locally (i.e. a retail provision, GP surgery, primary school and post office facility) this is not the case in many other rural settlements. As such Functional Clusters of settlement should be seen as working collectively, including in cases where neighbouring rural communities are more reliant on settlements such as Blyth with better local service provision. Therefore it is not considered reasonable to separate any one settlement from a Functional Cluster solely based on individual access to a good range of rural services.</p> <p>Whilst recognising the wider importance of Worksop and Retford in Bassetlaw the relationship identified between Blyth and Harworth & Bircotes reflects the relative proximity of the two settlements in relation to service accessibility. It is reasonable to explore this relationship further as during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan. However it is important to stress that the Harworth & Bircotes Functional Cluster is not intended to undermine the integrity of Blyth as a separate rural community.</p> <p>The Bassetlaw Plan will establish an aspirational economic context but must also respond to demand indicators that suggest warehousing, distribution and manufacturing are strong local sectors. To ignore this would act to artificially limit local economic development opportunities. It is reasonable to explore in more detail policy criteria that will help guide economic development proposals in the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.</p>	<p>Explore functional connectivity between Blyth and Harworth & Bircotes.</p> <p>Consider planning policy criteria approaches to help manage the character of economic development proposals.</p> <p>Explore planning policy mechanisms to assure the delivery of planning permissions by developers.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
			<p>Traffic/highway impacts will be considered where the Bassetlaw Plan looks to allocate any land for development during the next stage of the document and during any relevant planning applications.</p> <p>Any planning policy mechanisms that can support the delivery of sites with planning permission and/or support the delivery of former colliery sites will be explored during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/33	Agent/Developer/ Planning Consultant	DLP Consultants	<p>Neighbourhood Plans are required to be in conformity with the strategic policies of the adopted development plan, in relation to Bassetlaw this is the current Core Strategy. All Neighbourhood Plans are tested for this conformity and as such can operate in parallel where Neighbourhood Plans offer a local interpretation of settlement character and/or look to allocate sites for development. Any discussion over local housing need will be done in partnership with Bassetlaw District Council.</p> <p>Shireoaks and Rhodesia are identified as separate settlements in recognition of their settlement integrity. However both settlements are linked with Worksop as a part of a Functional Cluster given their strong links and relative proximity to the town. As such a balance is sought to recognise both the independent character of Shireoaks and Rhodesia but also recognise their functional relationship with Worksop.</p> <p>The IDBP document was intended to outline the proposed principles for, and distribution of, growth across Bassetlaw. Any site allocations will be proposed as a part to the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan. In relation to rural areas and the proposed 20% cap on settlement growth across Functional Clusters the intention is to allow the opportunity for these rural settlements to develop proportionately alongside the operation of larger, more strategic site allocations that will help address housing need in Bassetlaw.</p> <p>The proposed rural policy criteria will be re-assessed during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan and tested again for clarity, the intention being to promote more nuanced decision making in the context of any settlement growth.</p> <p>Refined targets for affordable housing and associated delivery will be addressed during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan</p>	<p>Continue to refine rural policy criteria in relation to settlement growth in Functional Clusters.</p> <p>Look to clarify further the relationships between employment and housing growth.</p> <p>Continue to refine affordable housing need and delivery across the District.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
			<p>Links between housing and employment growth is complex. This relationship will be explored and clarified in the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/34	Individual	Individual	<p>Support for research underpinning the IDBP is welcomed by the Council. This is alongside appreciating the importance placed on economic growth and investment in Bassetlaw although it is worth noting that Bassetlaw will not change in name to 'Sheffield City'.</p> <p>Any specific development proposals relating to waste and minerals will be managed by Nottinghamshire County Council in partnership with Bassetlaw District, as such this is outside the remit of the IDBP document. The relationship between proposed growth on wider infrastructure provision will be addressed through an infrastructure study forming a part of the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.</p>	<p>Continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council in relation to waste and mineral applications.</p> <p>Continue infrastructure study work as the Bassetlaw Plan progresses.</p>
IDBP/35	Organisation	Mansfield District Council	General support for the IDBP document at this stage is welcomed and the importance of maintaining links with Mansfield District Council recognised.	Continue to consider the strategic impact of any growth proposals on Warsop and Mansfield.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/36	Organisation	Mattersey Parish Council	<p>The emerging IDBP identifies Neighbourhood Plans as an important part of the local planning policy framework and this will continue to be the case. In particular Neighbourhood Plans can promote the direction of local growth through allocations and/or provide a detailed insight into the character of local settlements which will assist in development management decisions. Where there is any conflict with the strategic policies of the Bassetlaw Plan on adoption with existing Neighbourhood Plans this will not make Neighbourhood Plans invalid but may mean some adjustments are made. Bassetlaw District Council will support any need for review and adjustment.</p> <p>It is reasonable to identify Mattersey Thorpe within the Everton & Mattersey Functional Cluster under the current methodology.</p> <p>The nature of the proposed 20% cap on growth, and 10% cap on single development proposals, across Functional Clusters will be considered again during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan. The baseline calculation date for any settlement cap will also be re-considered based on the eventual adoption date of the Bassetlaw Plan and when refined housing need is calculated from. Current proposals allow scope for Neighbourhood Plans to meet the 20% cap through allocations or exceed it through planned growth. Also with the intention of positively planning for rural areas it is not considered appropriate to remove any growth cap where a Neighbourhood Plan is in place. It is also worth stressing that where an individual settlement does not or cannot grow by 20% there is no intention that any shortfall is shared amongst other, neighbouring settlements. As such any development cap will only apply to each individual settlement within a</p>	<p>Look to identify Mattersey Thorpe within the Everton & Mattersey Functional Cluster.</p> <p>Continue to explore the proposed 20% growth cap and 10% cap on individual development proposals across settlements within Functional Clusters.</p> <p>Agree a baseline date for any caps to be calculated from in relation to the calculation of District wide housing need.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
			<p>Functional Cluster.</p> <p>The proposed policy criteria for Functional Clusters protects against the merging of rural settlements, that includes within Parishes, and the removal of development boundaries is to allow for more nuanced, local character led development decisions.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/37	Organisation	Lowland Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Local Nature Partnership	General support for the IDBP document at this stage, particularly around rural development proposals, is welcomed by the Council. It is reasonable to consider further the eight 'natural capital assets' identified and how they can be incorporated into supporting evidence and the subsequent Bassetlaw Plan. Detailed suggestions in relation to the proposed Functional Clusters policy criteria are acknowledged and will be considered during the next stage of drafting the Bassetlaw Plan.	Consider existing or emerging evidence around 'natural capital assets' including protected land, soil, species, (ground/surface) freshwater, air quality, mineral protections and sub-soils. With a particular focus on evidencing these assets and relating them to proposed growth. Consider comments (see detailed response) on rural policy criteria and suggested increased emphasis on environmental characteristics. Consider changes (see detailed response) to the IDBP's vision (inclusion of walking/cycling reference) and objectives.
IDBP/38	Organisation	Blyth Awareness Community Group	Functional Clusters are intended to help understand and recognise the importance of access to shared rural services across Bassetlaw. Service access across the District's rural areas is not consistent and although some communities such as Blyth residents have access to all the defined primary services locally (i.e. a retail provision, GP surgery, primary school and post office facility) this is not the case in many other rural settlements. As such Functional Clusters of settlement should be seen as working collectively, including in cases where neighbouring rural communities are more reliant on settlements such as Blyth with better local service provision. Therefore it is not considered reasonable to separate any one settlement from a Functional Cluster solely based on individual access to a good range of rural services. Whilst recognising the wider importance of wider settlements such as Bawtry the relationship identified between Blyth and Harworth & Bircotes reflects the relative proximity of the two settlements in relation to service accessibility. It is reasonable to explore this relationship further as during the next stage of	Explore functional connectivity between Blyth and Harworth & Bircotes.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
			<p>the Bassetlaw Plan. However it is important to stress that the Harworth & Bircotes Functional Cluster is not intended to undermined the integrity of Blyth as a separate rural community.</p> <p>It is worth stressing that the proposed rural policy criteria associated with Functional Clusters are intended to maintain the integrity of rural settlements where development boundaries are removed.</p>	
IDBP/39	Organisation	National Trust	<p>The IDBP proposed to retain development boundaries around Worksop and any planned extensions to the town will be proposed with explicit care in mind to Clumber Park and Sherwood Forest both of which represent significant historic/natural assets.</p> <p>During the next stage of drafting the Bassetlaw Plan the approach to assessing the need for employment land will be further refined, including an assessment of employment forecasts. Whilst the lower job density of warehousing and distribution development is recognised this type of economic development needs to be considered as a major contributor to Bassetlaw's local economy and as such planned for. This is alongside encouraging new, entrepreneurial forms of economic activity. It is reasonable to further explore a range of planning policy criteria to help better manage economic development proposals through the Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>General support for relevant historic environment, design, climate change and infrastructure policy areas is welcomed by the Council. Specific recommendations in relation to the historic and natural environment will be considered during the next stage of drafting the Bassetlaw Plan.</p>	<p>Explore further a range of planning policy criteria to help better manage economic development proposals.</p> <p>Consider changes (see detailed response) to historic and natural environment policy areas.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/40	Organisation	Gladman Developments Ltd	Relates to the former Bevercotes Colliery (BDC identified)	
IDBP/41	Organisation	Historic England	<p>General support for the IDBP document is welcomed by the Council in relation to the historic environment.</p> <p>The role of heritage in relation to any land allocations, and the Sustainability Appraisal process, will be considered at length during the next stage of drafting the Bassetlaw Plan alongside a range of wider criteria.</p> <p>It is reasonable to consider further the relationship between any future CIL monies and the wider historic environment.</p> <p>It is reasonable to consider altering wording so that heritage policies look to '<u>conserve and</u>' enhance heritage assets in their setting.'</p>	<p>Reaffirm the role of heritage in the site allocation assessment and Sustainability Assessment processes.</p> <p>consider altering wording so that heritage policies look to '<u>conserve and</u>' enhance heritage assets in their setting.'</p>
IDBP/42	Organisation	JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd	<p>General support for the principle of Functional Clusters is welcomed by the Council. The proposed level and distribution of growth across the whole District, including that in Functional Clusters, will be considered in more detail during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan. This will be in light of new housing needs evidence (including the implications of the February 2017 planning white paper) and the results of public consultation. The need to present a wide range of sites facilitating market choice and in order to successfully meet housing need is appreciated, however the concern raised is noted.</p>	<p>Continue to identify a range of sites at differing scales for possible allocation through the Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>Explore differing development caps based on the scale and context of rural settlements in Functional Clusters for monitoring development.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
			<p>It is reasonable to explore differing development caps that account for the relative scale and context of settlements within Functional Clusters during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan. However it is worth stressing that a single, percentage based development cap is intended to retain the principle of proportionate development across all relevant settlements in the first instance. This is to be used as a monitoring tool and not intended to be a target for growth.</p>	
IDBP/43	Organisation	PB Planning on behalf of Barratt Homes	<p>Relates to land at Tickhill Road, Harworth (former SHLAA site/preferred option and new submission for LAA)</p>	
IDBP/44	Organisation	Walkeringham Parish Council	<p>General support for the objectives of the IDBP is welcomed by the Council. However until the Bassetlaw Plan is formally adopted by the Council any related planning policies do not form considerable material weight when making development decisions. Up until the adoption of the Bassetlaw Plan the current Core Strategy adopted in 2011 remains the most relevant development planning document.</p> <p>CIL funding is intended to delivery infrastructure of strategic importance at a District wide scale. Any site specific planning gain would still be managed through individual Section 106 agreements.</p> <p>Although supporting data is often used at Parish level Functional Clusters are intended to operate on a settlement basis. This is the built extent of any hamlet, village or town regardless of Parish boundaries. It is however reasonable to explore the role of relevant hamlets (which are often related to a larger settlements) and clarify the position of any related development cap.</p> <p>The proposed 20% development cap in the IDBP does account for full planning permissions at the time of adoption.</p>	<p>Explore the role of smaller settlements and hamlets which form a part of a Functional Clusters. In particular addressing their relationship to larger settlements and any Parish boundaries.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
			<p>Development viability will continue to play a part in the negotiation of planning applications in the future as the Council looks to balance the need for developer profit against wider planning gains. However any decision to release of viability evidence, which is often commercially sensitive, as a part of planning applications will largely fall outside of the Bassetlaw Plan process.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/45	Organisation	DLP Consultants	<p>In terms of the housing target, the respondent's view is that this should be significantly higher than 435 dwellings per annum, in order to address economic aspirations and a very high need for affordable housing. The evidence base for the housing target, particularly the 2013 Strategic Housing Market Assessment is considered out-of-date. The respondent concludes that a housing target of 550 dwellings per annum would be more appropriate, particularly in order to address the District's declining working age population. The respondent also feels that there are clear signals of worsening affordability, though this appears to be based on the high need for affordable housing in Bassetlaw, rather than the rising value of market housing.</p> <p>The Council recognises that the current Strategic Housing Market Assessment uses the 2011-based Household Projections as a starting point, and that these have now been superseded by, both, 2012-based projections and 2014-based projections. The background paper 'How much Housing does Bassetlaw need?' considered the potential impacts of these later projections on housing need for Bassetlaw, noting that they both projected lower growth in the number of households across the District than the 2011-based projections.</p> <p>The proposed housing target of 435 dwellings per year is subject to evolving evidence and policy context and the target will be reviewed in light of the consultation responses received and emerging evidence. However, the spatial strategy put forward through the Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan is considered to be sufficiently flexible to accommodate a range of housing need scenarios.</p> <p>The Council acknowledges that the latest household</p>	<p>To fully address the implications of more recent demographic projections and other emerging evidence, Bassetlaw has commissioned an update to the SHMA and the results of this will be taken into account in the next draft of the Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>The Council will also take account of the government's intention to consult on and introduce a standardised methodology for calculating Objectively Assessed Housing Need. We also acknowledge the need to set out a clearer calculation of how our housing target has been arrived at and to give further consideration to the base date for the housing target.</p> <p>Further work is needed to consider the relationship between housing need and economic growth and we are grateful to consultees for putting forward evidence for how this might be addressed. Bassetlaw is currently undertaking further work to assess the need for new employment land and this will be taken into account alongside the latest evidence on housing need when reassessing the appropriate housing target for inclusion in the next draft of the Bassetlaw Plan. This will also help the Council to consider its position in relation to the economic growth aspirations of D2N2 and Sheffield City Region.</p> <p>The Council will be undertaking full plan viability testing as part of the process of plan development.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
			<p>projections will lead to a reduced working age population, and that the Council will need to consider how to address this moving forward.</p> <p>Over the longer term the 2014 SHMA estimates affordable housing need as 646 affordable dwellings per annum (818 per annum in the short term only), more than the overall housing need calculated from demographic projections. However, the SHMA recognises that delivering such large number is unrealistic and that the private rented sector will play a significant part in addressing this need, supported by housing benefit payments.</p> <p>The need for affordable housing is, arguably, more closely related to the local jobs market than the affordability of owner-occupied market housing. Housing values in Bassetlaw are significantly lower than the national average, and the housing target should not, therefore, be adjusted for price signals.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the Council does have the option of increasing its housing target in order to increase affordable housing delivery, and this is something that will need to be considered moving forward.</p>	<p>We will need to undertake further consultation to consider whether the ‘pepper-potting’ of affordable housing is considered desirable by registered providers of affordable housing. Equally we will need to consider what triggers may be appropriate for activating overage clauses.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/46	Organisation	Pegasus Group	<p>The IDBP does not look to place a blanket or absolute restriction across any of rural Bassetlaw's settlements but instead looks to identify rural areas that are proportionately <i>more</i> sustainable growth. Current proposals account for appropriate residential opportunities and planned growth brought through Neighbourhood Plans across Wider Rural Bassetlaw. All evidence will in relation to Functional Clusters will be reviewed as a part of the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan and it is reasonable to reflect on the position of Mission as a part of this.</p>	<p>Explore the position and role of Mission in relation to Everton & Mattersay Functional Cluster.</p>
IDBP/47	Organisation	Planning and Design Group	<p>General support for the vision of the IDBP, and particular reference to the new settlement proposal, is welcomed by the Council. This is alongside overall support for the proposed spatial hierarchy of settlement.</p> <p>More detailed scoping and study of possible locations for a new settlement will take place during the next stage of drafting the Bassetlaw Plan. The intention is that any new village would significantly enhance, or creates opportunity for, a Functional Cluster. It is noted that reference to a new settlement could be made clearer through Wider Rural Bassetlaw policies.</p> <p>The proposed 20% cap on overall settlement growth across Functional Clusters is intended to bring about positive and proportionate levels of development within a clear framework of sustainability based on mutual settlement support and connectivity. It is considered unreasonable to remove any development cap, this could result in excessive and unsustainable growth in some rural areas. However it is reasonable to explore further the development caps in relation to individual settlement context.</p>	<p>Continue scoping work to help identify possible locations of a new settlement and look to further clarify the role any new settlement within Wider Rural Bassetlaw.</p> <p>Consider changes suggested (see detailed comments) to the Bassetlaw Plan vision and objectives.</p> <p>Continue to explore the proposed 20% growth cap and 10% cap on individual development proposals across settlements within Functional Clusters.</p> <p>Continue to refine market/affordable housing needs evidence in light of any new SHMAA and government advice following the 2017 planning White Paper.</p> <p>Continue to refine employment land needs evidence and the relationship between employment land and</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
			<p>Current five year housing land supply equations fall outside of the remit of the emerging Bassetlaw Plan and housing/employment need evidence will be refined during the next stage of drafting the document.</p> <p>It is reasonable to review the need for an updated Landscape Character Assessment as a part of the emerging Bassetlaw Plan however the current evidence is still considered relevant and applicable.</p> <p>In relation to the re-use of historic assets the Council will continue to adopt a flexible stance dependent on individual proposals and all relevant legislation.</p>	<p>housing delivery projections.</p> <p>Review the need for an updated Landscape Character Assessment as a part of the emerging Bassetlaw Plan.</p>
IDBP/48	Organisation	Savills	Relates to land at Beck Lane, Hall Farm and Town Street, Clayworth (LAA 264/265/266). Would like to see the inclusion of Clayworth in the North East Functional Cluster.	
IDBP/49	Organisation	BiLFINGER GVA	Relates to land off Park Lane, Retford	
IDBP/50	Organisation	Sturton Le Steeple Parish Council	<p>Full support is given to neighbourhood plans across Bassetlaw and IDBP proposals intend to enhance the emphasis placed on settlement character and setting through a detailed criteria approach as opposed to existing development boundaries.</p> <p>Neighbourhood plans (including the neighbourhood plan review process) can enhance the understanding of local character to help improve development decisions and proactively allocate land to assure the direction of future growth.</p> <p>Although the desire for smaller dwellings is noted any future development proposals will need to be negotiated at the time of application based on the most recent housing need/demand evidence available. This evidence could be contained as a part of a neighbourhood plan development or review process.</p>	Explore the potential for local plan and neighbourhood planning policies which respond to the need/demand for differing dwelling size across rural Bassetlaw.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/51	Organisation	West Lindsey District Council	General support for the proposed approach in the IDBP document is welcomed by the Council including the recognition of Gainsborough as a service hub for the North East Functional Cluster of rural settlements.	Maintain contact with West Lindsey over future growth proposals for Gainsborough which acts as a service hub for north eastern rural Bassetlaw.
IDBP/52	Organisation	Cushman & Wakefield on behalf of Uniper	Relating to land at Cottam power station, Cottam. Re-use of site for employment or expansion of existing use. Recognising the importance of power generation locally as an employer.	
IDBP/53	Organisation	Derbyshire County Council	Support for the proposed (strategic) distribution of growth across urban areas and approach to landscape character/green infrastructure is welcomed by the Council. Concern over a lack of references to Creswell Crags as a local heritage asset are noted and it is reasonable to amend this during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan. It is also reasonable to explore how references to mineral protection and agricultural land can be better integrated in the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.	Look to enhance recognition of Creswell Crags as an exceptional local heritage asset through the Bassetlaw Plan. Explore links to landscape, tree and 'Policy Zone' maps/references (see detailed response) that are absent or failing to work and clarify the status of any 'Policy Zones'. Explore how references to mineral protection and agricultural land can be better integrated in the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.
IDBP/54	Organisation	Carlton in Lindrick Parish Council	Broad support for proposed Functional Clusters and 20% settlement development cap is welcomed by the Council. It is reasonable to consider a 'North West' Functional Cluster where Styrrup is grouped with Harworth & Bircotes due to geographic proximity. This will be explored during the next stage of drafting the Bassetlaw Plan alongside the integration of Costhorpe with Carlton & Lindrick. The proposal to allocate land through the emerging Neighbourhood Plan that would result in exceeding the proposed 20% housing cap is noted by the Council. Where this growth is planned and appropriate the principle of exceeding any development cap is considered reasonable.	Consider a 'North West Functional Cluster' where Styrrup is grouped with Harworth & Bircotes and including Costhorpe as an integral part of Carlton & Lindrick.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/55	Individual	Individual	<p>The currently adopted 2011 Core Strategy for Bassetlaw is still the most up to date and relevant planning policy document for the District and is used as the basis through which to assess development proposals. This will remain the case up to the adoption of the emerging Bassetlaw Plan in 2019. It would be highly unreasonable to introduce a moratorium on growth in any settlement. The planning system must in principle be positive and cannot make blanket objections to planning applications without offering due consideration within the relevant sustainability, policy and legislative framework.</p> <p>Full support is given to neighbourhood plans across Bassetlaw and IDBP proposals intend to maintain settlement identity/separation through a detailed criteria approach as opposed to existing development boundaries. This includes managing any rural settlement growth in Functional Clusters so that it is sympathetic in character and will not result in the merging of settlements. Any development cap introduced through the Bassetlaw Plan will account for existing full planning permissions and/or those sites under construction.</p>	Continue to explore the proposed 20% overall development cap in villages across Functional Clusters.
IDBP/56	Organisation	Oxalis Planning on behalf of Merryvale Developments	Relates to land at Grove Wood Road, Misterton (LAA 224)	
IDBP/57	Organisation	Bolsover District Council	<p>Concern over a lack of references to Creswell Crags as a local heritage asset are noted and it is reasonable to amend this during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>The IDBP attempts to take a strategic, cross-boundary approach but it is reasonable to look closer at links with</p>	<p>Look to enhance recognition of Creswell Crags as an exceptional local heritage asset through the Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>Assess the relationship of Shirebrook to the South West Functional Cluster.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
			Shirebrook and any joint employment flows during the next stage of drafting the Bassetlaw Plan.	Look to identify any major cross-boundary employment sites that enhance the understanding of commuter flows.
IDBP/58	Organisation	Canal and Rivers Trust	It is reasonable to consider the role of Chesterfield Canal in the context of historic and natural environment policies as a part of the emerging Bassetlaw Plan. The potential for Chesterfield Canal to be enhanced as a tourism asset is also noted.	Explore the role of Chesterfield Canal in the context of historic, natural and tourism related policies in the emerging Bassetlaw Plan.
IDBP/59	Organisation	Fisher German LLP on behalf Mr David Thorlby	Relates to land east of Shireoaks Common, Shireoaks (new submission for LAA)	
IDBP/60	Organisation	Home Building Federation	<p>Housing needs evidence will be considered further during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan. This includes a reflection on the latest household projections and any government methodology changes to the calculation of objectively assessed housing need announced through the planning White Paper. The overall support for the proposed spatial hierarchy is welcomed. The desire to allocate a range of sites to meet objectively assessed housing need in the interest of providing a range of market opportunity is noted. This, alongside any appropriate contingency or buffer, will be considered during the next stage of drafting the Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>Whole plan viability testing will form a part of the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan, this will include affordable housing and planning gain considerations.</p> <p>Comments on energy efficiency standards and self-build units being driven by local demand are noted and will be considered during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.</p>	<p>Continue to reflect on housing needs evidence including joint work on an update SHMA and the emerging government methodology on the calculation of objectively assessed housing need. Continue to assess a range of sites for possible allocation through the Bassetlaw Plan and consider the level of contingency required (suggested at 20% by the HBF) through the oversupply of sites. Reflect on the relationship between economic aspiration and the impact on housing need across the District.</p> <p>Start building approaches to whole plan viability testing.</p> <p>Consider comments (see detailed response) on energy efficiency standards and self-build units. Make strategic policy referencing clearer to provide context for Neighbourhood Plans.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
			It is reasonable to make clearer the emerging strategic policies of the emerging Bassetlaw Plan for easy reference in relation to Neighbourhood Plans.	Consider adopting the caveat of a 'minimum' housing target.
IDBP/61	Organisation	Fisher German LLP on behalf Mr David Thorlby	Relates to land north of Gateford Toll Bar, Worksop (new submission for LAA)	
IDBP/62	Organisation	Fisher German LLP on behalf Mr M Horrocks	Relates to land north of Bracken Lane, Retford (LAA 248)	
IDBP/63	Individual	Individual	<p>General support for the Functional Cluster approach is welcomed by the Council. The relationship of Functional Cluster and employment proposals is outlined in principle but will be enhanced during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan alongside any allocation of land for future development.</p> <p>Flood risk across the District will be considered through further evidence as a part of the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan. Any site specific flood risk will be considered at the potential allocation phase or as a part of any development proposal.</p> <p>Specialist and affordable housing evidence will be considered in more detail as a part of the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan, this will include the need for supported living accommodation.</p>	<p>Continue to look at site allocation options through the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>Continue developing evidence around strategic flood risk and affordable/specialist housing.</p>
IDBP/64	Organisation	Fisher German LLP on behalf of CA Strawson Farms Ltd	Relates to land east of London Road, Retford (LAA 249)	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/65	Organisation	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	<p>Concern over the future growth of Worksop and any impacts this may on the A57 leading into Rotherham MBC is noted.</p> <p>This is alongside the need to continue mutual monitoring and discussion through the Duty to Cooperate process.</p> <p>It is reasonable to explore references to National Nature Reserves, Special Areas of Conservation and Special Protection Areas in relation to the Sherwood Forest area.</p>	<p>Continue Duty to Cooperate discussions with Rotherham MBC, specifically over any growth implications on the A57 and address the possibility of joint improvement works through CIL funding.</p> <p>Explore references to National Nature Reserves, Special Areas of Conservation and Special Protection Areas in relation to the Sherwood Forest area.</p>
IDBP/66	Organisation	CBRE Ltd on behalf of Worksop College	Relates to land at Ranby House School (new submission for LAA)	
IDBP/67	Organisation	Beckingham cum Saundby Parish Council	<p>General support for the aims and objectives of the IDBP are welcomed by the Council alongside the aspiration to continue engagement with local communities as the Bassetlaw Plan develops.</p> <p>Until the Bassetlaw Plan is formally adopted by the Council any related planning policies do not form considerable material weight when making development decisions. Up until the adoption of the Bassetlaw Plan the current Core Strategy adopted in 2011 remains the most relevant development planning document and live development proposals or planning permissions fall outside of the scope of the emerging Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>CIL funding is intended to deliver infrastructure of strategic importance at a District wide scale. Any site specific planning gain would still be managed through individual Section 106 agreements.</p> <p>The proposed 20% development cap in the IDBP does account for full planning permissions or sites under construction at the time of adoption.</p> <p>Development viability will continue to play a part in the</p>	Continue to pro-actively engage with local communities as the Bassetlaw Plan develops.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
			<p>negotiation of planning applications in the future as the Council looks to balance the need for developer profit against wider planning gains. However any decision to release of viability evidence, which is often commercially sensitive, as a part of planning applications will largely fall outside of the Bassetlaw Plan process.</p>	
IDBP/68	Organisation	Fisher German LLP on behalf of Mr and Mrs Witney	<p>Relates to land south of North Moor Road, Walkeringham (LAA 244/245)</p>	
IDBP/69	Organisation	Anglian Water Services Ltd	<p>The Council will welcome more detailed comments on the emerging Bassetlaw Plan during subsequent consultations on proposed site allocations from Anglian Water. At this stage the IDBP is intended to help establish the spatial principals of the emerging document.</p> <p>Comments on securing the principle of sewage network capacity at an early stage of a development proposal are noted and it is reasonable to explore them further during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan. This includes considering the role of developer contributions in securing adequate sewage capacity.</p> <p>Support for SuDS schemes proposed through the IDBP is also welcomed by the Council.</p>	<p>Explore the principle of development criteria that ask developers to evidence existing sewage capacity in relation to planning proposals and fund/part-fund improvements where necessary.</p> <p>Consider adopting water efficiency standards as outlined by Anglian Water in the Water Resource Management Plan (2015).</p> <p>Consider producing a Water Cycle Study as a part of wider infrastructure evidence supporting the emerging Bassetlaw Plan.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
			<p>It is reasonable to reference and consider any implications contained in the Water Resource Management Plan (2015) produced by Anglian Water in relation to adopting water efficiency standards.</p> <p>It is reasonable to consider a Water Cycle Study as a part of wider infrastructure work within the emerging Bassetlaw Plan.</p>	
IDBP/70	Organisation	Fisher German LLP on behalf of Mr P Hinds Rampton	Relates to land south of Treswell Road, Rampton (LAA 066)	
IDBP/71	Organisation	WYG on behalf of Chaterpoint Group	Relates to land south of Markham Moor A1 junction (new submission for LAA)	
IDBP/72	Organisation	Strutt & Parker LLP on behalf of Folijambe Estate Kilton	Relates to land east of Kilton, Worksop (LAA 338 - employment/strategic extension to east Worksop)	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/73	Organisation	Barton Willmore on behalf of R E Howard and Sons	<p>Relates to land south of Ordsall, Retford (LAA 141/270/276) and employment land south of Harworth (LAA 172)</p> <p>The response generally supports the Draft Vision, Objectives and proposed Spatial Strategy. However, the respondent feels that more attention is needed to Bassetlaw's position in relation to D2N2 and Sheffield City Region. The respondent also disagrees with the new village proposal, feeling that the rural area is not an appropriate location to deliver new development, and that the focus should instead be on the main settlements, including urban extensions with an emphasis on sustainability. In particular, the respondent highlights the growth potential of Retford and the potential for further significant employment growth at Harworth.</p> <p>Additionally the respondent advocates an approach to rural development based on assessing the capacity of each individual development, rather than through a blanket cap. In terms of the housing target, the respondent's view is that this should be significantly higher than 435 dwellings per annum, in order to address economic aspirations and a very high need for affordable housing. The evidence base for the housing target, particularly the 2013 Strategic Housing Market Assessment is considered out-of-date. The respondent supports a viability led approach to affordable housing provision but objects to the possible use of overage clauses and the proposed requirement to 'pepper-pot' affordable housing throughout a development.</p> <p>In other areas the respondent is of the view that further evidence is required to underpin the economic growth aspirations set out in the document, that the wording of the natural environment approach should acknowledge the inevitable loss of some of the natural environment to</p>	<p>ASKED FOR SITE PLANS NOT TO BE RELEASED</p> <p>To fully address the implications of more recent demographic projections and other emerging evidence, Bassetlaw has commissioned an update to the SHMA and the results of this will be taken into account in the next draft of the Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>The Council will also take account of the government's intention to consult on and introduce a standardised methodology for calculating Objectively Assessed Housing Need. We also acknowledge the need to set out a clearer calculation of how our housing target has been arrived at and to give further consideration to the base date for the housing target.</p> <p>Further work is needed to consider the relationship between housing need and economic growth and we are grateful to consultees for putting forward evidence for how this might be addressed. Bassetlaw is currently undertaking further work to assess the need for new employment land and this will be taken into account alongside the latest evidence on housing need when reassessing the appropriate housing target for inclusion in the next draft of the Bassetlaw Plan. This will also help the Council to consider its position in relation to the economic growth aspirations of D2N2 and Sheffield City Region.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
			<p>accommodate development and that there should be more flexibility in the pursuit of good design.</p> <p>The Council recognises that the current Strategic Housing Market Assessment uses the 2011-based Household Projections as a starting point, and that these have now been superseded by, both, 2012-based projections and 2014-based projections. The background paper ‘How much Housing does Bassetlaw need?’ considered the potential impacts of these later projections on housing need for Bassetlaw, noting that they both projected lower growth in the number of households across the District than the 2011-based projections.</p> <p>The proposed housing target of 435 dwellings per year is subject to evolving evidence and policy context and the target will be reviewed in light of the consultation responses received and emerging evidence. However, the spatial strategy put forward through the Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan is considered to be sufficiently flexible to accommodate a range of housing need scenarios.</p> <p>The Council acknowledges that the latest household projections will lead to a reduced working age population, and that the Council will need to consider how to address this moving forward.</p> <p>Over the longer term the 2014 SHMA estimates affordable housing need as 646 affordable dwellings per annum (818 per annum in the short term only), more than the overall housing need calculated from demographic projections. However, the SHMA recognises that delivering such large number is unrealistic and that the private rented sector will play a significant part in addressing this need, supported by housing benefit payments.</p>	<p>The Council will be undertaking full plan viability testing as part of the process of plan development. We will need to undertake further consultation to consider whether the ‘pepper-potting’ of affordable housing is considered desirable by registered providers of affordable housing. Equally we will need to consider what triggers may be appropriate for activating overage clauses.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
			<p>The need for affordable housing is, arguably, more closely related to the local jobs market than the affordability of owner-occupied market housing. Housing values in Bassetlaw are significantly lower than the national average, and the housing target should not, therefore, be adjusted for price signals.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the Council does have the option of increasing its housing target in order to increase affordable housing delivery, and this is something that will need to be considered moving forward.</p> <p>It is important to emphasise that the proposed inclusion of a new village is based on a location and size of development that would bring additional services, thereby serving surrounding villages. This is a key factor in current work being commissioned to consider whether this should be taken forward. Additionally, our proposed approach to new housing development in the rural area is to allow proportionate new housing development only where residents have access to a range of key services. In such settlements the approach is intended to focus on how new development complements the existing character of the village.</p> <p>The proposed design policy is intended to recognise that Bassetlaw has not always attracted high quality design, arguably making an emphasis on high quality design more important for future development in the District.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/74	Organisation	National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups	Gypsy and Traveller site delivery is addressed through chapter 18 of the IDBP titled 'Gypsies, Travellers & Travelling Showpeople'. However it is recognised that this chapter heading was missed from the contents page of the IDBP. The Council welcome continued work with The National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups and hope for future comments on the emerging Bassetlaw Plan.	Assure the 'Gypsy, Travellers & Traveling Showpeople' chapter is properly referenced in all future Bassetlaw Plan documents.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/75	Individual	Individual	<p>The overall reference to the IDBP as a good paper, and in particular design policy proposals, is welcomed by the Council. It is reasonable to consider further reference to the tourism offer of Bassetlaw in relation to the Sheffield City Region.</p> <p>Although reference to improving school results may be reasonable in providing a sense of context this falls outside of the policy remit of the emerging Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>Rural homeworking is recognised as a part of the IDBP document through the emerging Functional Cluster approach and recognition that rural settlements are increasingly connected and play a part in the wider economy.</p> <p>It is reasonable to consider the role of Mission within the context of Functional Clusters as a part of the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>The location of any new settlement will be considered in more detail during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>Any marina site would be subject to a multiagency approach and open to a range of viability and wider sustainability assessments. This is unlikely to be pursued through the Bassetlaw Plan process but instead as a stand alone project.</p> <p>The proposals in the IDBP look to fundamentally shift the role of rural areas by identifying areas for greater levels of sustainable housing growth. The proposed Functional Cluster approach opens up the potential for development across a much wider range of rural settlements whilst retaining an emphasis on sustainability and proportionality, this includes retaining the importance of heritage setting.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the private rental sector absorbs a large proportion of those residents who are in need of more affordable housing, this is formally accounted for in the most recent Strategic Housing Market Area Assessment.</p>	<p>Consider further reference to the tourism offer of Bassetlaw in relation to the Sheffield City Region through a possible policy area.</p> <p>Look to enhance reference to the wider connectivity of rural areas through referencing rural skills, commuting patterns and home working.</p> <p>Consider the role of Mission within the context of Functional Clusters as a part of the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan, particularly in relation to Bawtry.</p> <p>Continue to review the principle, and possible location of, a new settlement.</p> <p>Look to give more recognition of the role of the relationship between the private rental and affordable housing sectors.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/76	Organisation	NLP Planning on behalf of SP Scholey	<p>The proposed thematic policies are intended to establish the direction of travel for the emerging policy areas within the Bassetlaw Plan. They are not intended to contradict strategic proposals but instead propose how development and growth could be managed in the future.</p> <p>General support for the vision and objectives of the IDBP is welcomed by the Council. The vision of the plan will be refined during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan and forms the overarching spirit of the emerging document.</p> <p>The principle of sustainable rural growth runs throughout the proposals behind Functional Clusters which, as collections of settlement, look to balance rural growth across the District with the need for this to be proportionate and suitably located to enhance local communities. Unchecked or overly disproportionate development across rural Bassetlaw is not considered to be a sustainable or reasonable approach.</p> <p>The evidence for housing need will be reviewed as a part of the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan. This will take into account the most recent household projections contained in an updated SHMAA and government advice on calculating objectively assess housing need containing in the 2017 planning White Paper.</p> <p>All housing trajectory and windfall assumptions will be assessed again during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan. Any housing allocations in rural areas will be considered during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan. However the intention of the IDBP is to focus larger scale growth towards Bassetlaw's larger towns with Functional Clusters growing proportionately in-line with market demand.</p> <p>The intention of any new settlement in not to undermine growth across rural Bassetlaw it is instead to enhance/create</p>	<p>Continue to refine market/affordable housing needs evidence in light of any new SHMAA and government advice following the 2017 planning White Paper.</p> <p>Consider analysing the residual housing target in light of the likely build out rate of existing permissions and NLP suggestions (see detailed response).</p> <p>Continue to explore the proposed 20% growth cap and 10% cap on individual development proposals across settlements within Functional Clusters.</p> <p>Continue to review housing trajectory and windfall delivery assumptions.</p> <p>Consider reviewing the necessity for limited rural land allocations in light of site capacity across Bassetlaw, any altered housing need and possible implications of the 2017 planning White Paper.</p> <p>Consider changes to the proposed Functional Clusters criteria policy (see detailed response).</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
			sustainability in Wider Rural Bassetlaw. In this sense any new settlement would occur simultaneously to growth across Functional Clusters of settlement.	
IDBP/77	Individual	IBA Planning	<p>Strong support for the overall approach of the IDBP is welcomed by the Council. This is alongside support of the Functional Clusters approach, proposed Spatial Hierarchy of settlement and the principle of a new settlement.</p> <p>Concerns raised of the nature of the Functional Cluster policy criteria are noted and it is reasonable to consider these during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>Possible flexibility over the proposed 20% development cap is noted, particularly where this may be in local community interest (for example delivering enhanced infrastructure or affordable housing).</p> <p>It is reasonable to consider a Design Review Panel or design competition in the interest of pursuing exemplar new settlement design. This would be at a later stage of the Bassetlaw Plan process if the principle of a new settlement is established.</p> <p>Comments on the proposed rural buildings and residential development policy approach across Wider Rural Bassetlaw are noted. All related policies will be tied more explicitly to the 2015 GPDO during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.</p>	
IDBP/78	Organisation	East Markham Parish Council	<p>Reference to Sheffield City Region through the IDBP is to help provide spatial context for Bassetlaw.</p> <p>Concerns over the proposed approach to Functional Clusters and the proposed replacement of development boundaries are noted. The intention of Functional Clusters is to help reflect the increasing connectivity of rural communities that, for example, share services and access to employment across</p>	Continue to explore connectivity between proposed rural settlements across Functional Clusters and refine the proposed policy criteria.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
			<p>the District. Connectivity between relevant rural settlements will be continue to be considered during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan alongside the proposed policy criteria to help manage growth in replacing development boundaries.</p> <p>General support for a 20% growth level for East Markham and other relevant rural settlements is welcomed by the Council.</p>	
IDBP/79	Organisation	Water Management Consortium	<p>General support for the IDBP's proposed approach to flood risk, and in particular SuDS, is welcomed by the Council. It is reasonable to account for increased SuDS capacity in light of climate change and expected increase in rainfall.</p> <p>It is reasonable to include reference to the two Internal Drainage Boards operating in Bassetlaw, namely the Trent Valley Drainage Board and the Isle of Axholme and North Nottinghamshire Water Level Management Board.</p>	<p>Look to account for increased SuDS capacity in light of climate change and expected increase in rainfall.</p> <p>Look to include reference to the two Internal Drainage Boards operating in Bassetlaw, namely the Trent Valley Drainage Board and the Isle of Axholme and North Nottinghamshire Water Level Management Board.</p>
IDBP/80	Organisation	Fisher German LLP on behalf of The Hospital of the Holy and Undivided Trinity	Relates to land at North Road, Retford (LAA 133/134)	
IDBP/81	Organisation	The Coal Authority	The lack of concern/comments raised by the Coal Authority is noted by the Council.	Continue to consult with the Coal Authority as the Bassetlaw Plan develops.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/82	Individual	Architectural Technologist Lts	<p>General support for the approach to rural sustainability, vision for Bassetlaw and Functional Clusters of rural settlement is welcomed by the Council.</p> <p>Concern over the difficulty of engaging investment in highways, utilities and public transport infrastructure is noted. Concern raised over the development criteria proposed to managed development across Functional Clusters is noted. It is worth stressing that Neighbourhood Plans can choose to exceed the proposed development caps where there is community support and aspiration. Also, the aspiration for rural growth and the market proposal of sites must be balanced against principles of sustainability and proportionality. This also applies to the range of settlements considered appropriate for future growth.</p> <p>Support for any new settlement is welcomed by the Council, the principle for this and any indicative locations will be outlined during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>Concerns over development viability and impact of planning obligations and policies on land values are noted. Whole plan viability assessments will help establish appropriate levels of planning obligations through the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan and the relative impact of proposed policies will be tested. However the planning system must always look to balance economic and financial considerations against the wider sustainability.</p> <p>The current process of development management decisions falls outside of the remit of the emerging Bassetlaw Plan. A new housing and employment land need baseline date will be agreed as a part of the emerging Bassetlaw Plan, this will respond to emerging central government advice on calculating</p>	<p>Continue working with external providers to help address strategic infrastructure need through the Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>Consider opinion on the proposed Functional Cluster criteria (see detailed response) around waste water, community infrastructure provision and the 10%/20% development caps which are considered restrictive. Continue to assess the range of rural settlements included in Functional Clusters in the light of ongoing evidence collation. Also, continue Look at the proposals for Wider Rural Bassetlaw in relation to NPPF guidance on rural development.</p> <p>Continue to consider the principle for, and location of, any new settlement.</p> <p>Continue to analyse housing and employment land need, considering accounting for any delivery shortfall.</p> <p>Consider rural employment policies and the scale of economic development that may be appropriate in a rural context.</p> <p>Continue to address affordable, and in particular elderly, housing need and delivery mechanisms.</p> <p>Reassess rural development policies in light of changing permitted development rights around agricultural buildings and the nature of rural worker connection criteria.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
			housing land need and look to reasonably account for any delivery shortfall.	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/83	Organisation	Notts County Council	<p>More detailed proposals for any new settlement will be developed during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan. It is reasonable consider developing tourism policy area. The development of Functional Clusters is grounded in the principle of mutual access to core service provision.</p> <p>It is reasonable to consider site permeability in relation to public transport, pedestrian and cycle access to new development.</p> <p>General support for the IDBP proposed approach to ecology is welcomed by the Council, specific comments will be considered during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.</p>	<p>Consider developing tourism policy area.</p> <p>Consider reference to the Spatial Planning for Health and Wellbeing of Nottinghamshire (2016) document alongside the adoption of Health Impact Assessments for future planning policy proposals and major development schemes.</p> <p>Consider specific Health Impact Assessment recommendations (see detailed response) including those around minimum build and open space standards.</p> <p>Consider how mineral and waste matters, and any possible safeguarding, could influence any site allocations.</p> <p>Look to link transport permeability and flow into general design principles.</p> <p>Consider incorporating specific comments on ecology (see detailed response).</p> <p>Retain pro-active contact with Nottinghamshire County Council link relation to any possible public transport, highways and education (with more reference) implications linked to new development.</p> <p>Consider Landscape Character Assessments in relation to the review/removal of any development boundaries and emphasise landscape impact more in any Functional Cluster policy criteria.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/84	Organisation	Felsham PD on behalf of INEOS Upstream Ltd	Mineral extraction and mineral works are managed by Nottinghamshire County Council. As such it is unreasonable for the emerging Bassetlaw Plan to contain policies on mineral/hydrocarbon extraction.	Continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council in relation mineral applications and any relevant mineral policies for the County.
IDBP/85	Individual	W S Barnes LLP	General support for the Bassetlaw Plan is welcomed by the Council.	
IDBP/86	Organisation	Sutton Cum Lound Parish Council	General positive comment on the IDBP is welcomed by the Council. The proposed 20% cap on overall settlement growth across Functional Clusters is intended to bring about positive and proportionate levels of development within a clear framework of sustainability based on mutual settlement support and connectivity. It is reasonable to explore further the development caps in relation to the individual settlement context of Sutton-cum-Lound.	Continue to explore the proposed 20% growth cap and 10% cap on individual development proposals across settlements within Functional Clusters.
IDBP/87	Organisation	Doncaster Council	It is reasonable to consider the relationship between Harworth & Bircotes with Bawtry during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan. Specifically considering expanding the scope of the current Functional Clusters to form a wider 'North West Functional Cluster' and including more reference to the potential impact of development in Harworth & Bircotes on Bawtry. Specific discussions around any impacts on service provision and highways will be addressed through joint meetings under the duty to cooperate as the Bassetlaw Plan develops. It is reasonable to reference Bassetlaw's position within the 'Airport Corridor' as a part of the SCR Integrated Infrastructure Plan.	Look to adopt a 'North West Functional Cluster' that recognises the links, and mutual impact of growth, between Harworth & Bircotes and Bawtry. Continue to pursue positive discussions with Doncaster MBC under the duty to cooperate process that address growth proposals for Harworth & Bircotes, any revised housing targets and gypsy and traveller site proposals. Look to reference Bassetlaw's position within the 'Airport Corridor' as a part of the SCR Integrated Infrastructure Plan.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/88	Organisation	DHA Group on behalf of Laing O'Rourke	Relates to employment land to the west of Worksop, Explore Industrial Park. Support for aspirational employment policies.	Any employment allocations will be considered as a part of the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan. Any planning applications to extend existing premises will be considered against the adopted Local Plan at the time

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/89	Organisation	Everton Parish Council	<p>It is important to stress that Bassetlaw does have a currently adopted Local Plan, the 2011 Core Strategy. The recent increase in rural planning permissions being sought is based on the lack of an identified five year housing land supply in the District which, through national policy, effectively removes local housing related planning policies.</p> <p>The Council recognises the need to address the relationship between Everton and Harwell.</p> <p>Openly negative 'character/conservation area' policies that impose blanket restrictions on development are unlikely to be considered reasonable.</p> <p>The proposed Functional Clusters include links to external towns, such as Bawtry, where mutual service provision has been accounted for. Also, the aspiration of the Functional Cluster approach is to enhance the viability of important rural services.</p> <p>The proposed Functional Cluster policy criteria are intended to explicitly protect against rural settlement sprawl by grounding decisions in character and relationship to settlement boundaries.</p> <p>Any current planning permissions cannot be influenced by the emerging Bassetlaw Plan, this is until the document gains some material weight and is adopted. During the next stage of developing the Bassetlaw Plan a baseline date to monitor any final development cap will be considered.</p> <p>The nature of planning contributions in rural areas will be considered in more detail during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan, this will include consideration of development viability testing.</p> <p>It is reasonable to continue consider the scale of cap on individual development proposals, currently proposed at 10%.</p>	<p>Look to address the relationship between Everton and Harwell.</p> <p>Consider adding more reference to the context of heritage assets in emerging policy.</p> <p>Consider broad rural settlement 'buffer zones' to help identify open countryside separation between Functional Cluster settlements.</p> <p>Explore a rural settlement SPD looking to enhance evidence around rural character and heritage.</p> <p>Consider the monitoring baseline for monitoring residential growth across Functional Clusters.</p> <p>Continue to consider the scale of cap proposed for individual development proposals, including a 5% cap.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/90	Organisation	South Leverton Parish Council	<p>The Council welcome more engagement with South Leverton Parish Council as the Bassetlaw Plan develops and look to align this process with any Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>There is no pre-allocated land area associated with planned housing growth. Any planning application or land allocation will consider dwelling numbers/density on a site by site basis.</p> <p>Any development proposals in an area covered by a Neighbourhood Plan will be considered against that document and the currently adopted Local Plan for Bassetlaw.</p> <p>Planned growth will be considered in relation to an infrastructure needs assessment of Bassetlaw, this will include working with external service providers to help identify areas of service deficiency.</p> <p>The Land Availability Assessment process and results will be made publicly available.</p> <p>The Council supports the principle that suitable rural growth can act to enhance local populations, boost local demand for services and add to vibrancy.</p>	<p>Continue engagement with external infrastructure providers as a part of the whole plan infrastructure needs assessment, in particular addressing rural service need.</p>
IDBP/91	Organisation	The Planning Bureau on behalf of McCarthy and Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd	<p>General support for the IDBP approach to affordable and specialist housing, particularly housing for the elderly, is welcomed by the Council. The general aging structure of Bassetlaw's resident population is recognised and will be addressed again when revised housing need numbers are produced during the next stage of the emerging Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>Your concern for the need for bespoke sites to accommodate specialist housing is noted alongside the opinion that larger land allocations may not be able to successfully incorporate specialist elderly housing schemes.</p>	<p>Continue to assess specific affordable housing requirements when considering OAHN calculations. This includes the need for elderly, specialist and sheltered accommodation.</p> <p>Consider the guidance contained within (2012) <i>Housing in Later Life: Planning Ahead for Specialist Housing for Older People</i> and associated toolkit.</p> <p>Consider specific policy areas on elderly, specialist and sheltered accommodation in the emerging Bassetlaw Plan.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/92	Individual	Individual	<p>Your site specific submissions are noted by the Council and will be assessed during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>However it is important to note that the sites detailed will not become a formal part of the Land Availability Assessment Process.</p> <p>Your concerns and observations relating to Worksop and Retford are noted. Any existing planning permissions will fall outside of the remit to the emerging Bassetlaw Plan. Crime prevention is a wider issue managed through partnership with the Police although planning policy can play some role in helping to prevent crime through good design.</p>	<p>Consider reference to crime minimisation in emerging design policies.</p> <p>Screen the sites submitted (see detailed response).</p>
IDBP/93	Organisation	Cushman and Wakefield on behalf of EON	Relates to land at former High Marnham Power Station, High Marnham (new submission for LAA)	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/94	Individual	Individual	<p>This response has been redacted given that the Council has a specific duty under the 2015 Equality Act to promote good relations between groups in our society. Some comments you made could be considered offensive by other members of society.</p> <p>All efforts are made to consider the opinions and perspectives of existing residents when developing planning policies however there it is essential the Council plan positively to meet the housing and employment needs of Bassetlaw's changing population. Concerns raised about traffic impacts around Retford and the need for smaller dwellings are noted. These issues will be addressed further during the next stage of evidence associated with the emerging Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>The proposed removal of development boundaries across Bassetlaw's rural settlements through the IDBP is intended to be replaced by a range of policy criteria which will specifically prevent unchecked development. There is currently no proposal to remove the development boundary around Retford.</p>	Continue to assess potential highway and social infrastructure impact/needs as a part of the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan alongside the need for smaller dwellings/bungalows.
IDBP/95	Organisation	Town Planning on behalf of client base	<p>Your overall support of the strategic direction of the emerging Bassetlaw Plan is welcomed by the Council.</p> <p>Your concern about the Trent Corridor Functional Cluster is noted. Although there is not one clear 'parent' settlement in the Functional Cluster the relevant settlements are able to work co-operatively to provide access to daily primary services for local residents.</p>	Look to refine the Functional Cluster approach, in particular re-assess the ability of local residents across the Trent Corridor Functional Cluster to reasonably access primary services.
IDBP/96	Organisation	Sandhills Community Vision Plan	Your comments about the Sandhills site are noted, more detailed land implications associated with any proposed development across Retford will be developed during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.	Continue to look at site allocation options and growth options for Retford through the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/97	Individual	Individual	<p>Any new settlement proposals will be outlined in more detail during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>The need for specific housing types, including bungalows, will be considered through evidence collated as a part of the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.</p>	<p>Continue to assess the need for specific dwelling types, including bungalows, through wider housing needs evidence as a part of the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>Continue to build a positive relationship between residents and the Planning Service of the Council.</p>
IDBP/98	Organisation	The Priory Shopping Centre	Your support for the IDBP document is welcomed by the Council. The impact of projected growth on the highways network will be considered through infrastructure modelling as a part of the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.	Continue to assess the impact of projected growth on the highway network as a part of the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.
IDBP/99	Organisation	Natural England	<p>General support for the proposed vision and objectives are welcomed by the Council.</p> <p>The land allocation process will have full regard to environmental value and be guided by the SA and HRA process.</p> <p>General support for the proposed landscape, green infrastructure, open space and climate change policy approaches are welcomed by the Council.</p>	<p>Look for any emerging/additional opportunities to protect and enhance the natural environment through the emerging Bassetlaw Plan alongside promoting biodiversity networks. This is alongside adopting a strategic approach to the natural environment.</p> <p>Guide any land allocations through the SA and HRA process.</p> <p>Consider specific recommendations and references during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan (see detailed response) alongside developing policy areas around soil protection, air pollution, tranquillity and water quality.</p>
IDBP/100	Organisation	WYG on behalf of William Davis Limited	Relates to land off St Annes Drive, Worksop (LAA 206) and land off Carlton Road/Hemmingfield Rise, Worksop (LAA 205)	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/101	Individual	Individual	<p>It is important to stress that any previous or current development management decision such as that at Harworth South fall outside of the remit of the emerging Bassetlaw Plan. Any S.106 agreements and their enforcement are unique to each planning agreement.</p> <p>Although economic aspiration will form a fundamental component of the emerging Bassetlaw Plan it is important to respond to the local economic character and strengths of Bassetlaw and the resident workforce. Further evidence will be developed during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>General support for the principle of introducing proportionate and diverse rural growth is welcomed by the Council.</p> <p>Functional Clusters are intended to help understand and recognise the importance of access to shared rural services across Bassetlaw. Service access across the District's rural areas is not consistent and although some communities such as Blyth residents have access to all the defined primary services locally (i.e. a retail provision, GP surgery, primary school and post office facility) this is not the case in many other rural settlements. As such Functional Clusters of settlement should be seen as working collectively, including in cases where neighbouring rural communities are more reliant on settlements such as Blyth with better local service provision. Therefore it is not considered reasonable to separate any one settlement from a Functional Cluster solely based on individual access to a good range of rural services.</p> <p>Whilst recognising the wider importance of Retford as a rural-hub town in Bassetlaw the relationship identified between Blyth and Harworth & Bircotes reflects the relative proximity of the two settlements in relation to service accessibility. It is reasonable to explore this relationship further as during the</p>	<p>Continue to explore the qualitative and quantitative need for employment land as a part of the emerging Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>Look to adopt employment development design standards.</p> <p>Explore the functional connectivity between Blyth and Harworth & Bircotes.</p> <p>Look to address street frontages as a part of the emerging town centre policy areas.</p> <p>Explain in more detail terms such as 'legibility' in relation to design and 'nuanced' in relation to policy decisions.</p> <p>Consider identifying/defining 'Wider Rural Bassetlaw' in more detail for clarity of policy interpretation.</p> <p>Look to recognise the relative role of Bassetlaw within the Sheffield City Region economy.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
			<p>next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan. However it is important to stress that the Harworth & Bircotes Functional Cluster is not intended to undermined the integrity of Blyth as a separate rural community.</p> <p>Fracking will be referenced in the emerging Bassetlaw Plan but any associated development will be managed by Nottinghamshire County Council.</p> <p>Strategic transport modelling to assess road capacity will be carried out during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan this is alongside updated strategic flood risk evidence.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/102	Organisation	Environment Agency	<p>It is reasonable to consider improved reference to biodiversity enhancement and water security.</p> <p>General support for the strategic proposals of the IDBP are welcomed by the Council.</p> <p>General support for the approach and aspiration of the biodiversity and geodiversity policy areas is welcomed by the Council. This is alongside the support for the IDBP's approach to flood risk and infrastructure provision.</p>	<p>Retain contact with the Environment Agency as specific site allocations are proposed.</p> <p>Consider improved reference to biodiversity enhancement and water security/use minimization.</p> <p>Also work with Building Regulations to establish water use standards on new build dwellings.</p> <p>Consider a standalone draft objective on the 'protection and enhancement of biodiversity and green infrastructure', changes to the biodiversity policy area and more detailed reference to SuDS within the design policy areas (see detailed response).</p> <p>Look to include reference to flood risk within the Gypsy and Traveller policy area.</p>
IDBP/103	Organisation	NFU	General support for Strategic Proposal 6A is welcomed by the Council and in particular the policy approach proposed for the conversion of rural buildings.	Reflect on changing permitted development rights relating to the re-use of agricultural buildings during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.
IDBP/104	Individual	Individual	<p>A clear baseline will be drawn to calculate any 10% cap on individual development proposals across Functional Clusters, this will avoid the compounding of development numbers.</p> <p>The proposed policy criteria associated with Functional Clusters explicitly look to protect the character of associated settlements and prevent coalescence. Also the IDBP does not propose to remove the development boundary surrounding Retford.</p> <p>The Council is fully supportive of Neighbourhood Planning and this will remain the case as the Bassetlaw Plan adopted</p>	Continue to explore the proposed 20% growth cap and 10% cap on individual development proposals across settlements within Functional Clusters.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
			throughout which work will continue with local residents to help them achieve their aspirations.	
IDBP/105	Organisation	Elmton with Creswell Parish Council	Concern over the lack of reference to Creswell Crags Heritage Centre is noted by the Council and it is reasonable to look at this further during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.	Look to include greater reference to the Creswell Crags as an important local heritage and natural asset.
IDBP/106	Individual	Individual	It is reasonable to consider how Mattersey Thorpe relates as an individual settlement within the Everton & Mattersey Functional Cluster.	Consider how Mattersey Thorpe relates as an individual settlement within the Everton and Mattersey Functional Cluster as a part of analysing the role of smaller hamlets in Functional Clusters.
IDBP/107	Organisation	Central Bassetlaw Forum	Support for the proposed Functional Clusters outlined in the IDBP is welcomed by the Council. The Council is fully supportive of Neighbourhood Planning and this will remain the case as the Bassetlaw Plan adopted. It is reasonable to consider how Neighbourhood Plans can be better accounted for in the emerging Bassetlaw Plan.	Look for ways to encourage better understanding between the Planning Policy team at Bassetlaw District Council and Neighbourhood Planning groups as the Bassetlaw Plan emerges. Also consider how Neighbourhood Plans can be better accounted for in the emerging Bassetlaw Plan.
IDBP/108	Organisation	Bawtry Town Council	Concern over the growth of Harworth & Bircotes is noted by the Council. It is worth stressing that any existing planning permissions or strategies will be outside of the scope of the Bassetlaw Plan.	Keep Bawtry Town Council informed of progression on the emerging Bassetlaw Plan.
IDBP/109	Organisation	Retford Civic Society	Any site allocations will be considered during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan. A formal allowance for windfall development (and housing associated trajectory) will be accounted for during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan. The proposed 20% cap on settlement growth across Functional Clusters is intended to work alongside any Neighbourhood Plans and subsequent land allocations. The final cap on development would account for any sites with full	Continue the assessment of sites for possible allocation within the Bassetlaw Plan process. Continue to review the proposed 20% development cap across Functional Clusters and the relationship of any cap to Neighbourhood Plans and the monitoring framework.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
			<p>planning permission, those under construction and all existing dwellings. All associated data will be monitored regular against a suitable base line date on adoption of the Bassetlaw Plan and inform future decisions about settlement growth. The proposed loss of development boundaries will be compensated by a range of planning policy criteria that will offer a sustainable approach to rural development.</p> <p>It is reasonable to consider changing the tone of emerging policies to be more positive about sustainable growth in Retford that enhances the town centre.</p> <p>Support for the general approach towards heritage is welcomed by the Council. Locally designated heritage assets will continue to form an appropriate level of consideration in future development decisions.</p> <p>Open space designations will be considered in more detail during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan. It is reasonable to explore visual and amenity value of sites although any formal designation will most likely take precedence.</p>	<p>Consider changing the tone of emerging policies to be more positive about sustainable growth in Retford that enhances the town centre.</p> <p>Consider exploring the visual and amenity value of any open space designations.</p>
IDBP/110	Organisation	Linden Homes	<p>Concerns raised over development viability and the importance of providing a range of small to medium sites, in the interests of diversifying the housing market, are noted. Any site allocations will be considered during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>General support for the proposed approach to Retford through the IDBP document is welcomed by the Council. It is reasonable to consider the role of Retford both as a 'hub' town and emphasise the town's inherent sustainability.</p> <p>Whole plan viability assessment will start as an early stage in the Bassetlaw Plan process the help test the viability of proposed planning policy obligations.</p>	<p>Continue the assessment of sites for possible allocation within the Bassetlaw Plan process, including the scope for small to medium sites.</p> <p>Look to consider the role of Retford both as a 'hub' town and emphasise the town's inherent sustainability as Bassetlaw's second largest urban area.</p> <p>Look to begin early whole plan viability assessments to better assure the viability of proposed planning policy obligations.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/111	Organisation	Education Funding Agency	<p>Work with Nottinghamshire County Council will continue during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan to assure infrastructure funding for Schools is fully addressed. Concerns raised over the need to consider changing demand for school provision over time are noted.</p> <p>Any land safeguarded for school provision will be considered during the site allocation phase wherever necessary.</p>	Continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council in the assessment of school provision and associated funding throughout the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan, in particular noting any shifting demand or the possible need to new school delivery.
IDBP/112	Organisation	North and South Wheatley Parish Council	The aspiration to endorse the comments made by Sturton Parish Council are noted by the Council.	Link the comments of North & South Wheatley Parish Council to those of Sturton Parish Council.
IDBP/113	Organisation	Pegasus Group on behalf of Edward Fisher	Relates to land north-west of Chestnut Road, Langold (LAA 209/312)	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/114	Organisation	Headon, Upton, Grove and Stokeham, as well as the Neighbourhood Planning team	<p>Possible repetition of previous comments.</p> <p>The relationship between housing and employment growth is complex. This is because the range of skills/qualifications of new households may not always directly correlate with the demand of local employers. However the strategic importance of boosting employment opportunities across the District and assuring a sustainable working age population locally through housing growth will be recognised in the Bassetlaw Plan. It is also reasonable to test any employment land allocations against a commuter catchment area. The detailed character and range of employment land need will be explore further in the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>Functional Clusters are not intended to restrict rural communities into a certain patterns of service use but instead represent groups of settlement where there is <i>reasonable</i> accessibility to a range of key services. However the principle of looking at how Functional Clusters operate in relation to commuter flows is reasonable during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>Functional Clusters are not linked to public transport access as it is unreasonably restrictive to plan around, for example, rural bus services. However the importance of public transport to rural communities is appreciated. Therefore the Council will independently assess a range of methods to support rural public transport access through the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>The evidence detailing the position of Grove in relation to the Retford & Villages Functional Cluster is welcome. It is reasonable to re-examine the position of Grove in any Functional Cluster.</p> <p>Although the brownfield land first approach is recognised it is</p>	<p>Look to build a methodology to assess the commuter catchment area of any proposed employment land allocations.</p> <p>Consider the nature of commuter flows in relation to Functional Clusters.</p> <p>Build rural public transport accessibility into infrastructure studies as a part of the Bassetlaw Plan process.</p> <p>Consider the role of Grove as a part of the Retford & Villages Functional Cluster.</p> <p>Explore defined policy parameters around the prevention of settlement merging.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
			<p>important to note that Bassetlaw is a predominantly greenfield area with around 96% of the District being classified as rural in character. As such new development over the life of the Bassetlaw Plan is likely to impact on greenfield areas to some extent.</p> <p>The character, built form and integrity of all settlements within Functional Clusters underpins the rural policy criteria in the IDBP. It is however reasonable to offer policy parameters around the protection of settlement integrity and avoiding settlement merges.</p> <p>The sale of any private land for proposed development is outside the scope of the emerging Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>The detailed provision of affordable and specialist housing will be considered as a part of the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan alongside the ability to deliver on sustainable energy generation.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Bassetlaw District Council ID	Association and/or Organisation	Organisation	Officer Response	Further Action
IDBP/115	Organisation	North Leverton Parish Council	<p>The Core Strategy is being replaced due to changes in national planning policy and guidance. As such the emerging Bassetlaw Plan will be in a far stronger position to manage effectively the distribution and character of development across the District. The proposed 20% cap on overall development for each settlement in a Functional Cluster would take into account existing full-planning permissions, sites under construction at the time, any Neighbourhood Plan site allocations and all existing dwellings in the settlement. Impacts of any development proposals on existing transport, utilities and social infrastructure will be modelled during the next stage of drafting the Bassetlaw Plan. Neighbourhood Plans are recognised as an important part of the planning policy framework through the IDBP and will be supported as such through the emerging Bassetlaw Plan. The Sheffield City Region plays an important role in establishing sub-regional economic aspiration and involved in the delivery of some major site locally however Bassetlaw District Council retains all planning powers and as such will continue to produce a planning policy framework for the District.</p>	Retain watching brief on Sheffield City Region.
IDBP/116	Organisation	Severn Trent Water	The lack of concern at this stage of the Bassetlaw Plan is noted by the Council.	Continue to inform Severn Trent Water of developments in the Bassetlaw Plan, particularly at the site proposal phase where a closer assessment of water capacity can be made.
IDBP/117	Organisation	Highways England	The overall lack of concern at this stage of the Bassetlaw Plan is noted by the Council, this is alongside recognising previous work on the A1/A614 junction.	Continue to inform Highways England of developments in the Bassetlaw Plan, particularly at the site proposal phase where a closer assessment of impact on the highways network can be made.
IDBP/118	Organisation	National Grid	The lack of concern at this stage of the Bassetlaw Plan is noted by the Council.	Continue to inform the National Grid of developments in the Bassetlaw Plan.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Draft Bassetlaw Plan- Part 1: Strategic Plan (2019 Consultation)

The following table includes the representations received during the consultation and the responses provided by the Council to address them. Where necessary, the Council's response identifies the changes which would be made for the following iteration of the Plan as a result of the submitted representations.

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
Duty to Cooperate			
DBLP37	Marine Management Organisation	<p>As the marine planning authority for England the MMO is responsible for preparing marine plans for English inshore and offshore waters. At its landward extent, a marine plan will apply up to the mean high water springs mark, which includes the tidal extent of any rivers. As marine plan boundaries extend up to the level of the mean high water spring tides mark, there will be an overlap with terrestrial plans which generally extend to the mean low water springs mark. Marine plans will inform and guide decision makers on development in marine and coastal areas. Planning documents for areas with a coastal influence may wish to make reference to the MMO's licensing requirements and any relevant marine plans to ensure that necessary considerations are included. The East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans are relevant and cover the area from Flamborough Head to Felixstowe including the tidal extent of any rivers within this area. Only aspects regarding the tidal extent of the River Trent have been considered - suggest that the Council complete an interpretation of the Marine Plan. Recommend that the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans are highlighted as a regional policy document. This is due to the tidal extent of the River Trent, which is included in Bassetlaw District. The East Marine Plan contains a number of policies that are relevant: east plan policies may be relevant to policies 14, 15, 17, 19, 21 and 24 in the Local Plan: CC1, CC2,</p>	<p>All relevant planning documents will be considered and referred to, where appropriate, in the Local Plan including the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans - these will form part of the evidence base for the Local Plan.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		SOC2, SOC3, BIO1, BIO2, ECO1, GOV1. Recommend consult East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans and Marine Information System for further information.	
DBLP57	Central Lincolnshire Core Local Plan Team	It is noted that, in both the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan and SCI, reference is made to West Lindsey District Council as an adjacent authority but not to Central Lincolnshire. It should be noted that, for planning purposes, whilst West Lindsey District Council retains its development management function, the Central Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee and the officers of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Team are responsible for producing the Local Plan for West Lindsey, North Kesteven and the City of Lincoln. May be appropriate to include Central Lincolnshire as well as West Lindsey officers in future Duty to Cooperate and Statement of Common Ground discussions. Have recently announced a review of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan and look forward to discussing any potential cross boundary matters in the near future.	It is agreed that it would be appropriate to involve Central Lincolnshire officers in future Duty to Cooperate and Statement of Common Ground for cross boundary matters.
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	There is no evidence at this time to doubt the Council that is has discharged its Duty to Co-operate and that its neighbouring authorities have not requested that Bassetlaw accommodate outside growth. Do not consider this should be the end for Bassetlaw considering its role in the wider area and its role as part of 2 LEPs. Bassetlaw has the opportunity to contribute to and, more importantly, capitalise on the wider growth of the SCR as a driver for growth in its own District. To capitalise on that growth the plan will need to be ambitious and not simply meet the minimum requirements of meeting its own needs for growth. Bassetlaw's overarching aim for the District should be to achieve a long mooted 'step-change' in its economic growth which will require a boost to the housing market to facilitate that growth.	The Council agrees that there is a need for a step change in the economic strategy and is planning to deliver a significant level of housing (well in excess of the housing requirement) to achieve this objective.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP143	Persimmon Homes & Charles Church	<p>BDC is part of the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw Housing Market Area (HMA) which comprises constituent authorities of Bassetlaw, Bolsover, Chesterfield and North East Derbyshire. There is also a recognised overlap between this HMA and the Sheffield City Region HMA with shared economic links. The Local Plan must demonstrate co-operation between authorities to meet unmet housing needs in full. A signed Statement of Common Ground (May 2018) between the North Derbyshire & Bassetlaw HMA was entered into where Duty to Cooperate requirements on active and on-going engagement is allied to the preparation of a Joint North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw SHMA. Further details on the outcome of cross boundary work between the HMAs to establish whether Bassetlaw's OAN accounts for demand arising from the neighbouring Sheffield City Regional HMA would be welcomed - uncertain whether the plan fully addresses this key housing market relationship.</p>	<p>Comments Noted.</p>
DBLP221	Gladman Developments	<p>Recognise that the DtC is a process of ongoing engagement and collaboration, as set out in the PPG it is clear that the Duty is intended to produce effective policies on cross boundary strategic matters. The Council must be able to demonstrate that it has engaged and worked with its neighbouring authorities, alongside their existing joint work arrangements, to satisfactorily address cross boundary strategic issues, and the requirement to meet any unmet housing needs. This is not just consultation but effective cooperation to ensure that the Housing Market Area's (HMAs) housing needs are met in full. From attendance at other local plan examinations in the HMA, Gladman is aware that the Council has signed a SoCG. Recommend that this evidence be made publically available in order to demonstrate that the Council has effectively worked with its neighbouring authorities in order to discharge the DtC.</p>	<p>The Council will continue to discharge its Duty to Cooperate requirements throughout the Local Plan process. All Statements of Common Ground will become part of the Local Plan evidence base and wil be added to the Local Plan website in due course.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP255	Home Builders Federation	<p>To fully meet the legal requirements of the Duty to Co-operate should engage on a constructive, active and on-going basis with its neighbouring authorities to maximise the effectiveness of plan making. The Plan should be prepared through joint working on cross boundary issues such as housing needs. The 2019 NPPF requires Plans to be positively prepared and provide a strategy which as a minimum seeks to meet its own local housing needs in full and is informed by agreements with other authorities so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated (para 35a). The meeting of unmet needs should be set out in a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) signed by all respective authorities in accordance with the 2019 NPPF (paras 24, 26 & 27). The Local Plan should be based on effective joint working on cross boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred as evidenced by a SoCG (para 35c). One key outcome from co-operation between authorities should be the meeting of housing needs in full. A key element of Local Plan Examination is ensuring that there is certainty through formal agreements that an effective strategy is in place to deal with strategic matters such as unmet housing needs when Local Plans are adopted. Bassetlaw adjoins seven other LPAs (Bolsover, Doncaster, Mansfield, Newark & Sherwood, North Lincolnshire, Rotherham, and West Lindsey). Bassetlaw is a part of the North Derbyshire & Bassetlaw Housing Market Area (HMA) with North East Derbyshire, Bolsover and Chesterfield Councils. There is an identified overlap between this HMA and the Sheffield City Region HMA (including neighbouring authorities of Doncaster & Rotherham) with recognised functional economic links between the two HMAs. Bassetlaw is a non-constituent member of the Sheffield City Region LEP and a full member of the Derbyshire & Nottinghamshire D2N2 LEP. At the time of consultation no SoCG explaining cross boundary working was</p>	<p>The Council will continue to discharge its Duty to Cooperate requirements throughout the Local Plan process. A statement of common ground has been signed by the local authorities, which form the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw HMA (Bassetlaw DC, Bolsover DC, North East Derbyshire DC, and Chesterfield BC). Bassetlaw DC has also signed a statement of common ground with Mansfield DC. The Council intends to sign a statement of common ground with all neighbouring authorities and Sheffield City Region, subject to agreement of the contents, prior to the submission of the Bassetlaw Plan for examination. All Statements of Common Ground will become part of the Local Plan evidence base and wil be added to the Local Plan website in due course.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>available. It is understood that the Council is proposing to deliver all its development requirements in its own boundaries and no requests to address the development needs of neighbouring local authorities have been received. From attendance at recent Local Plan Examinations for North East Derbyshire and Bolsover it is known that the Council has signed a SoCG.</p>	
DBLP287	Sheffield City Region	As part of the DTC the Council continue to work with other districts through the SCR Heads of Planning Group which focuses on strategic planning matters and evidence sharing.	Acknowledgement and support of ongoing DTC is welcome and noted. The Council will continue to discharge its Duty to Cooperate requirements throughout the Local Plan process.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		The continued participation will help ensure positive collaboration as the Plan moves through to implementation.	
DBLP440	990764	It is noted that, in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan and SCI, reference is made to West Lindsey District Council as an adjacent authority but not to Central Lincolnshire. It should be noted that, for planning purposes, whilst West Lindsey District Council retains its development management function, the Central Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee and the officers of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Team are responsible for producing the Local Plan for West Lindsey, North Kesteven and the City of Lincoln. It may be appropriate to include Central Lincolnshire as well as West Lindsey in future Duty to Cooperate and Statement of Common Ground discussions.	It is agreed that it would be appropriate to involve Central Lincolnshire officers in future Duty to Cooperate and Statement of Common Ground for cross boundary matters.
Figure 1			
DBLP51	Canal & River Trust	Welcome the inclusion of the Chesterfield Canal and River Trent on the key diagram. Believe this will help make decision makers more aware of the location of our network and where policies that affect our work may apply.	Support for the inclusion of the Chesterfield Canal and River Trent on the key diagram is noted.
DBLP90	Lichfields on behalf of db symmetry Ltd	The Key Diagram excludes the site from the area identified to the south of Harworth & Bircotes. This is not clarified in the supporting text. Acknowledge that this is illustrative but if our assumptions do reflect the Council's position, this is misleading and inaccurate. It should be made clear that the strategy for Harworth & Bircotes includes land in Blyth parish and the location marker should be repositioned.	Figure 1 is indicative and does not show parish boundaries. It is inappropriate to focus on such a detailed, specific matter in the Key Diagram for one part of the District, as other detailed matters would also need to be shown making the diagram illegible. The matter would be better addressed elsewhere in the Local Plan.
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Suggest that the key for Figure 1 is updated to make clear the mode of transport denoted by each demarcation.	The key used reflects standard practice for maps - a dotted line is rail services, a blue line is a water course and a solid line is a road. To aid legibility the rail lines, watercourse and roads are each named in the key.
DBLP207	Robert Doughty Consultancy on	Support Key Diagram, which identifies Misterton as a settlement in "Rural Bassetlaw".	Support for Key Diagram welcome and noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
	behalf of J. Travis		
Context: Geography			
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Chapter 2 sets out a number of challenges facing the District over the plan period. The clearest geosocial challenges from a spatial planning aspect are the polarisation of wealth and deprivation within the District and the projected future age profile; and subsequent reductions in the working age population.	Comments noted. Chapter 2 acknowledges the significant changes in the age profile of the population over the plan period (para 2.4) and the varied picture of deprivation across the District (para 2.7).
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Paragraph 2.4 notes a 'nuanced approach' to planning for housing need in Bassetlaw. It is not clear what is meant by 'nuanced approach'. The answer to the shift in demographic is unlikely to be nuanced at all, but rather, will come from a policy approach that seeks to change the direction of those trends beyond what the current planning approach has achieved. The retention of young people and attraction of immigrants of working age will only be achieved through suitable job opportunities, provision of affordable and attractive housing to younger and working age people and through provision of vibrant and attractive towns. In terms of overcoming deprivation, the employment market and opportunities must be developed to reflect the skills and labour market of the area; the profile of the job market must be capable of supporting the employability profile of the District.	Bassetlaw is a large district with a wide range of development needs. This relates to the need to support local services and promote economic growth in both urban and rural areas , whilst also ensuring the character of each area is conserved or enhanced. This is a more tailored approach to planning when compared the current 2011 Bassetlaw Core Strategy which restricts growth in many rural settlements. It ensures that the individual development needs of each area addressed. "Nuanced" relates to the subtle differences in the development needs and character of each area and the need for the Council to plan for those subtle differences.
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Welcome the recognition that the borough benefits from strong transport links by road and rail, including a strong network of public transport provision. Agree that it will be important to enhance sustainable movement.	Support for 2.9-2.13 is noted and welcome.
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Para 2.14 sets out that Bassetlaw has a greater proportion of manufacturing workers than the regional or national average but that Bassetlaw has a lesser qualified workforce than the regional or national average. The District has a net out	Comments noted. New planning policies relating to employment will address this point in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		migration of its workforce. It will be vital to provide for that workforce and help retain labour within the District.	
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)	Does this statement need updating in the light of the announcement about the Cottam Power Station closure?	The next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan will update all facts and figures, including reference to Cottam Power Station.
DBLP172	dha planning on behalf of Laing O'Rourke	Agree that the important challenge for Bassetlaw is to deliver appropriate investment in the local and regional economy to boost jobs and prosperity. Client's actions have demonstrated that they have invested and that there is significant scope for further investment and jobs growth at the site.	Your support is welcomed. Thank you for your comments.
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Support Para 2.18. Agree that the District's challenge is to deliver appropriate investment in the local and regional economy to boost jobs and prosperity. Note the investment from SCR and D2N2 LEPs. However, the key to driving forward an economic step change for the District will ultimately need to be led by market forces. The Council must make sure that the opportunities for investors to deliver change in the District are seized; this can only be achieved through providing the economic conditions for growth; including levels of housing development to support that growth.	Support for para 2.18 is noted. Acknowledge that the Local Plan should create the right conditions to ensure housing and economic growth can take place in the District in future. New planning policies relating to employment will address this point in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan.
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Not convinced by the approach at 2.19 that seeks to rely on home grown enterprise to boost economic production whilst facilitating sustainable out-commuting to the SCR. The key to the long term sustainable success of the District will be in securing inward investment into the District and the provision of goods and services to the SCR rather than the exporting of its labour market outside of the District. As above, the district benefits from excellent transport links to the SCR and D2N2 and has the ability to provide competitive locations for investment. Those attributes should be exploited to the benefit of the District.	The Local Plan is providing a balance for employment opportunities by allocating land for new economic growth to support and encouraging investment into the District. In addition, it is also protecting existing employment land and supporting rural enterprises in suitable locations.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
Context: Policy			
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Broadly agree with the summary of the NPPF requirements for the Local Plan but have some concerns regarding whether the Local Plan is compatible with those requirements. Note that the NPPF requires the Local Plan to be drawn up over a 15 year time horizon but it also stipulates that 15 years should be from the date of adoption. Noting the Council's proposed adoption date of February 2021, consider that the currently proposed plan period should be extended to at least 2036/7. Consider that Part 1 of the Local Plan should indicate broad locations for strategic development and land use designations as per the requirements of the NPPF and this should include the locations of strategic site allocations	Agree. The Plan has been extended to 2037.
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Para 3.7 notes its relationship in policy terms with the SCR and D2N2 LEPs. Support the Council's interaction with the LEPs - the aspirations to contribute towards the economic aims of the LEPs are being undersold; particularly in comparison to the previous 'Initial Draft' Local Plan which was predicated on the Council's bid to be incorporated with the SCR combined authority. The district is well related to the SCR and for the potential of Bassetlaw's economy to be realised, its relationship with SCR is fundamental; particularly with regard to the economic step change that was envisaged through the regeneration of Harworth. Both LEPs have set out plans to develop the economy of its respective area. The Plan references the D2N2 Growth Plan - the need for additional 55,000 jobs in the private sector 2013 - 2023. The D2N2 Growth Plan does not set out the requirement against an existing shortfall but the same region between 1998 - 2008 delivered growth of some 30,000 jobs including a fall in private sector jobs by 2,200. The Plan does not seek to commit to the contribution that it seeks to make to that growth to 2023 or	Acknowledge that the Local Plan should create the right conditions to ensure housing and economic growth can take place in the District in future. This will include helping to address the priorities and aspirations of the LEPs. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment will provide a clearer vision and plan for employment growth as well as how that relates to housing growth.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>beyond for the remainder of the plan period. To achieve its ambition it needs to invest in programmes which will support a step change in private sector job creation in D2N2. The LEP envisages this will include support to help business growth, access to finance and skills and innovation. The LEP identifies the need to invest in creating the sites and premises that will allow indigenous businesses to grow as well as attracting inward investors from across the world. The SCR Growth Plan identifies the need for more jobs to meet ‘the Productivity Challenge’. The SCR sets out that the area has a shortfall of around 65,000 private service sector jobs, when compared with the employment density in other LEPs. Additionally 70,000 jobs are required to reach the pre-recession peak employment level in the SCR. Trend based forecasts show that the SCR will generate 27,000 FTE jobs over the next 10 years, this includes the expected decline in some sectors. Addressing this shortfall will necessitate the SCR increasing its expected level of employment growth by more than 60%. The SCR seeks to re-establish the economic contribution the area once made to the national economy. Based on the forecast growth in other parts of the country the SCR would need to create c.120,000 jobs to have that impact. The SCR sets out that of the shortfall of 65,000 jobs, over 60% need to be in activities not dependent upon local expenditure; including business, professional and financial services (and support) and ICT. The key to this economic growth is the inward investment from outside the local and regional area. Each area will have to significantly improve its economic performance which includes attracting growth and expenditure from outside of the local and regional markets. The improvement in economic performance over forecasted trends should include a significantly increased performance in Bassetlaw which falls within both LEP regions. But the Plan does not reference the growth plans for the SCR</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>and it is not clear how it will support the aims of the LEPs and where Bassetlaw sees itself in the context of the wider regions. Needs to set out a clearer vision and plan accordingly.</p> <p>Concerns regarding the Council's proposed employment target and housing requirements and the lack of clarity regarding the formation of that target / requirement.</p>	
DBLP60	Nottinghamshire Fire & Rescue Service	<p>There are a number of references throughout the plan, to Neighbourhood Planning Groups; who make up these groups, what is their remit and will Fire & Rescue Services be considered when planning location of Fire Hydrants?</p>	<p>Details of Neighbourhood Plan Groups are displayed on the Council's website under 'Neighbourhood Planning'. The Council will advise neighbourhood plan groups to consult the Fire and Resuce Service on draft Neighbourhood Plans.</p>
DBLP207	Robert Doughty Consultancy on behalf of J. Travis	<p>Note and support the positive approach the draft Local Plan takes to the role of Neighbourhood Plans to allocate development sites, such as our clients land off Fox Covert Lane, Misterton. The communities in Bassetlaw have, with the support of Bassetlaw District Council, grasped the opportunity presented by Neighbourhood Planning and are bringing forward a number of positive plans, not least the submission draft plan at Misterton.</p>	<p>Support for Neighbourhood Plans is noted and welcome.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)	A typing error under the paragraph “Eight neighbourhood plans are currently under development”. The parish is called ScRooby, not Scooby	Acknowledge the typing error. This will be addressed in the next version of the Local Plan.
Vision and Objectives			
DBLP31	BDC Councillor	<p>Most is aspiration and unachievable by BDC. Health and wellbeing of residents will not improve by building in the villages. New development is likely to increase density with urban extensions which will lower residents quality of life. Highways improvements are NCC responsibility. The present accumulated underspend on rural roads is £100-£150m. An increase in NCC budget of £20 was included 18 months ago to address deficiencies. The Clarborough Bole corner route is to receive an average speed camera. The Retford Markham Moor has an installed system. These serve travellers and increase safety on these main routes, drivers can be from Retford and Worksop and a percentage of rural travellers. It will be uneconomic with current technology to put speed safety systems on rural little used routes. The safety of the major routes is ongoing and financially justifiable and this should encourage residential to be put in the towns where residents can use improved safety routes. Allowing 20% increases in the villages is going to increase the number of dead and casualties by 20% at least - a higher death rate than on Bassetlaw main roads. Bus services in Bassetlaw rural areas are most subsidised in Nottinghamshire and services are sparse. Schools are provided by NCC. Many schools are academies which BDC cannot influence, as are health centres and other necessary community facilities. Advance high quality and reliable communications infrastructure provided commercially in Retford and Worksop. In rural areas BDC are active in microwave broadband provision but the superfast fibre optic</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that most infrastructure provision is provided and managed by external infrastructure providers. However, the Council work closely with these providers through Duty to Cooperate requirements to ensure that the infrastructure identified as being needed to deliver the Local Plan is deliverable.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		has been facilitated by NCC with finance from government. Fibre to the premises needs to be provided now in the rural areas.	
DBLP74	Sport England	Support Objective 10 to Promote Health and Wellbeing. Has Bassetlaw signed up to the Nottinghamshire Planning and Health Protocol - should this be referenced? One aspect of promoting health and well being is to ensure that Active Design is considered as part of the development process. In addition Strategic Objective 7 would be supported by Active Design.	This has helped to inform the emerging policy on Health and Welbeing which includes reference to active design.
DBLP110	Cushman & Wakefield on behalf of Stancliffe Homes	Support the Council's vision which seeks to support development and growth of both the rural and the urban areas of Bassetlaw.	Support welcome and noted.
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Support - it supports significant levels of growth for the District, but that level of growth must be significantly increased. Support the delivery of large scale sites. But the Plan must focus development towards the District's main settlements to support their role and function as service centres; not only for their own populations but their surrounding rural hinterlands. It is more appropriate for the Council to seek to deliver 'sustainable urban extensions' which are defined by their sustainability benefits rather than solely through scale.	Objective 2 provides for a range of housing sites which could include sustainable urban extensions.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	<p>Disagree - Whilst it is vital to maintain the vitality and viability of existing rural settlements the rural areas and smaller settlements are not a sustainable location in which to meet the borough-wide needs for development. The main settlements in the district should be the focus for growth - Retford to be the main hub for the rural centre and east which contributes greatly to the sustainability of the District's rural areas and settlements for meeting their day to day needs and as a transport hub. This role should remain and be enhanced through the Local Plan. Note the Council's desire to follow the 'garden village movement' do not consider that there is a driver for doing so in Bassetlaw. The garden village movement was driven by overcrowding in urban areas and a need to house significant amounts of people in new sustainably designed settlements. Bassetlaw does not suffer from those urban problems and its main settlements are suitable for urban expansion and, as above, would benefit from additional growth to maintain and enhance their vitality and viability. Additional growth will be vital as the current population of those towns ages and the number of working age people naturally declines; it will be vital to encourage younger people and families to those towns.</p>	<p>Disagree. Rural communities need to remain sustainable. The Council will continue to work with rural communities to support the delivery of sustainable development in rural areas. It should be noted that the Economic Development Needs Assessment identifies that a large percentage of employment in Bassetlaw is located in the rural area. Rampton Hospital employs approximately 2000 staff. There are also other large employers in the rural area, for example Ranby Prison, Power Stations, schools etc. It is essential that the Plan supports local businesses and local communities.</p>
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	<p>Support - The mechanism for achieving growth requires more detail, and more growth.</p>	<p>Acknowledge that the Local Plan should create the right conditions to ensure economic growth can take place in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment will provide a clearer vision and plan for employment growth as well as how that relates to housing growth.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Support - it is important to stress the opportunities that new development will provide in terms of unlocking existing development opportunities where infrastructure constraints might exist.	Comments noted.
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	The plan proposes a vision for the District up to 2035 which must be extended to include a plan period of at least 15 years from the date of adoption in line with the requirements of the NPPF. With a predicted adoption date of 2021 the plan period should at least extend to 2036/37.	LP will be made in line with the requirements of the NPPF so the adoption date will be extended to 2037
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Agree with the vision that the District should strive to be a place that prospers from investment and growth. Consider that there will need to be a step change in the level of economic and housing growth that Bassetlaw plans for over the plan period.	Acknowledge that the Local Plan should create the right conditions to ensure economic growth can take place in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment will provide a clearer vision and plan for employment growth as well as how that relates to housing growth.
DBLP148	ID Planning on behalf of Harron Homes	Support - which states that development in Bassetlaw will be distributed across the district ensuring towns and villages grow at a rate and scale commensurate to their defined role.	Support welcome and noted.
DBLP151	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	There are 10 strategic objectives, all of which are relevant and correct to some degree. Good to see that Objective 2 the needs of an aging population are identified but less sure that this has translated into meaningful and positive policies.	Acknowledge that the Local Plan should ensure the needs of an ageing population can be met in future. Planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan will better address specialist housing needs.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP151	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	Objective 6 talks about promoting rural Bassetlaw as a living and working landscape. Need to look away from agriculture as the main employer. Tourism has its place and there are existing examples of good tourist related activities in the district. Need to do more to attract would be employers into the countryside. Bassetlaw is not a large district nor is it poorly served by the road network. Have the A1, the M1 on western boundary and other major arterial roads heading east, west, south and north to South Yorkshire and all the opportunities that it brings including Doncaster Sheffield Airport. No longer have great tracts of land in Retford for commercial development nor do have much in the way of rural employment. For this objective to succeed this needs addressing - should not follow the traditional “farming diversification” route. Radical innovative thinking needs to be employed to identify land that could be brought forward for employment, not necessarily nor immediately related to agriculture. Centering employment on the main conurbations does not help the rural economy, it simply increases journeys to work, results in congestion in our towns and place a greater financial burden on employees that do live in the countryside.	Acknowledge that the Local Plan should create the right conditions to ensure economic growth can take place in the rural area in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to rural employment will provide a clear vision and approach for the consideration of rural employment in the future.
DBLP172	dha planning on behalf of Laing O'Rourke	Fully support. Facilitating development opportunities that will enhance Bassetlaw's economy through the delivery of new and the expansion of existing enterprises, providing jobs across urban and rural Bassetlaw. Further development at EIP can help to deliver this vision.	Support welcome and noted.
DBLP173	Lichfields on behalf of SP Scholey and the estate of WA Scholey	Support the Vision and welcome its aspiration for growth. Support the strategic objectives which acknowledge that the Local Plan will seek to achieve ‘significant new housing growth’ in a balanced pattern across both urban and rural areas. Note the delivery of two new garden villages as one of the strategic objectives and agree with the principle that these have the potential to improve the sustainability of the wider rural area.	Support welcome and noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		This principle is equally applied to Strategic Objective 10, whereby other forms of large scale development are capable of enhancing the sustainability of existing towns and villages in Bassetlaw e.g. Folly Nook Lane, Ranskill which is committed to delivering affordable housing, open space and local bus stop improvements.	
DBLP173	Lichfields on behalf of SP Scholey and the estate of WA Scholey	As part of Strategic Objective 4, welcome the support for economic growth in Bassetlaw. It is important that the proposed level of housing growth reflects the wider aspirations for Bassetlaw, including in terms of economic growth. As currently drafted, unconvinced that the draft Local Plan has adequately addressed this point.	Acknowledge that the Local Plan should create the right conditions to ensure economic growth can take place in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to rural employment will provide a clear vision and approach for the consideration of employment growth in the future.
DBLP179	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Support the vision and objectives - consider that this approach will contribute to securing sustainable development in Bassetlaw and contribute appropriately towards the wider Sheffield City Region and D2N2 Region. Note the two proposed garden villages near to Elkesley at Gamston Airport and the former Bevercotes Colliery site and are willing to share experiences, with respect to allocating the Bassingthorpe Farm Strategic Allocation in the adopted Rotherham Core Strategy, and the preparation of its evidence base to support this allocation through the independent examination of the Local Plan.	Support welcome and noted.
DBLP182	Severn Trent Water Ltd	In principle support the strategic objectives. The majority of the District are provided potable water by Anglian Water there are areas that are served by Severn Trent, note that one of the strategic objectives is that new development will deliver improved water efficiency. Severn Trent are fully supportive of this approach.	Support welcome and noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP183	Environment Agency	Supportive of the draft vision, it would be good to have a standalone element for nature, rather than the current wording which puts it in the context of people being able to enjoy it. Suggest the following text could be incorporated into the paragraph: "The rich environmental assets of the area will be protected, enhanced and extended, allowing residents and visitors to enjoy a valuable, attractive, diverse and accessible environment."	The draft vision will be expanded to better reflect the content of the emerging Local Plan and its full range of policies.
DBLP183	Environment Agency	Suggest that the protection and enhancement of the Natural Environment should be given more weight, either by way of its own strategic objective or additional wording is added. This would add further weight and importance to the content of Chapter 15, but would go some way to ensuring the Plan helps deliver the aspirations of the Government's 25 Year Environment Plan. Suggest the following wording, which could be added to Strategic Objective 5, or given its own strategic objective: "The natural environment and biodiversity will be protected, restored, enhanced and created, with an emphasis on building stronger connections between sites and the creation of new sites while maintaining the current biodiversity infrastructure to provide a robust natural environment for future generations to enjoy. Rivers and waterbodies will be protected, enhanced and restored with the aim that they achieve Good Ecological Status in line with the requirements of the Water Framework Directive (WFD), contributing positively to biodiversity networks and wider enjoyment of the District's diverse waterside habitats." Included reference to the WFD as the District supports several major waterbodies, all of which are currently failing under WFD –this more ambitious objective should be set, to ensure that the environment benefits from new development and growth.	Protecting and enhancing the environment is an important objective of the Local Plan. Therefore Objective 5 will be strengthened accordingly. However, it is considered that reference to the WFD would sit better alongside the relevant thematic policies.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP183	Environment Agency	Objective 8 reads well. Encourage reference to potential flood schemes and the use of Natural Flood Management (NFM) techniques. Development of wetland habitat as part of the flood mitigation process, reconnecting rivers with floodplains, is an integral part of flood management. Suggest the following addition: 'Opportunities will be sought for new development to contribute to improved flood mitigation schemes, including Natural Flood Management (NFM) techniques which should be applied at a catchment wide scale, or the development of wetland habitat which reconnects rivers to their floodplains.'	Protecting and enhancing the environment is an important objective of the Local Plan. The Objective will be strengthened accordingly. However, it is considered that reference to flood mitigation would sit better alongside the relevant thematic policies.
DBLP186	Natural England	Welcome objective 5 which aims to conserve the District's historic and natural environments. Welcome objective 8 which supports increasing resilience to climate change. Support objective 10 which supports new and enhanced infrastructure which will improve the quality of life in Bassetlaw, this includes the provision of new and enhanced natural and semi-natural green space that will provide benefits for people and wildlife. Advise that the vision and emerging development strategy should address impacts on and opportunities for the natural environment and set out the environmental ambition for the plan area. The plan should take a strategic approach to the protection and enhancement of the natural environment, including providing a net gain for biodiversity, considering opportunities to enhance and improve connectivity. Where relevant there should be linkages with the Biodiversity Action Plan, Local Nature Partnership, Rights of Way Improvement Plans and Green Infrastructure Strategies.	Support for objectives 5, 8 and 10 is welcome and noted. Revised and new planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to the natural environment will be clearer about the environmental ambition for the District and will reference all relevant supporting documents accordingly.
DBLP191	National Trust	Support Objective 5 and Objective 8.	Support welcome and noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP192	Johnson Mowat on behalf of Barratt Homes	Supported. In order to achieve the vision consider that the Local Plan should take a proactive approach to development in order to gain the necessary boost and investment needed to enhance health, wellbeing and quality of life. Policies should look to encourage opportunities and where possible remove barriers to the delivery of development. It is important that the strategic objectives make specific reference to different types of housing markets in the District with an objective included to refer to the regeneration requirements of parts of the District, in particular Harworth. This is connected with the spatial strategy strands in Section 5.	The emerging Local Plan will take a proactive approach to development to ensure that the right conditions are in place to help deliver the infrastructure and sites needed to meet objectively assessed needs in the District. The objectives are strategic so while reference to regeneration can be added specific reference to particular areas of the District will be best left to the planning policies themselves.
DBLP194	Emery Planning on behalf of J G Pears Property Ltd	Support Objectives 4 and 8 and highlight that land interest at the Former High Marnham Power Station offers the Council a significant opportunity to help achieve these two key objectives in a sustainable manner.	Comments noted.
DBLP208	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	The loss of aviation-dependent businesses and development both contradicts and ignores two of the supposed Visions & Objectives namely:- a. 4 . and 6. Therefore, the plan's proposals are the opposite of what is prescribed in paragraphs 4. and 6. in that closing Retford Gamston Airport removes, rather than expands, existing enterprises and fails to protect the intrinsic character of the countryside given that the airfield has been an integral part of that since 1942.	It is acknowledged that should Retford Gamston Airport close some aviation businesses may have to relocate out of the District. However, the proposal also includes the provision of employment development. Objective 6 is designed to relate to rural employment such as farm diversification. This point could be clearer.
DBLP217	Axis ped on behalf of FCC Environment	Support Strategic Objective 4 which seeks to facilitate development opportunities that will enhance Bassetlaw's economy through the delivery of new and the expansion of existing enterprises, providing jobs across urban and rural Bassetlaw and Strategic Objective 6 which seeks to promote rural Bassetlaw as a living and working landscape, where new development responds to local needs and opportunities, and protects the intrinsic character of the countryside.	Support welcome and noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP219	Planning and Design Group on behalf of the Welbeck Estates Company Ltd	<p>The objective of delivering balanced development across both urban and rural areas is welcomed. This objective will help enable sustainable development in rural Bassetlaw. It recognises the predominantly rural character of the District and will offer significant benefit to rural communities by recognising their, often bespoke, development requirements. This is supported by the objective to promote rural Bassetlaw as a 'living and working landscape', home to more organic forms of residential and employment development. Rural growth opportunities are linked closely with the other elements of the vision e.g. with respect to enhancing design quality and building standards, a District that recognises the diversity of its housing needs, places that support the economy on different scales, and a flourishing rural Bassetlaw. The vision and objectives help the plan be a creative exercise in finding ways to enhance and improve the places in which people live, supporting a prosperous rural economy and seeks to be genuinely plan led, as desired by the NPPF. The objectives could more successfully achieve or take account of important themes and policy concerns and should be enhanced with: To make optimum use of previously developed and under-used land and bring empty and derelict buildings into reuse. To ensure the District's housing stock is decent, suitable and affordable, meets community need and is balanced with access to employment opportunities. Welbeck is a significant landowner in the District and has a unique, important role in delivering new housing, employment and environmental benefits through the development of sustainable greenfield sites or re-development of its brownfield sites. The longstanding ties that Welbeck has with local communities' means the delivery of high-quality development is important to create, and support, well-balanced and healthy communities.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the vision and objectives could better reflect the importance of using previously developed land and underused land and buildings. Objectives will be changed accordingly.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP220		Objective 6 relates to the ‘protection of the intrinsic character of the countryside’. Do not consider that it will be protected with 1000 houses concentrated in a rural area over 15 years and subsequently a further 3000 houses over the next 15 or so years. The proposed areas are close to local and regional popular leisure, heritage and historical tourist area with such attractions as the Dukeries, Clumber Park and Sherwood Forest. These housing developments will spoil the attraction to these unique places and locally will urbanise an area known for its rolling green farmland and beautiful landscapes.	The development of garden villages will inevitably change the character of the area. However, these locations will be designed to fit well within their landscapes. The Dukeries, Clumber Park and Sherwood Forest are some distance from the proposed garden villages so it is not envisaged that their development would create an adverse impact on these sites.
DBLP221	Gladman Developments	Support the positive and proactive approach to future development in Bassetlaw over the plan period to 2035 and the positive approach to new growth and the Council’s decision to allocate a range of sustainable housing sites and the identification of two new garden villages which will provide a significant focus for growth and investment over the plan period (and also beyond the plan period). It might be appropriate to change ‘3. To Initiate the delivery of two garden villages’ to ‘3. To Support the delivery of two new garden villages.’ The success of the Garden Villages will rely upon a long term close working relationship with the Council across a number of disciplines (including planning) working towards the delivery of at least 1,000 dwellings within the plan period and after, which will require significant staff resourcing.	Support welcome and noted.
DBLP259	Historic England	Relates only to conserving the District’s ‘distinctive historic built and natural environments’. Since buried archaeology, known or unknown, is not necessarily ‘built’ heritage it is not clear how the objective and, Chapter 16 and Policy 21 address archaeology. One option would be to revise the wording of SO5 to read ‘historic, built and natural environments’ by inserting a comma, or revise to read ‘historic built and natural environments and archaeology’.	Protecting and enhancing all the historic environment is an important objective of the Local Plan. Therefore Objective 5 will be strengthened accordingly.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP267	Sustrans Bassetlaw Rangers	Strongly support Strategic Objective 10 – delivery of new and enhanced infrastructure	Support welcome and noted.
DBLP270		<p>Review of the Strategic Objectives indicates that the outcome of the 2018 Bassetlaw Rural Settlement Study, fails to comply with SO1, SO8, SO9 and SO10. SO1: Awarding equal % growth to 73 rural settlements does not represent "balanced" growth. SO1 is flawed in that its inference confers "balance" only within the context of the urban/rural split. SO1 needs to recognise that Bassetlaw is a rural district with diversity between rural settlements:</p> <p>SO1: Manage the scale and location of development to support a balanced pattern of growth across urban and rural areas and between rural settlements.</p> <p>SO8: this needs to be altered: Increase resilience to climate change through improved congestion mitigation, improved flood mitigation, better energy and water efficiency and support for renewable energy production.</p> <p>SO9: This does not recognise the risks of congestion Enhance the vitality and viability of Bassetlaw's town centres and local centres via commensurate local development</p> <p>SO10: The NPPF differentiates between infrastructure to deliver health and well-being and infrastructure that will deliver sustainable development. The draft Bassetlaw LP does not make this distinction. SO10 therefore needs to change: Improve the quality of life, health and wellbeing in Bassetlaw by delivering new and enhanced infrastructure where needed – whilst making best use of existing infrastructure through well-planned allocations.</p> <p>SO3: Must be dropped. Delivery of Garden Villages is a delivery mechanism not a strategic objective. Housing delivery is the strategic objective and the 2017 LAA results have been ignored.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The spatial strategy has been revised following comments from the consultation and further gathering of evidence. The information in the LAA is high-level and does not always translate into all "potentially suitable" sites being allocated or suitable for development. The LAA assessment flags up some known planning constraints, but doesn't always assess the detail and therefore is only considered a site management database tool rather than an accurate assessment of sites.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP273	Friends of Woodlands and Coachwood Green Ltd	The Strategic Objectives (SO) are well balanced but open to interpretation.	Comments noted. Changes proposed should help clarify points of interpretation.
DBLP279	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	The loss of aviation-dependent businesses and development both contradicts and ignores two of the supposed Visions & Objectives namely:- a. 4 . and 6. Therefore, the plan's proposals are the opposite of what is prescribed in paragraphs 4. and 6. in that closing Retford Gamston Airport removes, rather than expands, existing enterprises and fails to protect the intrinsic character of the countryside given that the airfield has been an integral part of that since 1942.	It is acknowledged that should Retford Gamston Airport close some aviation businesses may have to relocate out of the District. However, the proposal also includes the provision of employment development. Objective 6 is designed to relate to rural employment such as farm diversification. This point could be clearer.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)	Conserve the District's distinct historical build and natural environments. Putting a blanket build requirement of 10_20% for rural areas such as Scrooby will put in jeopardy the conservation of its heritage.	Although heritage is an important issue, it should not preclude development in isolation. In terms of the impact of additional growth in rural communities, this will be based on their capacity to grow. A number of communities are undertaking work on Neighbourhood Plans in order to allocate specific sites for development which should be those that have the least impact on heritage and other factors.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)	Increase resilience..... How can this objective be met and still retain the build / type / quality of the smaller but exceptionally historic areas of Bassetlaw.	New developments are built to higher efficiency standards, and designed to a higher quality than previously therefore it is expected that new development will be better placed to mitigate the effects of climate change. Any new development in heritage areas will be assessed to ensure that there are no adverse impacts upon those assets.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP400	Nottinghamshire County Council - Highways	There are no specific transport related objectives cited in the tables that immediately follow each of the draft Local Plan policy objectives. Specific and targeted transport objectives are recommended and should be included in the tables for Policy 1, Policy 2, Policy 9, Policy 10 and Policy 11. It would be useful for example to have at least a transport related objective that supports and promote the use of public transport, cycling and walking in each policy table.	Objective 10 covers investment in transport infrastructure and this is referenced after Policies 1, 9, 10 and 11. However, it is accepted that the Local Plan would benefit from transport objective, rather than one which relates to investment in transport infrastructure.
DBLP443	990800	Support the overall strategy which will seek to deliver the Council's Vision of making Bassetlaw a place where rural and urban life prosper from investment and growth. Support Strategic Objective 4 which seeks to facilitate development opportunities that will enhance Bassetlaw's economy through the delivery of new and the expansion of existing enterprises, providing jobs across urban and rural Bassetlaw and Strategic Objective 6 which seeks to promote rural Bassetlaw as a living and working landscape, where new development responds to local needs and opportunities, and protects the intrinsic character of the countryside.	Support for Objectives 4 and 6 is welcome.
DBLP524	991184	The loss of aviation-dependent businesses and development both contradicts and ignores two of the supposed Visions & Objectives namely:- a. 4 . and 6. Therefore, the plan's proposals are the opposite of what is prescribed in paragraphs 4. and 6. in that closing Retford Gamston Airport removes, rather than expands, existing enterprises and fails to protect the intrinsic character of the countryside given that the airfield has been an integral part of that since 1942.	It is acknowledged that should Retford Gamston Airport close some aviation businesses may have to relocate out of the District. However, the proposal also includes the provision of employment development. Objective 6 is designed to relate to rural employment such as farm diversification. This point could be clearer.
Policy 1: Spatial Strategy			
DBLP2	Individual	Supports the overall spatial strategy	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP16	Individual	Support the overall strategy for Bassetlaw. People need affordable housing which is close to essential services - doctors, pharmacy, travel links, shops, schools etc. But suitable housing also needed for elderly and for disabled. Sited away from noise but in a pleasant 'landscaped' and possibly sheltered accommodation area.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP24	Individual	Supports the overall spatial strategy	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP31	BDC Councillor	The country to the NE and S of Bassetlaw is rural in character and not heavily populated, the landscape is attractive. This should be accepted as positive. The attractive nature of the open agricultural cropping and more heavily wooded areas and historic legacy assets recommends itself to international and national tourism as well as the local interests of the nearby urban populations. These rural areas are less attractive for leisure pursuits. People travelling to Bassetlaw for these reasons do not wish to pass a massive New Town on the edge of the Dukeries. There must be an economic cost to tourism and leisure if this course is taken. These areas are positive for agriculture where residential fringe is an impediment to efficient agriculture. No attempt has been made to consider the agricultural quality or production capacity of the land. It may not be a national requirement but would have been appropriate as there is much good agricultural land which would be advantageously conserved from development. The country imports much of the crops which can be grown in the District and this country and is a strategic asset. Recent planning permissions in East Markham have been granted on Grade 2 agricultural land - Grade 2 is better quality than Grade 3.	Agricultural land quality of potential sites is considered through the Sustainability Appraisal. The impact of the loss of Grade 1, 2 and 3 agricultural land is recognised through Objective 1 and Policy 27 Green Infrastructure.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP31	BDC Councillor	Benefits of economic growth through population growth are imagined in the Plan. An increasing population does not necessarily lead to economic growth but there are definite demands on the services such as health care, education, public transport, leisure which can result in more of a liability than an economic investment. For instance, Italy has a modern economy with an educated population which has grown over the last 20 years, but economic growth has not grown but stayed static. This may be to do with an ageing population. A younger population is associated in classical economics with economic growth and capital formation.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP31	BDC Councillor	The Plan expects an ageing population which will create a strain on services. Increasing numbers of old people in hard to get area will increase demand in health care and emergency facilities. It will be difficult to meet these needs. It would be better to provide residential for the ageing population near a health centre and A&E in Retford or Worksop close to Bassetlaw hospital where health care is available in their own houses. The younger generation in general wish to work in cities. The most successful will wish to be located near to their work and to a good public transport link to give easy access to cities of the North and more quality time with their families. The older growing population is unlikely to be economically dynamic. While older people are part of the economy the strategy envisaged is unlikely to fire up economic growth. Residential urbanisation may restrict growth and see a reduction in quality of life for existing residents.	Yes- this matter will be addressed in policy 19 of LP.
DBLP31	BDC Councillor	Proposed developments are new residential towns, urban extensions as identified by BDC. Not villages. Are many garden villages in Bassetlaw, most could be described as such. The proposed sprawling estates, played down in the Plan, do not come into the garden village category. The garden village concept glosses over the residential urbanisation of a rural,	The garden village concept will create a mixed community which comprises of housing, employment and local services. This will create a sustainable settlement that addresses inclusivity and address localised needs.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>attractive area. ALTERNATIVE: The 2 sites should be used for industrial commercial as the sites are brown land. Clear access onto the A1 is a unique asset for this part of Bassetlaw for heavy goods and large load access with no residential for the heavy traffic to pass through. Benefits for Tuxford: large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties. This is an opportunity to encourage relocation of business to Bevercotes and Gamston Airfield and allow residential development on the industrial estate, with smaller traffic being more suitable for the centre of Tuxford than the juggernauts. This would make the centre of Tuxford safer and revitalise it, provide economic and environmental benefits, cut diesel pollution. Conclusion: The draft proposal of so called garden villages (New Town should be classed as urban extension) will drastically reduce accessibility within this area of the district. Leaving Gamston Airfield as brown land and the colliery which has planning permission for a distribution centre to provide jobs would enable Retford, Tuxford, East and South East Bassetlaw and Worksop to access jobs without a long commute. Jobs are required especially as Cottam Power Station has closed (loss of 300 jobs) and West Burton Power Station will close shortly. Residential provides 6 car movements a day per house. "Garden Villages" would create serious congestion into Retford. Industrial and commercial on those sites will produce many times less small traffic. Large heavy traffic would be straight onto the A1. The concrete products manufacturer in Tuxford makes the longest concrete beams in the country for motorways, etc. Their competitors are national - Eire and Europe. Have difficulty getting their products through Tuxford,</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		there is no alternative. Use extra long transport but must mount pavements and use both sides of the road to get past the central Tuxford junction. Were considering moving and a supported move to Gamston Airfield would improve the situation all round.	
DBLP31	BDC Councillor	Does not supports the overall spatial strategy	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP32	Individual	Supports the overall spatial strategy	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP81	GPS Planning and Design Ltd	As Bassetlaw is predominantly a rural District, support the positive distribution of growth spatial strategy approach to rural development advocated in the Local Plan. This seeks to deliver a minimum of 1777 dwellings over the Plan period with encouragement given to Neighbourhood Planning Groups to allocate sites to meet their housing requirement.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP90	Lichfields on behalf of db symmetry Ltd	In the absence of a specific area strategy for Blyth parish, the site could potentially be considered part of either Harworth & Bircotes or Rural Bassetlaw. Whilst we have made some assumptions this needs to be clarified in the next iteration of the DBLP. This is particularly important given that the strategy for Rural Bassetlaw largely looks towards encouraging individual Parish Council's to prepare Neighbourhood Plans to guide development at parish level. It is imperative that the DBLP establishes Symmetry Park as one of the district's key strategic employment sites and does not open the door for piecemeal interpretations of its status to be made within forthcoming Neighbourhood Plans. Do not believe it was the Councils intention to exclude Symmetry Park, but DBLP fails to acknowledge it meaning the site remains in a policy vacuum. This could be addressed by the inclusion of references to the site in the text, minor adjustment of language used in respect of the proposed sites, and the minor adjustment of the key diagram. Object to the current DBLP and believe it fails to meet the tests of soundness set out in the NPPF. a Is not positively prepared in that it fails to have regard to a major development	Acknowledge that the Local Plan should create the right conditions to ensure economic growth can take place in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment will provide a clearer vision and plan for employment growth including for Symmetry Park.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>that benefits from planning permission and will contribute towards meeting identified needs. b Cannot be justified in that the DBLP disregards the evidence base which clearly identifies Symmetry Park as a significant employment site. c Is not effective in that it is unclear and fails to provide a strategic framework for neighbourhood and other development plan / local plan documents. d Is not consistent with National Policy in that it does not clearly define the overall strategy for the “pattern, scale and quality of development” - it does not clearly define the development on this site in the parish of Blyth. Nor does the DBLP identify “broad locations for development” or indicate these accurately on a “key diagram”. The BDLP thus fails to provide a clear strategy on how it will bring sufficient land forward for employment development.</p>	
DBLP110	Cushman & Wakefield on behalf of Stancliffe Homes	<p>Policy 1 sets out the Spatial Strategy for the distribution of housing and employment growth across the district. These are set out in 5 spatial strands. These strands/strategies set their own growth targets as part of the overarching target for growth. For Rural Bassetlaw the strategy identifies that their future growth will be delivered by a combination of neighbourhood plan housing land allocations and a strategy to support appropriate market-led applications, in and adjoining rural settlements up to an identified cap. The purpose of the cap is to allow opportunity-based future development not allocated to be approved where they are of a scale appropriate to the existing settlement. Support the principle of the policy to distribute development which contributes to an overall sustainable pattern of growth to ensure the needs of the local communities within Bassetlaw are met. However, object to the allocation of Shireoaks and Rhodesia as Rural Bassetlaw. There is no justification within the 2018 Bassetlaw Rural Settlement Study (2018) as to why Shireoaks and Rhodesia have been excluded from Worksop as a location for growth. Within the</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. Shireoaks and Rhodesia are parishes in their own right and this needs to be acknowledged in planning for their future growth. Each Rural Settlement as listed in Policy 8 has a 20% cap. The Council considers this is a fair and equitable approach as it enables communities to plan for their own development needs through a NP.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>Core Strategy Policy CS1 includes both Shireoaks and Rhodesia as part of the ‘Principal Urban Area’ of Worksop. Where the focus of major housing, employment and town centre retail growth would be directed. It is unclear from the evidence why these have now been excluded from the Principal Urban Area of Worksop and identified as Rural Settlements, where growth will be capped. It is also unclear what the reasoning is for the 20% cap rate. Each application should be determined on its own merits and future growth of settlements should not be resisted where the 20% cap has been reached. The level of development for each settlement should be regularly reviewed as development comes forward. The policy fails to identify any broad locations of growth or set out a mechanism by which new sites will be allocated for development as part of the next stage of the Local Plan process. Policy 1 as worded is unjustified and unsound. It should be reworded and Figure 3: Key Diagram should be amended to include Shireoaks and Rhodesia within the Worksop area: “....New development within and adjoining the largest town in Bassetlaw including Shireoaks and Rhodesia along with supporting town centre focused investment and regeneration to support Worksop’s role as the main employment, infrastructure and service centre for the District. Economic investment and residential growth in Worksop will also support and benefit from the town’s strong sub-regional links to South Yorkshire and widely connected through excellent proximity to both the A57, A1 and east-west rail links. This growth will significantly contribute to the delivery of new housing and economic development (inter alia).</p>	
DBLP115	Peacock & Smith on behalf of Gleeson	<p>Concerned that the equitable distribution of growth strategy fails to recognize the role and function of Worksop as the largest settlement within the District with the greatest range of shops and services and employment opportunities. The spatial</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The spatial strategy will be reviewed and amended where necessary.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
	Regeneration Ltd	<p>strategy would lead to a disappropriationate amount of housing growth located in rural settlements and garden villages, leading to greater travel by the private car, and therefore giving rise to an unsustainable pattern of development. The 2011 Core Strategy identifies Worksop as the District's primary town and the main retail and employment centre for the District. EDNA states: "Worksop market has a high level of services and good transport infrastructure. The area is the key work destination concentrating 38% of the total employment of the District (over 19,000 jobs). Half of all the office services across the district are concentrated in Worksop. Worksop dominates economically and it constitutes the key employment hub, particularly for the west parts of the District." Surprised and disappointed that only 24% of the District's housing requirement is directed to Worksop, which represents an 8% drop from the share set out in the Core Strategy. This significantly reduced share of housing growth for the District's primary settlement would not support sustainable development, and it has not been adequately justified. The housing requirement for Worksop should be increased to reflect its status as the largest settlement within the District with the greatest range of shops and services and employment opportunities. An appropriate share would be that level set out in the Core Strategy.</p>	
DBLP127	TwelveTwenty One Planning Services on behalf of Hamlin Estates	<p>Support the strategy. The overall policy is laudable though the reliance, albeit limited, on two new villages is debatable. New villages inevitably prove contentious and, if approved, will require substantial infrastructure and other establishment costs. This can prove a deterrent to delivery - an issue that will likely prove to be intractable for two new settlements so close to one another where they will predate upon the same housing market. The general strategy set out in Policy 1 is supported, particularly the on-going role of the rural centres. These rural</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted nad the approach taken with Policy 8. Neighbourhood Plans must be in general conformity with the NPPF and the BLP.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>centres should continue to make an important contribution to housing delivery. Development across these settlements is sustainable as it makes full and efficient use of existing public and social infrastructure and also helps to sustain local services. It is also considered that any Neighbourhood Plans should not be restrictive but should, instead, seek to provide policies that facilitate housing delivery.</p>	
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	<p>Agree in principle with the proposed 'alternative hybrid' approach to development across the District which is reflected in the Council's 'Spatial Strategy Options' document. Agree that it is not necessarily the case that growth must be allocated proportionally in line with a rigid settlement hierarchy. Agree that the availability of suitable sites is also an important factor in determining the levels of growth that are apportioned to settlements. Significant concerns with how the approach has led to growth being proportioned across the District. Concerns that the development needs of the District have been underestimated for the Plan and the subsequent development requirements have subsequently been understated. Consider that there is no one single focused special strategy which would a) be sufficient to meet the needs of the District and; b) result in sustainable development across the District's settlement (both higher and lower order settlements). It is not clear from the Local Plan or its evidence base how the final apportionment of development across the District has been arrived at. It is simply stated within Figure 3 of the plan with a percentage distribution across the settlements within the District. Whilst it is not necessary to stick rigidly to a settlement hierarchy, it is necessary to take an evidence based approach to distributing development based in the needs of those settlements.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted, the Spatial Strategy is based around the principle that rural settlements should grow sustainably and this could be achieved through the production of NPs. Functional cluster approach was tested and was found to not be viable. Officers have worked with NP groups and gained better understanding about issues facing rural issues and discovered an appetite for growth in more rural areas than what the functional clusters were enabling. Also refer to the Rural Settlement Study.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	<p>Support the broad model for the distribution of development across the District in the 'Spatial Strategy Options' document Option 1 as it represents an accurate settlement hierarchy. SSO 1 is reflective of the established settlement hierarchy across the District as proposed in the Council's previous Core Strategy and consistent with the need to maintain and enhance the vitality of the main settlements within the District. The proposed distribution of housing development is not reflective of the overall settlement hierarchy and consider that adjustments should be made in relation to the overall distribution of development to more closely align (which can be made as part of the process for SSO 2 which is supported); in particular to Retford and Harworth. The allocation of 27% of development to the rural areas and local service centres without any proposed allocation of employment land or any specific measures to enhance their sustainability is considered to be unjustified.</p>	<p>EDNA study indicates that a large percentage of employment is in rural areas and therefore suitable housing provisions should be in rural areas. Policy in the LP is supportive of employment in sustainable rural locations where there is a justified need for it.</p>
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	<p>Disagree with 15% of the District's proposed housing being allocated to the new garden villages. The District already comprises a largely rural borough with a significant number of villages, particularly within the east of the borough. Do not support the creation of two new villages, particularly when the Council is already seeking to locate some 18% of its housing distribution to the rural area to support the sustainability of rural areas. Retford, as a rural hub for the centre and east of the District, and an area for employment growth is ideally placed to meet the bulk of the housing needs in the rural part of the District; subject to the plan identifying and meeting specific needs of the rural and local service centres. Object to Retford being allocated only 13% of the overall housing requirement for the District; less than any other town or the rural area. The continued growth of Retford is vital for the health of the rural areas and for the District in meeting its</p>	<p>The Council's overall strategic approach recognises the roles of Worksop and Retford in its settlement hierarchy, but also recognises that there are constraints to delivering significant development in both towns. Therefore, the Council is looking to deliver a new settlement which is equidistance between Worksop and Retford. This, along with some limited growth in rural villages, will address some of the development needs of both towns later in the plan period, whilst supporting the improved connectivity between the towns and the wider region including the new adjacent strategic employment site. The need for economic land reflects the findings of the EDNA and the housing supply supports that. The LP will allocate employment land in the most sustainable locations that are attractive to the market. Site allocations will be considered in the next version of the local plan.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>wider development needs. Housing growth in the District is going to need to undergo a significant step change upwards which will require the development of areas which are able to sustain higher levels of housing growth. Retford is a sustainable and attractive location for housing development and its continued growth is considered to somewhat underpin the success of the housing market within the District. The AMR 2017/18 sets out the level of housing completions in the District between 2006/7 to 2017/18. Of the 2,619 net completions over that period, 1,321 completions were in Retford which comprises over half of the completions within the District's towns. The monitoring data demonstrates that the Local Plan dramatically underestimates the role of Retford in the housing market. Retford, as the District's second largest town has been allocated the least amount of housing development of the three main settlements. This is despite Retford having suitable sites for development and market signals point a proven track record of delivering housing where other settlements within the District have been less successful. Consider that the delivery of a sustainable urban extension on land to the south of Ordsall will help deliver the required level of growth at Retford and should be allocated accordingly. The Council's economic aspirations should be increased and the District should more closely align itself with the SCR to benefit from the level of growth planned regionally. There is an argument for increasing the proportion of employment development (and subsequently housing development) which is envisaged within Harworth. It is disappointing that the Plan no longer seeks specifically to deliver a 'Step Change' in employment growth at Harworth, which was the strong aspiration of the Core Strategy and the 'Initial Draft'. Consider that the circumstances to deliver that step change (including planning permission for land to the south of Harworth 84ha of</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		employment land) exist and this should be reflected in the new Local Plan going forwards.	
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Para 2.6 of 'Spatial Strategy Options' (SSO) is potentially unclear in considering the Council's future approach to Harworth considering its future role in the context of pipeline development proposals. For clarity, where development proposals are not started but considered likely to come forward through the plan period they should be allocated within the Local Plan. For the avoidance of doubt the proposed development of 84ha of employment land at 'Land to the South of Harworth should be allocated within the Local Plan and be considered as an existing commitment for the purposes of forward planning.	The Local Plan should create the right conditions to ensure economic growth can take place in the District in future. The EDNA identifies the employment land needs at a District level, and includes provision for the A1 Growth Corridor which does not readily sit with an employment land target for any of the three main towns. On that basis the new Local Plan identifies an employment land need for the District by identifying new employment sites of importance for the general and strategic employment market. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment will provide a clearer plan for employment growth including site allocations.
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Support SSO Option 2 as a sustainable approach to the distribution of development. A sustainable approach to planning for the rural area and its settlements is to establish the development needs of those villages and apportion an appropriate level of development where those needs arise. Do not support the level of growth apportioned to the villages and rural area currently which is in excess of what is required to support the Council's rural area. More appropriate to allocate the 1,000 homes proposed for new villages to be allocated to the existing villages within the rural areas. Worksop and Retford should be the main focus of housing development within the District. Those Strategic Options should make clear that the vital role that Retford will have in meeting the housing	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The spatial strategy will be reviewed and amended where necessary.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		needs of the District as well as the role of new housing in supporting Harworth and Bircotes as a centre for regeneration and employment; those roles should not be underestimated.	
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Disappointed that the Council has pulled back from its commitment to allocate urban extensions to Worksop and Retford within the previous Local Plan. The Local Plan should focus on the delivery of urban extensions as part of a hybrid approach to housing delivery. Those urban extensions should be allocated respective to their potential sustainability. The sustainability of an urban extension will be dependent on the context in which it is delivered; including, but not limited to, its environmental surroundings and constraints, access to facilities and location on and access to the strategic road network. Consider that the land to the south of Ordsall, Retford, is a logical and sustainable location for an urban extension and has historically represented a growth area for Retford.	The draft Local Plan does not contain site allocations - these are to be included in the next draft Local Plan.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	<p>Should be re-drafted to reflect amended 'Spatial Strategy Strands' that direct growth to the District's main settlements and omit the proposed development of Garden Villages. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased housing growth towards Retford; and • Significant reduction in the development directed towards the Rural Area. <p>Support the policy's positive approach to supporting development proposals that comply with strategic allocations, site specific allocations or strategic or detailed policies governing the growth of settlements through market led windfall applications. The success of this policy will be in the detail of those other policies. Disagree with Spatial Strategy Strand 1 in relation to Rural Bassetlaw. It is vital that the vitality and viability of the rural area is maintained and some growth in those areas will be necessary. Object to the proposed allocation of development proportionate to the size of existing villages resulting in 27% of development being located to the rural area. The level of development to be delivered in the sustainable rural settlements should be based on a robust assessment of each of those settlements which establishes the level of appropriate development for each settlement; taking into account its development needs and constraints. Further work is required to establish the appropriate level of development in those locations. Supportive of the policy proposing new development within and adjoining Retford but the level of development should be dramatically increased in recognition of its fundamental role in maintaining the sustainability of the rural east of the District. Spatial Strategy Strand 4 for Harworth and Bircotes should be amended to a more aspirational approach for the town. Support the focussing of investment and new development to encourage regeneration of the town, the Plan should go further and seek to drive forward growth in Harworth and Bircotes as a centre for employment within the District. Emphasis should be put on</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The spatial strategy will be reviewed and amended where necessary.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>its potential role as a regionally important settlement in terms of its economic contribution to the SCR and D2N2.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the extant permissions at Harworth (and pipeline development such as land south of Snape Lane) the need to deliver a ‘step change’ in the economic growth aspirations of Harworth should be stressed at Strategic Proposal 4 in line with the strategy set out within the Bassetlaw Core Strategy. Whilst significant progress has been made in term of the commitment of sites that ‘step change’ has not yet been delivered at Harworth and Bircotes and realising that ‘step change’ should remain a priority of the Plan. Spatial Strategy Strand 5 should be removed. Support a ‘hybrid’ approach but the Plan must focus housing and employment development on the three main settlements of Worksop, Retford and Harworth; with an emphasis on employment development at Harworth. The distribution of that development should be managed through allocations by way of Sustainable Urban Extensions at the main tier settlements as well as a measures and proportional allocation of smaller development sites to the lower tier settlements to maintain and enhance their viability. In addition, the key role that Retford plays in maintaining the viability and vitality of the rural centre and east of the District as a service and transport hub for those areas should be recognised. The need to cater for the needs of the rural area as well as the resident population of Retford should be confirmed within the Local Plan.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	<p>Consider the Council has underestimated the level of uplift which it has sought to the minimum SMOAN figure to account for economic growth. The economic potential of the borough to grow given the economic opportunities that exist now and in line with the economic development of the SCR and D2N2 LEPS. The Council's EDNA suggests that the District will experience a 'modest' level of economic growth to 2035 - the industrial market in Bassetlaw demonstrates strength - The total stock is above average compared to other more rural authorities in the sub region and has shown 16% growth over the last 15 years, outperforming regional and county benchmarks. The EDNA comments that industrial activity in the district is currently focussed around Worksop but that the A1M is considered an emerging or longer term market with commitments at Harworth subject to securing occupiers. The EDNA considers that an economic led housing need is identified in conjunction with the preferred scenario being of 390 dwellings per annum. Support an approach which seeks to increase housing land supply to take account of economic growth, the assessment does not go far enough. The EDNA is based on the District continuing to do what it has already started to do modestly well at economically and therefore the forecasts do not appear to reflect Bassetlaw's previous ambitions for a step-change in the District. Even if a modest level of growth was accepted as being the District's aspiration, it is not clear why the EDNA sought to support the Oxford Economic (OE) 'mid-point' forecast for growth within the borough. Table 16 of the EDNA sets out a number of growth scenarios and demonstrates that the OE baseline, midpoint and high growth scenarios are significantly lower than those provided by Cambridge Economics (CE) or Experian forecasts. The next lowest 'mid-point' growth scenario requires the provision of housing growth at 456dpa. The mean housing</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. As required by the Housing Need PPG, the housing requirement/need will be kept under review as the Plan progresses.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>growth for the three forecasts for ‘mid-point’ growth scenarios is 446dpa (supporting 4766 jobs). As a minimum, this mean point should be the level of housing growth that should be provided to support economic growth in the District. The above forecasting fails to realise the potential of, and the Council’s influence over, the District’s opportunities to bring forward that step-change. Support the recognition that Harworth prevents an opportunity as an economic growth market as above. The scale of opportunity has been underestimated. The EDNA set out that over 1,000 hectares of assessed sites provide a spectrum of existing development, future commitments and potential further areas of development. The EDNA notes there are committed but (partially) undeveloped sites, including the site at Harworth, which are able to meet and exceed the projected needs of the district. The Council should be driving forward that change and encouraging the delivery of that employment land during the plan period. This will include the need to support that economic growth with a sufficient local labour force which will include a need for a significant uplift in housing provision. Capitalisation on the opportunities presented by the A1(M) and available development land at Harworth should be one of the key aims of the Council’s economic strategy. The level of housing provided should be tailored around supporting a ‘high growth’ economic forecast which across the forecasts would provide between 6,500 and 8,700 jobs (7,533 jobs is the mean average of the 3 forecasts) which would require between 518dpa and 608dpa respectively (mean average of 560dpa across the 3 forecasts). An aspirational plan that sought to support the level of growth which could be achieved within Bassetlaw would provide for circa 560dpa or 10,080 dwellings across an 18 year plan period. Should the Council disagree that it is necessary to provide for a higher level of economic growth (and to stay with OE mid-point</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		growth scenario of 390dpa), there are reasons why that figure should be increased.	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	<p>The baseline projections for household projections (which have been used to derive economic led household forecasts) are based on 2016-based subnational population projections (SNPP) from 2018 to 2035. The baseline for the projections is started below that of the SMOAN against which the forecasts are considering an uplift. For the EDNA to robustly consider the extent to which economic growth should be factored into any increase in housing needs, the baseline for the demographic needs and economic growth should utilise the same projections. Chapter 7 'key points' refers to the SHMA as being the most up to date evidence on housing need - suggests a need of 435 dwellings per annum to meet Bassetlaw's Objectively Assessed Need (OAN). It states it may be necessary to allocate sites for more dwellings than the residual housing requirement to reflect that larger sites may deliver beyond the plan period. Para 6.9 considers whether a higher rate of housing delivery might be indicative of a level of housing need above the SMOAN. Agree that delivery of housing between 2010-2018 averages 329dpa which would not indicate a need to deliver above 390dpa. The last two years of delivery, with market conditions more broadly reflecting the conditions seen within Bassetlaw today, delivery has exceeded 500dpa. This indicates that the housing market has a need for in excess of 390dpa. Note the continuing trend of the Council's evidence base to underestimate housing growth needs. The OAN identified previously was between 435 - 500dpa. Since then, the 2017 SHMA recommends a housing requirement of 374dpa or, if a more ambitious plan is chosen, a level of housing growth at 417dpa. It is indicative that as market conditions for economic growth improve within the District, and delivery rises, the evidence base is demonstrating a concerning trend downwards for the level of housing it considers needs to be delivered. Significant concerns that underestimating the supply</p>	<p>The Council is satisfied that the EDNA study is robust and it provides sufficient evidence to justify the approach taken to the annual housing requirement as proposed in the LP.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>of housing needed over the plan period could constrain economic growth below the potential that the Council has helped to cultivate.</p>	
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	<p>There is a case for the level of housing provision to be further increased to account for the need to provide affordable housing within the District. The PPG notes that the SMOAN makes an 'affordability adjustment' to ensure that the standard method for assessing local housing need responds to price signals and is consistent with the policy objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. This specific adjustment in this guidance is made in response to the 'affordability' of housing. The adjustment is made only to ensure that housing provision is set at a level to ensure that the minimum housing need "starts to address the affordability of homes". As a minimum, this policy requirement is only that it does not make the affordability of homes worse. The above makes no requirement on the solving of affordable housing shortfalls within Districts. The SHMA identifies affordable</p>	<p>The Council is satisfied that the EDNA study is robust and it provides sufficient evidence to justify the approach taken to the annual housing requirement as proposed in the LP.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>housing needs for the District separately; which the SMOAN does not. That affordable housing need is 134dpa for affordable homes between 2014-2035. Para 7.5 shows that, taking into account under delivery, that there is a residual requirement for 2,719 affordable homes to be delivered within the plan period (or 39% of the proposed housing requirement). The Plan suggests that the affordable housing needs will not be met due to viability issues. Whilst the ability of the open market to deliver affordable housing is an issue which must be addressed, including allocation of Sites in more buoyant market areas, the main contributing factor to the lack of affordable housing that can be delivered is the lack of housing proposed overall. Not provided a breakdown of what the maximum number of affordable units the proposed supply could deliver. From a review of the annual monitoring data available it is clear that the delivery of affordable housing is likely to fall significantly below the 134dpa required through the plan period. From 2014-2018 the Council only delivered 95 affordable dwellings. In 2016/17, it delivered 459 dwellings and 67 of those were affordable; circa 15%. If the above rate of delivery of affordable homes was maintained, the District would need to deliver some 893dpa to deliver the level of affordable housing it needs. In light of increasing difficulties facing the District with regard to the affordability, it is considered that an additional uplift should be applied to the Council's housing requirement to boost the supply of housing to help meet affordable housing needs.</p>	
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	If the economic aspirations are curtailed from previous drafts of the Local Plan to only a 'mid-point' growth scenario, that a mean average of forecast job growth would require 446dpa or 8,028 dwellings over an 18-year plan period. But the level of housing should be tailored around supporting a 'high growth' economic forecast which across the forecasts would provide	The Council is satisfied that the EDNA study is robust and it provides sufficient evidence to justify the approach taken to the annual housing requirement as proposed in the LP.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>between 6,500 and 8,700 jobs. That growth should be supported by at least 560dpa or 10,080 dwellings across an 18 year plan period. Housing growth should be maximised to help meet the affordable housing shortfall as far as sustainably possible. At this stage, the Local Plan is seeking to set a housing requirement figure which would require the delivery of affordable housing at a rate of 40% of its open market units, or circa three times what it has previously achieved in its most successful year (15%).</p>	
DBLP138	Bothamsall Parish Council	<p>Does not support the spatial strategy: Bothamsall Parish Council are broadly in favour of allowing a small number of carefully controlled new dwellings but the total maximum number of 15 is too high. Any new housing in Bothamsall village will first require replacement of key services, in particular the already failing sewage transfer equipment/system. Support the development of Bevercotes Colliery site subject to significant improvements and limitation of through traffic passing through Bothamsall village, but do not support the loss of existing employment and redevelopment of Gamston Airport.</p>	<p>The figure given is not a requirement. The approach taken enables a small amount of development to occur where there is sufficient infrastructure to support it in the rural areas over the plan period (up to 2037). The community of Bothamsall has the opportunity to plan for this growth through the development of the NP.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP143	Persimmon Homes & Charles Church	<p>A hybrid approach to the distribution of development is drawn out from the Interim Sustainability Appraisal (2016). Note a subsequent revision (Jan 2019) has now also been published. The 2019 SA identifies the Council's preferred 'parallel strategy' differs from the 2016 interim SA 'hybrid strategy' referred to within the draft local plan. The new 'parallel strategy' incorporates the 'hybrid strategy' which looks to pursue a combination of the following with the addition of an equitable distribution of growth:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maintain extant local plan approach 2. New Hierarchy based on functional geography 3. Focus development along A1 corridor 4. New or expanded rural settlements 5. Large scale urban extensions. <p>It is acknowledged a pluralistic spatial approach maximises the available site allocation choices the resultant spatial policy lacks clarity. On review of Table 4.2 the adjudication procedures lacks precision, appear to be based upon broad assumptions with little weight given to acknowledged unknown factors which should by default be deemed risks until proven otherwise. The Local Plan espouses a 'hybrid approach' which does not reflect the latest 2019 SA which supports a 'parallel strategy'. Neither strategy appears to be fully evidenced raising questions over the appropriateness of the Local Plan spatial approach.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The Council's overall strategic approach recognises the roles of Worksop and Retford in its settlement hierarchy, but also recognises that there are constraints to delivering significant development in both towns. Therefore, the Council is looking to deliver a new settlement which is equidistance between Worksop and Retford. This, along with some limited growth in rural villages, will address some of the development needs of both towns later in the plan period, whilst supporting the improved connectivity between the towns and the wider region including the new adjacent strategic employment site. The need for economic land reflects the findings of the EDNA and the housing supply supports that. The LP will allocate employment land in the most sustainable locations that are attractive to the market. Site allocations will be considered in the next version of the local plan.</p>
DBLP147	ID Planning on behalf of The Haworth Group	<p>The Bassetlaw Spatial Strategy is encapsulated in 5 spatial strategy strands. These relate to rural Bassetlaw, Worksop: sub-regional centre, Retford: rural hub town, Harworth and Bircotes: local regeneration centre and new garden villages. It is clear the spatial strategy in relation to Harworth and Bircotes seeks to focus investment and new developments to support the continued regeneration of the third largest town in Bassetlaw. The strategy wants to strengthen its role as a local infrastructure and service centre to the north east district. Support the fact the strategy states development will be supported where it can benefit for Harworth and Bircotes</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		excellent connections to South Yorkshire and access to the A1. The planning application for land off Scrooby Road and North of Snape Lane, Harworth wholly mirrors the aims and aspirations of Policy 1 in respect of how it impacts on Harworth and Bircotes.	
DBLP148	ID Planning on behalf of Harron Homes	Retford is identified as a rural-hub town. The policy states that new development will be supported in and adjoining this town, which is the second largest in Bassetlaw. Support this spatial strategy strand in relation to Retford. Policy 1 also identifies a spatial strategy strand for two new garden villages. It is stated that these villages will establish a sustainable community delivering a large number of homes over the next 30 years. Do not object to the identification of garden villages in principle. There is a separate spatial strand for Rural Bassetlaw which seeks to support proportionate growth to support over 60 villages and hamlets across the District. It should be acknowledged that the new garden villages will form part of Rural Bassetlaw when they are delivered.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The spatial strategy will be reviewed and amended where necessary.
DBLP149	Fisher German on behalf of D Thorlby	The Spatial Strategy proposes a hybrid approach to meeting the District's development needs is generally supported. The proposed role of Worksop as a 'Sub-regional Centre' is logical and reflects the town's spatial role and sustainability credentials. The approach of directing new development to within and adjoining the town is supported. The delivery of housing on the edge of Worksop is considered to meet the requirements of the NPPF para 59 which states that "To support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed". There is a clear demand for housing in Worksop and therefore	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The spatial strategy will be reviewed and amended where necessary.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		it is imperative that the Council are proactive in planning for further housing to come forward. Whilst the approach proposed in respect of Worksop is supported, object to the proposed New Garden Villages.	
DBLP156	Sheffield City Council	Note this paragraph on addressing the Duty to Cooperate. Confirm that at the time of writing, there have been no requests for Bassetlaw to address the development needs of neighbouring local authorities. Sheffield wrote to all authorities within Sheffield City Region in April 2018 to formally ask whether there was any scope to meet Sheffield's needs. At that time, Bassetlaw responded that until conclusions are made on evidence for the emerging Local Plan Bassetlaw cannot commit to providing land to meet shortfalls elsewhere. For clarity this dialogue should be reflected in the Plan or supporting evidence on the Duty to Cooperate. Also note that there is sufficient land identified within the Draft Plan for meeting housing needs. On this basis, assume that Sheffield is not required to meet any of Bassetlaw's housing needs.	Whilst it is acknowledged that Sheffield CC wrote to Bassetlaw DC to scope out the potential for delivering some of their needs, it was not a formal request to Bassetlaw to ask them to meet their needs. Bassetlaw will continue to work with Sheffield CC as the Plan progresses to address the requirements of the duty to cooperate. This will be clarified in the next iteration of the draft Bassetlaw Plan.
DBLP153	The Haworth Group on behalf of Welbeck Colliery	Supportive of the overall strategy for Bassetlaw but feel that an opportunity has been missed in identifying the former Welbeck Colliery site for a mixed-use development especially when considering the need for investment in rural communities.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council will consider this suggestion as part of the ongoing development of the Plan.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP158	Fisher German on behalf of T Strawson and D Horrocks	<p>The Spatial Strategy which proposes a hybrid approach to meeting the District's development needs is generally supported. The proposed role of Retford, as a 'rural-hub town' is commensurate with both the towns spatial role and sustainability credentials. Retford benefits from a significant service provision and excellent transport connections and is considered sound for the town to be earmarked for growth.</p> <p>The approach of directing new development to and adjoining the town is supported. The delivery of housing on the edge of Retford is considered to meet the requirements of the NPPF para 59 which states that "To support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed". There is a clear demand for housing in Retford and it is imperative that the Council are proactive in planning for further housing to come forward. The approach in respect of Retford is generally supported, we object to the proposed New Garden Villages and the reduction in dwelling numbers assigned to Retford.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The spatial strategy will be reviewed and amended where necessary.</p>
DBLP169	Avant Homes (Central) and Wyndthorpe Developments Ltd	<p>Sets the overarching spatial strategy across the District through the identified plan period (2018 to 2035). Within the spatial strategy, the town of Retford is identified as a 'rural-hub town', second only to Worksop in terms of its scale and focus for investment & infrastructure. This is welcomed and consistent with the current settlement hierarchy found in Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy. The pre-amble text to the policy makes clear that over the plan period additional permissions may be granted where amongst brownfield & regeneration opportunities, there is an identified shortfall in supply that would engage the tilted balance found in NPPF para 11 d).</p> <p>Consider the policy should make clear that this may include sustainable development outside of the defined settlement limits, where proposals would generally accord with the</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The spatial strategy will be reviewed and amended where necessary.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>Development Plan as a whole. Note that the Council has yet to prepare monitoring indicators, to support the delivery of the plan. Given the complexities associated with the delivery of new isolated settlements, including the delivery of upfront infrastructure and associated viability issues, consider it prudent to commit to an early review of the plan should sites fail to deliver as anticipated, particularly the new villages. This would include a review alongside the housing trajectory supporting the plan, with a commitment to identifying further land for development should there be any slippage across sites in order to ensure that the minimum planned housing requirement is met as required by the NPPF. Consider a contingency against the plan requirement of 6,630 dwellings to ensure there is a sufficient land supply in order to provide a realistic prospect that the plan target will be met. From experience of participating in Local Plan examinations, recommend a minimum of 20% in order to reduce the margin for failure, consistent with those recommendations put forward by the Local Plans Expert Group and the Home Builders Federation. This is important given that the Council is seeking to rely upon the delivery of circa 1,000 units inside the plan period from two new strategic settlements. The above point is persuasive given the Council's evidence on lapse rates since the start of the plan period. Para 6.17 states lapse rates for sites of 5 or more dwellings have equated to around 25% since 2010. Whilst the application of the average lapse rate to those committed sites yet to commence construction is justified and welcomed, the evidence casts doubt on the deliverability of the residual requirement moving forward unless a sufficient contingency is factored in to the plan requirement.</p>	
DBLP170	East Markham Parish Council	Note you have abandoned the cluster model. The new plan is a fairer way to distribute housing growth in rural Bassetlaw.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		Could look again at the villages where growth is not supported, to ascertain if their conclusions are fully valid.	
DBLP173	Lichfields on behalf of SP Scholey and the estate of WA Scholey	<p>Support the overarching principles of the Spatial Strategy, consider that Policy 1 (or Policy 8) should go further in identifying which of the 60+ villages and hamlets located in Rural Bassetlaw are considered to be most suitable to accommodate new development. Note that the Initial Draft Local Plan provided much more detail on this and acknowledged, for example, that Ranskill – as a ‘Defined Rural Settlement within a Functional Cluster’ – was considered to be one of the district’s “sustainable rural settlements”, reflecting the availability of facilities and services in the locality of the village. Consider the “blanket” 10% distribution of new housing across individual settlements in Rural Bassetlaw (and the arbitrary 20% growth cap) to be too simplistic an approach and would prevent larger scale housing scheme being brought forward in locations where they could otherwise achieve a more sustainable form of development. This would limit the extent to which any affordable housing, community infrastructure, facilities and services can be delivered (and contrary to the associated policies in the draft Local Plan that seek to achieve these benefits). This approach is contrary to the test of soundness in the NPPF and the Spatial Strategy should be revised accordingly. The inclusion of two garden villages is noted as forming part of the proposed Spatial Strategy. Whilst the delivery of large scales sites can be an appropriate solution to meeting demanding housing requirements (as advocated at NPPF para 72), a realistic approach needs to be taken with regards to their existing context and how this will affect their delivery. To this end, the complexities of landownership issues; masterplanning; lengthy lead-in times / build rates and; the proximity of the two sites (insofar as this potentially supressing demand) all present</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The spatial strategy will be reviewed and amended where necessary.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>potential risk and delay to the delivery of the garden villages during the Plan period. Refers to attached 'Start to Finish' paper produced by Lichfields as a guide for determining the likely lead-in times and delivery rates on large-scale housing sites. Welcome Policy 1's inclusion of windfall applications as being an important contributor of new housing in the district. Support the opportunity for new residential development to be granted where there is an identified shortfall in housing supply, emphasise the importance of allocating a sufficient supply of housing in the first place. It is important that such flexibility is engrained throughout the emerging Plan.</p>	
DBLP177	Linden Homes Strategic Land	<p>Retford's role as a rural-hub is supported. Its important role does not appear to be reflected within the distribution of growth in the Key Diagram. This only allocates 13% of the housing growth for the District to Retford which conflicts with Para 5.6 that all settlements would grow by a consistent percentage (20%). It results in a noticeable reduction compared with the growth percentage in the adopted Core Strategy of 26%. The population of the town is approx 20% of Bassetlaw, and it is acknowledged in Para 10.7 that housing needs (including affordable housing needs) arising from the town over the Plan period will not be met in the town, but in the NGVs. Notwithstanding sustainable travel proposals outlined, the NGVs will not be as accessible to the communities from where the housing need arises, and this can create problems when seeking to meet affordable housing need in locations where those in need do not want to live due to the</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The spatial strategy will be reviewed and amended where necessary.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>location. The NPPF requires that planning should actively manage patterns of growth to promote the use of sustainable modes of transport, and maximise the use of existing transport infrastructure. The town has excellent public transport links as acknowledged in para 10.3, and their use should be maximised and not limited at the expense of other less sustainable locations which may themselves have unacceptable impacts on transport infrastructure. The social and environmental effects of growth at Retford compared to the NGVs does not appear to have been fully considered within the Sustainability Appraisal. Whilst this is not an objection to the NGVs, the Plan will carefully need to consider the balance of growth between the settlements and ensure that the Plan does not have unintended consequences through limiting growth in Retford. Retford could, and should, be providing more towards the housing needs of the District than other less accessible locations.</p>	
DBLP183	Environment Agency	<p>In line with the NPPF, priority should be given to sustainable developments and those on brownfield land rather than spreading into green belts and/or wedges. Appropriate recognition should be given to those brownfield sites which have the potential to be designated as Open Mosaic Habitat on previously developed Land (a UK priority habitat). Like the supporting text for this section to clearly state support for this hierarchy, if possible. Developments alongside existing transport links have the potential to enhance the network through appropriate greening. The “NEWP32 Transport green corridors” report looks at how the management of transport soft estate can be better integrated and linked with adjacent land management. This report was developed in line with Humberhead Levels Nature Improvement Area (NIA), so links in very nicely with the Plan. Would like to see the addition of the following wording, which would further enhance this already</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council will review the policy wording and make any necessary amendments.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		excellent section – either in the supporting text, or as an addition to the policy wording, which at first glance might sit best under the sub strand section ‘1. Rural Bassetlaw’: In all cases, proposals which would result in unmitigated damage to habitats and wildlife will be refused. Proposals which require modification of a watercourse will not be supported, unless it can be proven that the modification will be of long-term benefit to the environment.’	
DBLP186	Natural England	Support the inclusion of delivering net environmental gains in the New Garden Villages in Policy 1. Sites of Least Environmental Value: In accordance with the NPPF, para 171 , the plan should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value. Expects sufficient evidence to be provided, through the SA and HRA, to justify the site selection process and to ensure sites of least environmental value are selected, e.g. land allocations should avoid designated sites and landscapes and significant areas of best and most versatile agricultural land and should consider the direct and indirect effects of development, including on land outside designated boundaries and within the setting of protected landscapes.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently developing a site selection methodology which will inform the selection of site allocations. This will take into consideration environmental constraints.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP192	Johnson Mowat on behalf of Barratt Homes	<p>It is noted that the Plan moves away from setting out a rigid settlement hierarchy instead listing the individual strands of the spatial strategy. Do not object to this overall approach it is considered that the plan has now not gone far enough in identifying development priorities. The Council should seek to deliver a plan which has a pro-development focus and seeks to encourage development to meet the economic and social aspirations. The policy is misleading, interpreted as focusing development priorities in Rural Bassetlaw. If it is the Council's intention that these strands should be seen as parallel to one another this should be made clearer. It is suggested that the spatial strategy is reformatted as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Worksop: sub-regional centre 2. Harworth & Bircotes: local regeneration centre 3. Retford: rural-hub town 4. Rural Bassetlaw 5. New Garden Villages. <p>For continuity the Plan should be restructured to follow the order listed. The above order better reflects the conclusions of the background documents regarding Spatial Strategy including the Sustainability Appraisal. It recognises the desire to focus growth on key areas playing specific roles within the district such as supporting economic and residential growth in Worksop the main employment, infrastructure and service centre for the district and a focused investment in the regeneration area of Harworth & Bircotes, reflecting the settlement's role as a local infrastructure and service centre in the northeast of the District. The strategy as amended will also ensure development opportunities across the District as a whole. The EDNA is clear in supporting growth options which enables uplift in the A1 corridor and in existing key settlements. Harworth is both a key settlement and located within the A1 corridor. The amendment will more accurately reflect the preferred Growth Options Assessment. Supportive of the continued recognition of Harworth & Bircotes as an identified Local Regeneration Centre in the District within the</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council will review the evidence for the Bassetlaw Plan to ensure that it fully explains the rationale behind the spatial strategy.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		Spatial Strategy. The Council's evidence base is lacking in detail regarding the three main urban settlements of Worksop, Harworth & Bircotes and Retford. Whilst a Rural Settlement Study (2018) has been undertaken no detailed study of the three key urban areas has been undertaken to understand the continued need for growth. This is intrinsically linked to our comments in relation to Policy 2 and Policy 11.	
DBLP193	White Young Green on behalf of Stadium Development	The overall strategy, including the spatial distribution of housing for Bassetlaw is supported.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP194	Emery Planning on behalf of J G Pears Property Ltd	This Policy seeks to set out the Spatial Strategy for development in Bassetlaw over the Plan period. Support the reference within the Policy to the fact that: "over the plan period, additional permissions will be granted where it can be demonstrated that the benefits of the development will support the regeneration of the district and provide identifiable social, economic and environmental improvements above and beyond the current aims of this plan. This may include: • Unforeseen major redevelopment opportunities on largescale brownfield sites" This land interest should be allocated as an employment site and potentially for other uses, it is one site which would fall to be considered within the scope of this policy. Given the District's need to strive for greater	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council will review the wording of the Rural Bassetlaw Policy and make amendments where appropriate and necessary.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>employment opportunities, the significant number of now redundant major development sites in the District and, the need to achieve a reduction in out commuting, this policy is considered wholly appropriate. Assert that this support for redevelopment of major previously developed sites should be echoed through the first of the Spatial Strands set out for ‘Rural Bassetlaw’. Specific reference should be made to the importance of sustainable economic investment /employment generating development and the support for existing employment sites in these areas in order to sustain a vibrant rural economy and make best use of land. The reuse of such sites for residential purposes, subject to the proposals achieving sustainable development in accord with the Framework, should also be incorporated and supported.</p>	
DBLP195	Fisher German on behalf of The Hospital of The Holy and Undivided Trinity	<p>The Spatial Strategy which proposes a hybrid approach to meeting the District’s development needs are supported. The proposed role of Retford as a ‘rural-hub town’ reflects the towns role and sustainability credentials. Retford benefits from significant service provision and excellent transport connections and as such it is considered sound for the town to be identified for future economic and residential growth.</p> <p>Whilst the role of Retford is supported, have concerns with the limited dwelling numbers being directed to Retford as well as the proposed New Garden Villages.</p>	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP205	Fisher German on behalf of P Hinds	<p>The Spatial Strategy which proposes a hybrid approach to meeting the District's development needs is supported. The identification of the villages of 'Rural Bassetlaw' as the location for proportionate growth through a careful mix of planned and managed organic development is supported. Allowing new development to come forward in villages is considered to be in line with NPPF para 78, which states that in order to promote sustainable development in rural areas, "housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby". New housing in Treswell will help to enhance and maintain the vitality of the existing community, support both the Village Hall in Treswell and the services in the nearby settlements of Rampton, Cottam, South Leverton and North Leverton with Hablesthorne. The services present within these villages include pubs, schools, convenience stores and a post office. There are a number of large employers in area, the Referendum Version Treswell and Cottam Neighbourhood Plan (paragraph 5.6, page 13) notes that "there are some significant local employers, including Rampton Hospital, Sundown Adventure Land and Cottam Power Station where employees are always seeking accommodation within the area". This is in addition to the smaller employers that are dispersed across the neighbouring settlements. New housing in Treswell could also assist in providing housing for people employed in the locality.</p>	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP207	Robert Doughty Consultancy on behalf of J. Travis	<p>Support the approach to growth in Rural Bassetlaw in Policy 1 which promotes the delivery of: "Proportionate growth through a careful mix of planned and managed organic development that will support the living, working and</p>	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		environmentally diverse landscape of the district, containing over 60 villages and hamlets located in a range of distinct landscapes, shaped by a legacy of agriculture, mining and historic Ducal estates." Rural communities require ongoing growth to ensure that they can continue to thrive and provide sustainable places to live and work.	
DBLP208	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	Do not support "garden villages" in any form. Condemn the closing of established businesses for the sake of housing. I disagree with lining the pockets of shareholders in the major housing estate builders. I agree only with the freeing of useless or redundant greenfield and brownfield sites to allow anyone to build approved designs. I am disappointed that we as a nation have not learnt from our mistakes in the past with horrendous concrete monstrosities spread throughout otherwise beautiful towns, villages and cities. We still protect derelict wrecks with graded listings as they fall into disrepair and become unsafe while pretending to believe that we are doing the right thing by blotting the country with varying sized pockets of anonymous concrete and brick housing estates. Estates where we cram people from all levels of society and then show surprise when it becomes a melting pot for dysfunction. It is clear that Bassetlaw council have no wish for our period of history to be remembered for anything other than filling up the land with a practical solution which pleases no one. We have handed over our architecture to those with limited imagination. We have handed over our trades to the lowest possible bidder. We have helped the greedy to control our businesses and our industry. We even gave them a "lowest mark" to aim for. I do not support this strategy.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP217	Axis ped on behalf of FCC Environment	<p>Support the Council's proposed overall strategy which will seek to deliver the Council's Vision of making Bassetlaw a place where rural and urban life prosper from investment and growth. Consider the Draft Bassetlaw Plan Part 1: Strategic Plan actively seeks to support economic growth in accordance with the NPPF. This Plan sets out the Strategic Policies which will be supported by site allocations to deliver economic growth across the district. Support the identification of Rural Bassetlaw as one of the five Spatial Strategy Strands, this supports proportionate growth through a careful mix of planned and managed organic development that will support the living, working and environmentally diverse landscape. This also supports Strategic Objective 6 and is in accordance with the NPPF which confirms at Paragraph 83 that planning policies and decisions should enable the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings.</p>	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP218	Pegasus Planning on behalf of E Fisher and Company Limited	<p>The inclusion of Langold in the Settlement Hierarchy and as suitable for development is welcomed. The general approach to development within the 73 rural settlements is highly generalised, especially when considering 15/01605/OUT is capable of bringing forward a mixed use development. Acknowledged that the Council are due to assess each area based on its ability to accommodate this growth, it is considered that Langold would be a sustainable village that would be more suitable for growth than others, based on their size and existing service provision. The spatial strategy is unjustified as it does not provide an appropriate strategy for development outside of what could be considered to be the 'main' urbanised areas.</p>	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The spatial strategy will be reviewed and amended where necessary.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP219	Planning and Design Group on behalf of the Welbeck Estates Company Ltd	<p>The general principle introduced that 'all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development by supporting some measure of development in settlements of all scales' is welcomed. This approach will help to unlock sustainable rural growth, including that delivered by appropriate land allocations and the open market. As such, rural Bassetlaw is identified as one 'strand' of interconnected settlement and land. This is as opposed to a top down, more traditional, spatial hierarchy of settlement and is summarised below in relation to development across rural Bassetlaw: 'Proportionate growth through a careful mix of planned and managed organic development that will support the living, working and environmentally diverse landscape of the district, containing over 60 villages and hamlets located in a range of distinct landscapes, shaped by a legacy of agriculture, mining and historic Ducal estates (p.31).' Welcome the principle of a spatial hierarchy of settlements which is orientated around a positive approach to rural development. In particular the inclusion of Nether Langwith, Cuckney, Norton and Holbeck within the rural Bassetlaw strand of sustainable settlement is welcomed. Significant concerns are raised in relation to the proposed 20% cap to rural settlement growth and the apparent lack of differentiation made for the most sustainable rural settlements that may justify a higher cap.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP221	Gladman Developments	<p>The emerging Local Plan covers the period 2018 – 2035. Approve of the plan period as this is consistent with the requirements of NPPF para 22 of the NPPF (2019) which makes clear that strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum 15-year period. The two garden villages supported by a range of small-medium sized development will ensure that the Local Plan responds positively to the long-term development requirements of Bassetlaw. Support the decision in progressing with a spatial strategy which seeks to deliver its full housing need through a range of delivery methods. Within this hybrid strategy, fully support the exploration into the delivery of new settlements supported by a range of smaller housing developments to meet the needs of local communities. New settlements can play an important role in the delivery of new housing to meet the needs of the district whilst avoiding some of the major constraints that may limit development elsewhere. Such development can bring positive support for struggling local services and can help bolster rural economies and infrastructure demands whilst providing a solution to the ever-increasing housing shortfall. The delivery of the New Settlements will help to reinforce and strengthen existing networks of the market towns and rural villages through their strategic location by providing new facilities to support existing and future residents. Approve of the flexibility provided by Policy 1 which allows for additional permissions to be granted where it can be demonstrated that the benefits of development will support the regeneration of the district by providing identifiable social, economic and environmental improvements. Should there be a shortfall in housing land supply this provides a prudent approach to support development proposals not identified through the local plan to come forward in accordance with the presumption in favour of</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		sustainable development and in line with the Plan's vision and objectives.	
DBLP229		Support the growth of new development in urban and rural areas. Hayton is one 73 sustainable villages which is suitable for new residential development. Rural settlements like Hayton will prosper and evolve through the delivery of planned and managed growth which will sustain and enhance local services and facilities.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP251		Some of its proposals on future housing and employment are welcomed.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP262	Anglian Water	Note its proposed to identify additional housing and employment allocation sites as part of the next draft of the Local Plan. Anglian Water would wish to comment further on the implications of specific allocation sites for our existing water supply infrastructure once these have been identified.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council will continue to liaise with Anglian Water as the plan progresses, including identifying/assessing sites for allocation.
DBLP301	977042	Retford is not sustainable as it does not have adequate resources or infrastructure for current population. The roads and sewers are overloaded.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP303	978627	The fundamental need is to extend existing residential areas.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP308	986480	No support for the strategy.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP315	987680	Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP317	987880	Support. I agree we need to build more houses, but they need to be in the right place.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP319	987959	No support for Gamston	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP326	988057	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP328	988061	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP336	988172	No support for the strategy. Throw the draft plan in the bin and leave things as they are.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP339	988184	No support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)	In a rural environment it cannot be the case that a flat rate 20% “fits all”, large and small, particularly the very small settlements / parishes. In a village of say, 140 homes a growth of up to 25 will increase the population by 1/3rd but not allow the infrastructure and basic power, water, sewerage services to grow to satisfy that extra demand. This increase must be adjusted to that which is proportionate for that settlement.	The Council considers that an equitable approach is appropriate because development in one village has the potential to support services in another village (as identified in national policy - NPPF paragraph 78).
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)	Support but with individual reservations as described above.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP363	988482	No support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP364	988487	Do not support the strategy	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP372	988501	Support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP373	988503	Support the need for more homes, but I do not support the location of Retford Gamston Airport as a site for a new village or any location which would impact on the Airport Operations.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP375	988527	No support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP376	988557	Support. General concept is good. Devil is in the detail.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP384	988726	Broadly in agreement with proposed distribution of housing	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP391	988813	No support. Unacceptable to destroy a thriving airfield for use as housing.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP393	989007	No support. Firstly decide what you want Bassetlaw to look like 100 years from now and work towards that goal. Don't do knee jerk development because it is politically advantageous. Neighbourhood plans were developed over the past few years, discussed and agreed, and likewise the Bassetlaw Plan should follow the same route. Today was the first time I had heard about new villages etc. so to me it is obvious that wide spread communication has not happened	Thank you for your comments which are noted. This is a draft plan, not the final version of the plan. It is a consultation document to enable local residents to voice their views prior to the Council developing the plan further. This enables the Council to take on board views and make any necessary amendments.
DBLP394	989023	No support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP398	989658	No support. Unconvinced of the need for so much housing within Bassetlaw when there are insufficient employment opportunities for existing residents. The consultation provided no reassurances. One of the "garden villages" will be built on the airfield which provides employment currently and this will go - makes no sense. There are a number of developments currently under construction in and around Retford how many more people can the infrastructure support? Who are the people needing these houses? Where are they currently?	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP399	989741	No support. The plan threatens Gamston Airport, a different site should be chosen	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP402	990030	Support. The overall policy is laudable though the reliance, albeit limited, on two new villages is debatable. New villages inevitably prove contentious and, if approved, will require substantial infrastructure and other establishment costs. This can prove a deterrent to delivery - an issue that will likely prove to be intractable for two new settlements so close to one another where they will predate upon the same housing market. The general strategy set out in Policy 1 is supported, particularly the on-going role of the rural centres.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP403	990043	Support. Bassetlaw needs to be innovative at attracting people to the area with appealing modern housing.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP404	990059	Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP405	990062	Do not support. BDC are considering 2 very significant developments in close proximity to each other, one of which is also close to a large site that is being considered for development at Ordsall. Without the Ordsall site it will result in 4000 of the 6500 houses being constructed in effectively 1 location. This will not be far off the threshold for a large town whilst not actually supporting the growth of the 2 existing towns. Consideration has not been given for the proposed developments by neighbouring district councils who are also creating garden villages relatively close to these and would also use the same insufficient road networks. The A1 will not cope with the increase in traffic volume. An accident in Newark results in standing traffic at Elkesley within 30 minutes. It needs to become a 3 lane motorway, the A614 needs to become a dual carriageway and the A638, B6387 will certainly not be able to manage	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP410	990076	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP411	990079	No support. I feel the distribution is too heavily centred on one area and should be more evenly distributed throughout Bassetlaw.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP415	990150	<p>Do not support. We do not support the Spatial Strategy for Bassetlaw in terms of the proposed spatial distribution of housing across the District. The approach to housing growth for the three main towns appears again to promote significantly greater concentration upon Worksop and Harworth & Bircotes at the expense of Retford, notwithstanding its stronger housing market and consequent housing delivery performance. The respondent has invested strongly in commercial and high quality industrial development in the town and is advancing current proposals to enhance its retail and leisure offer. They feel that their ambitions for Retford are not matched by the extent of housing development proposed, notwithstanding opportunities for growth to the north east and south of the town. The respondents also object to the rigid 'capped' approach to additional housing within the Rural Settlement of Bassetlaw based upon the 'proportionate growth' principle. This approach appears to be defining individual settlement growth down to the last dwelling without assessment and/or recognition of constraints and opportunities that may be present in the respective villages. In the absence of an up to date local plan in recent years, there has been some significant housing growth in the rural areas which has now 'taken up' much if not all of the capacity of certain rural settlements such as Walkeringham. Much of this relatively uncontrolled growth has not been matched by the provision of infrastructure in these settlements and/or the land needed to expand existing community facilities such as local schools and medical facilities. The policies for growth for these rural area should therefore contain flexibility over and above the cap to enable additional land to be identified for development where it clearly assists in the delivery of infrastructure such as the expansion of Walkeringham School.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP416	990240	<p>Do not support. A)The Bassetlaw District Council has, I believe around 7.5 years of Land Stock for Housing. Added to this is the Report in September 2018 (Action on Empty Houses) that there are 1,292 Unoccupied and Substantially Unfurnished Properties in Bassetlaw, of which some 600 are classed as 'Long Term Empty' (over 6 months). These and other such properties should be brought into use before more land is taken for Housing. It is puzzling to see how Villages that, under the current Plan, are "unsustainable for more development" have suddenly changed to being "sustainable" to the point of being required to take a further 20% of housing development. What has changed ?? In Bothamsall, as an example, we have LOST services, not gained, and the suggestion that additional housing will bring services back does not 'hold water'. We have LOST a village shop ! We have LOST a Post Office ! We have LOST a Bus Service of any consequence. Yet we are now "sustainable for development". How has this changed ?? Where Housing Building is to take place it should be placed to reduce the amount of travel that occupiers of these new houses will need to make. Further, existing Industrial and Commercial activities should not be disturbed to make way for Housing when this will result in additional travel by the new Occupiers. Distances as recorded in the ADAS Report Section 4.6 are misleading and inaccurate and appear to be "AS THE CROW FLIES" and not by public road. As examples; Bevercotes to Tuxford shown as 3.9km when it is 8.4km; Bevercotes to Retford, 6.82km vs actual of 11.5km, and to Retford Oaks Academy shown as 7.0km but is nearer to 11.5km., The journey from Bevercotes to Elkesley School is really 9.4km, not the 4.4km quoted.</p>	<p>The Council is required to produce and adopt a local plan which covers at least 15 years. Empty homes cannot be counted towards the housing supply because they are already counted in the housing stock. Therefore it would result in double counting. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments. The anomalies identified will be reviewed.</p>
DBLP418	990387	<p>Support for all policies. The strategy provides a good base on which Neighbourhood Plans can be developed. Villages need to be able to grow at a reasonable rate, which can vary depending</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council continues to work closely with infrastructure providers to ensure</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		on the village, in order to maintain village amenities and enable each village to maintain its character. Thought also has to be given to the provision of services such as schools and medical facilities in the villages. Living in a village in Rural East Bassetlaw, it is important that this local plan takes into account items such as: - the character of these village - the growing demand for schools, particularly primary schools in each village - adequate provision of basic medical needs (doctors surgeries) in the villages - Green space and recreation facilities in each village - Expansion of small businesses in the villages In this way, our villages can thrive which is good in itself, but also good for the environment if people in the village have less need to travel to towns and cities	that the plan will deliver any necessary infrastructure associated with new development.
DBLP419	990400	No support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP420	990465	Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP421	990489	Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP422	990506	Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP423	990541	Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP424	990549	Don't support. Local airfields are an essential part of maintaining an effective and efficient flight training industry in the UK, in turn feeding aviation providers supporting hundreds of thousands of jobs nationally and many thousands locally. Housing development is obviously necessary, but should not come at the expense of airfields around the country.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP425	990570	Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP426	990571	Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP427	990577	Don't support. Stop building on green and open spaces. Build within the existing urban footprint but not on open or green spaces.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP428	990594	Don't support. Loss of vital aviation site that is beneficial to the local economy.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP429	990613	Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP430	990614	Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP431	990633	Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP434	990659	Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP435	990666	Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP436	990682	Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP437	990704	Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP438	990717	Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP439	990719	Don't support. A638 is already congested and the rural villages used as cut throughs through the already increased housing in the villages. Rural villages are becoming increasing like mini towns as housing increases. Since Ballards in Markham moor went up the amount of lorries and traffic that go past our houses is noticeable busier, making the junctions harder to get out of more dangerous.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP440	990764	Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP441	990783	Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP442	990799	Don't support. Overloading local structure, e.g. Rural roads ,services and traffic movement in and around Retford. Gamston site more suitable for industrial use. Having attended one of your excellent Consultation Events it is evident that many residents in the surrounding area are concerned that, having moved to this area for a quiet and peaceful village life, the proposed development could be unacceptable and change this.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The draft plan includes policies to address infrastructure requirements. The Council is working with infrastructure providers to ensure the necessary infrastructure will be delivered to support new development.
DBLP443	990800	Support the identification of Rural Bassetlaw as one of the five Spatial Strategy Strands, this supports proportionate growth through a careful mix of planned and managed organic development that will support the living, working and environmentally diverse landscape. This also supports Strategic Objective 6 and is in accordance with the NPPF which confirms at Paragraph 83 that planning policies and decisions should	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		enable the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings. Consider the Plan actively seeks to support economic growth in accordance with the NPPF. This Plan sets out the Strategic Policies which will be supported by site allocations to deliver economic growth across the district. FCC's sites at Carlton Forest are suitably located to help to achieve the Council's aspirations and spatial strategy.	
DBLP444	990802	Do not support. I have lived in this area for many years and am interested in any potential developments which may happen, I have been an active person in my own village as a parish councillor and community worker in the Retford area as well as having spent my career in public services. Had to 'cut through' the fanciful persuasive language and rhetoric to get to the core of what this Plan represents and its effect on the existing extraordinary rural nature of the South Retford area.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP445	990806	Do not support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP446	990814	Do not support. There is no evidence that these houses will be required. There is currently no shortage of housing in Bassetlaw and there is no trend of movement into the area for work related reasons. In fact the large scale traditional jobs such as power stations are under threat.	Thank you for responding to the consultation. The supporting text to Policy 2 sets out the reasoned justification for the housing requirement. The Bassetlaw Economic Development Needs Assessment (December, 2018) includes the assessment of housing need.
DBLP447	990818	Do not support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP448	990826	Do not support. New housing should be concentrated near the town centres & transport hubs (train stations & bus stations) encouraging people to use public transport instead of private transport.	Where possible new housing will be identified in sustainable locations close to existing town centres and transport hubs. However, this is not always possible. Where sites are identified in other locations necessary infrastructure will be sought to ensure that residents have the opportunity to use other modes of transport and not just the private car.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP449	990829	Do not support. I think it is dispicable, the area of Retford can't cope as it is on the roads... Having a whole new village built with an average of 2 cars per household will cause mayhem. I for one don't support this.	During the site selection process the Council will work with the Highways Authority to identify appropriate mitigation in relation to highways and other transport infrastructure to ensure that the impact of new housing on roads is minimal.
DBLP450	990836	Do not support. This consultation form appears to have been either written by someone who has absolutely no knowledge and experience of creating a neutral and unbiased questionnaire, or someone who has lots but has a predetermined picture of the results they want to receive...	Thank you for responding to the consultation. The comments form enables the consultee to respond in any way they like. Consultees can also send in their response separately. There is no requirement for consultees to use the form, it was created to gauge opinion on the key issues of the plan.
DBLP451	990837	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP452	990841	Do not support. Gamston airport provides valuable jobs and services to the area. The airport should remain Any development around the old colliery would affect less people	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP453	990842	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP454	990843	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP455	990845	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP456	990846	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP457	990847	Do not support. The locations seem poorly thought out. The information at the consultation event and in the draft plan is lacking.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP458	990848	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP459	990849	Do not support. Concern relates to proposed development at Retford Gamston. This is a nationally import transport hub for GA. Attempts to change this land use directly opposes goverment policy and will be instrumental in the loss of significant numbers of skilled STEM jobs to the local economy.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP460	990850	Support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP461	990852	Support. As long as it does not require the closure of Gamston Airport.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP462	990854	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP463	990855	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP464	990856	Do not support. Why are all of your questions leading questions?	The comments form enables the consultee to respond in any way they wish. Consultees can also send in their response separately. There is no requirement for consultees to use the form, it was created to gauge opinion on the key issues of the plan.
DBLP465	990859	Support. However it should not be to the detriment of existing businesses. The Gamston airport supports many businesses and also provides needed leisure activities	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP466	990862	Do not support. This strategy will ruin an aviation community at Gamston, a location that I like to visit and make use of the current facilities. The proposal will ruin this.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP467	990865	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP468	990869	Support. Gamston Airport is not a suitable location for a new village, it is more valuable to the area as an airport.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP469	990882	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP470	990884	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP471	990885	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP472	990886	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP473	990889	Support. Local affordable housing is certainly required within the growing population of not only Bassetlaw but the East Midlands in general.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP474	990891	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP475	990893	Do not support. I don't support the use of Gamston airfield which is a valuable resource and amenity and should be kept as an airfield. The planning guidelines also don't allow its use, the airfield is mostly green field there is some brownfield,,but this is nearly all in current use as a thriving local asset.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP477	990901	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP478	990904	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP479	990910	Do not support. The draft plan for Bassetlaw suggests that the population of the residential settlements will be subject to a proposed increase of 20% inline with all other areas of the district. In rural settings this increase is predicted to be achieved by identified sites within the curtilage of the present villages as well as bringing back into use empty properties and redundant farm buildings. This approach will need the councils commitment to protecting and preserving rural communities. Positioning the proposed Garden Village on the site of the current Gamston Airport goes against the above in placing a new medium sized town of 4000 properties directly adjacent to a current village.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP480	990912	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP481	990913	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP482	990914	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP483	990915	Do not support. The roads are too busy, it will spoil the area. There are alternative places to develop instead of brownfield sites. Ie cottam power station	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP484	990916	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP485	990917	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP486	990918	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP487	990919	Support. But not at an airport expense	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP488	990921	Do not support. The idea to close vital areas of land, such as the airport to extend a short term goal of extra housing would lose many an attraction to local tourism	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP489	990922	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP490	990926	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP491	990928	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP492	990930	Do not support. The airfield is active, and not something which can easily be replaced. It offers highend employment and training opportunities for youngsters who want to pursue a career in aviation. Many airfields have already been lost around the country, and there is nowhere similar locally. See nothing in the plan to replace the loss of the airfield if it was built on. It is thriving and busy, why should it be closed. I would prefer farmland to be given up than the airfield.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP493	990933	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP494	990934	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP495	990936	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP496	990937	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP497	990938	Do not support. The infrastructure isn't able to cope with the current traffic, ie Retford train station, all the road along Albert road is blocked BOTH SIDES already every morning when trying to access the station plus the 7:37 to Sheffield is already jam packed. I live in the beautiful small village of Eaton and DO NOT want to be overlooking foul built houses, or having any more traffic through the village, there's enough traffic already, a total of 4 cars in 2 years has crashed on the corner where I live, and only last Saturday night a car going TOO FAST crashed on Eaton bridge ending nose first in the river!	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP498	990940	Do not support. Coming from a STEM background myself, the direct loss of highly skilled STEM and technical jobs at the airport, for example flight training and engineering contradicts strategic objectives 4 & 6 stated in the local plan document. I can also garner from the plan the need for local housing in Worksop but I cannot see the same evidence for the need of housing in Retford. According to the plan Retford has already experienced significant housing growth in recent years since 2011. Achieved without the need to destroy existing	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		infrastructure. I believe the local plan drastically underestimates the effect of losing Gamston Airport would have and markedly undervalues the specialised services it provides and its contribution to the local economy. Jobs created in a 'Garden Village' are likely to be much lower skilled than those of a thriving flight training Airport and those of the technical and engineering business that run alongside.	
DBLP499	990942	Do not support. Whilst agreeing with an general provision of more housing I am strongly against the use of Gamston Airport for this purpose.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP500	990943	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP501	990944	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP502	990946	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP503	Individual	Do not support. The Draft Local Plan would simply see the destruction of a vital local and national transport facility counter to national policy (NPPF) with no plan to re-instate or support it elsewhere. The Draft Local Plan's destruction of skilled employment to build houses is contradictory to its own strategic objectives 4 and 6 for economic development and fails to recognise the opportunity the airport presents as a local economic hub. The draft local plan makes a case for local housing need in Worksop (9.7) but does not provide the same level of evidence for Retford. The plan states that Retford has already experienced significant housing growth in recent years since 2011, without the need to destroy existing infrastructure. From the local consultation meetings, it appears that the 'garden villages' are to be targeted at Sheffield overspill. This is counter to the documents stated aims and a risky endeavour given the distance from Sheffield. It is likely that commuters living at Retford and working in Sheffield would not be in the 'affordable housing' bracket as transport to Sheffield is not easy and costs/travel time is prohibitive. Those willing to travel that	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		distance would therefore be in the minority and not require the scale of development planned. If the plans aim is for Sheffield overspill, then brownfield sites further north on the A1M at Blyth or Tickhill/Styrrup would likely be more successful. The Draft Local Plan fails to provide evidence for the scale of development or the viability of the development at Retford Gamston Airport, or Bevercoates. It is also not backed up with a viable economic argument that would generate the needed employment in the area.	
DBLP504	990949	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP505	Individual	Do not support. NO.it is, too many houses in one area, and would it mean the closure of the existing primary school in Gamston in a few years time ? would it be a case ,as it is now that property is built too close together with inadequate parking and inadequate garden space ? A small increase in new homes across the district would be preferred , rather than creating 2 large garden villages. Would you want your family living on a disused colliery site ?	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP506	990952	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP507	990954	Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP508	990955	Do not support. I understand the need for housing, however I feel that just building new housing is not the answer. Grade 1 and 2 listed buildings are left to go in to disrepair, there are empty houses up and down the country that could be developed etc.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP509	990959	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP510	990961	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP511	990962	Support. Extremely concerned at the proposed closure of Gamston airport which is an extremely valuable asset to the area. I am a private pilot who uses the facilities at Gamston for private and business flying for hangarage and for maintainance	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		. I am sure that there are sufficient other sites which are available for housing without sacrificing this airfield.	
DBLP512	990964	Do not support. The National Planning Policy Framework is changing to safeguard a national infrastructure of airfields. This means airfields are unsuitable for inclusion in plans for housing developments. Local Councils, County Councils and property developers will all save a lot of time and money by making themselves aware of this and stop trying to turn airfields into housing. Please refer to the All-Party Parliamentary Group for Aviation for further information at http://www.generalaviationappg.uk/	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP513	990965	Support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP514	990980	Do not support. The destruction of an active, vibrant airfield and its associated work opportunities including highly skilled STEM jobs and its provision of vital communications links for businesses in the area, and the creation of two whole new villages with no parallel employment opportunities, will create huge problems for this area's future, West Burton & Cottam power stations are partially or wholly closing down, a fact you ignore. Retford will be inundated with unemployed inhabitants and local transport routes will be inadequate for the increased usage. Far better that growth is organically based on existing towns and villages.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP515	991045	Do not support. No, the construction of a housing estate at Retford airport and the loss of skilled jobs and infrastructure this would cause would be a disaster for the local area.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP516	991153	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP517	991157	Support. I agree Bassetlaw needs more housing but distributed across the region so as to not impact on the infrastructure in one particular area in such a huge way.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP518	991172	Do not support. Don't believe it has considered all the options fully, it's mainly assumptions made on behalf of other agencies and organisations and has not consulted the population correctly.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP520	991174	Do not support. I don't believe it has considered all the options fully, it's mainly assumptions made on behalf of other agencies and organisations and has not consulted the population correctly. It gave very little notice at the beginning of the consultation so much so that large swathes of the local residents did not know about it.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP519	991173	Do not support. Purely for logistic problems. Leave the pretty villages and picturesque Retford alone please!	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP521	991176	Do not support. No - I think the major areas of development/new homes should be in the towns where there are stations/better transport links.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP522	991178	<p>Do not support. Firstly , The overall strategy of the plan appears to be a complete U Turn from the previous plan when it advised that rural development and housing was unsustainable .I know we need more housing the 20%increase for the surrounding villages is probably enough as it is without overwhelming a small area of the district with housing. A 10% increase would be better as this would increase the population by the same figure. Employment is the most important factor for East Bassetlaw, I feel that the jobs should be created first then the housing , rather than the other way round , as people would just migrate to the surrounding areas and we wouldn't see the economic growth .</p>	<p>The Council has worked closely with neighbourhood plan groups in rural areas over the past few years. Over that time it has become apparent, from discussions with the groups, that there is a need for some development in the rural settlements to help support the existing services and enable people living in those areas to remain there i.e. those wanting to downsize or access their first home. The 20% is a cap, not a requirement. The plan proposes a 10% requirement, which is considered appropriate taking into consideration past growth since 2010. All applications would be determined against a criteria based policy which seeks to preserve the character of rural settlements. Additionally, the Council will take into consideration policies in made (and emerging depending on their status) neighbourhood plans.</p>
DBLP523	991181	Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP524	991184	<p>Do not support. The draft plan has failed in its own stated objective to be in conformity with the NPPF with having totally ignored Paragraph 104 f) of the NPPF dated July 2018 which clearly states that Bassetlaw Council should "recognise the importance of maintaining a national network of general aviation airfields, and their need to adapt and change over time – taking into account their economic value in serving business, leisure, training and emergency service needs, and the Government's General Aviation Strategy." The Council has also totally failed to justify its statement that Retford Gamston Airport is an "inefficient use of land" given that:- it is home to 10 businesses (11 including Gamston Aviation Ltd) - it provides employment for almost 100 people and a very high number being STEM jobs - it provides a training facility for Nottinghamshire Police - provides a base for a Children's Air</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		Ambulance - with 11 hangars it provides a base for not only the aircraft used by the businesses on site but also over 50 additional privately and business owned aircraft - it provides a strategic resource to Bassetlaw for business and leisure air travel that cannot be fulfilled by Doncaster Sheffield Airport or any other airfield / airport within close proximity. - it has 96 hectares on the wider airport site that is in continual use as productive arable BMV farm land. I do however support the redevelopment of the former Bevercotes Colliery site as it has currently no other utilisation, is attracting misuse and the potential for anti-social behaviour and its development has no impact on business or job losses, no loss of productive farmed land and no loss of a strategic and well used resource to Bassetlaw as is the case with the Retford Gamston Airport site.	
DBLP525	991186	Do not support. The proposal for the Bevercotes site is fine. Either this or commercial/warehousing development. The proposal for Gamston Airport is wholly inappropriate. This is a valuable 21st century commercial asset in the area and as such important for providing employment and attracting investment. It is not a 'brownfield' site. There must be other more suitable redundant sites in the area (Cottam PS ??)	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP526	991188	Do not support. This plan involves the closure of Gamston Airport.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP527	991190	Support. As a local Gamston resident I am delighted that the village has the opportunity to advance with modern services and infrastructure, relevant to the people in its society. The village has no amenities and the opportunity to have a shop or services to the public would be fantastic. Furthermore, as I currently am unable to drive due to health, bus routes only allow a service to Retford and once every Friday to Lincoln and not on Sunday. This offers little choice and limited facilities. I have a young child, if I want to take him anywhere I am	Your support is welcomed. Thank you for your comments.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		trapped as again there is no provision in any of the 5 villages. No park or entertainment only fields. Again, very limited jobs. I currently work part time and have to commute by train to Lincoln. The opportunity of local jobs would be excellent not only for the local infrastructure but for the future of my child. 100% support this development. People often do not consider positions of 'the unheard' voices of those that are disabled and currently this plan gives equality to residents of Bassetlaw.	
DBLP528	991208	Do not support. I support the need for more housing in Bassetlaw but do not think that two garden villages should be created. Bassetlaw need to stop listening to NIMBY's and work with landowners who want to develop land in villages. Affordable housing should be a preference not massive houses which locals cannot afford. Bassetlaw should be obliged to contact and work proactively with landowners not to ignore what they want to do with their own land.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP529	991209	Do not support Spatial Strategy Proposing that Carlton in Lindrick, Langold, Misterton and Tuxford form a 6th spatial tier representing as they do approximately 11% of Bassetlaw's population. Within this tier the 4 settlements to receive individual assessments as to what % growth they can achieve. This could result in an increase or decrease over the 10% hr / 20% cap.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP530	991219	Do not support. Too many houses, not enough jobs for all these people.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP531	991221	Do not support. I believe this plan is poorly designed.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP532	Individual	No support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP533	991230	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP534	991231	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP535	991234	Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP536	991235	Do not support. Retford and Worksops' new housing targets have been reduced to make way for the proposed development of the Garden Villages. By placing most of the development in one place, you are not achieving an even balance. The new development should be evenly spread around Bassetlaw.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP537	991237	Do not support. Whilst the addition of 10-20% increase in properties in rural locations is a sensible approach to increasing housing in Bassetlaw. The addition of the 2 "garden villages" is completely disproportionate to the size of Retford, it's infrastructure and the locations close to the locations.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP538	991240	Do not support. I understand the UK has a shortage of properties but I do not believe that there is the demand in Retford for this number of houses. Nor do I believe there is the industry to support this growth in population.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP539	991241	Do not support. To much housing in a protected rural area. The two garden villages are only one mile apart.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP540	991243	Do not support. I do not support this proposal if it means losing Gamston Airport. There is a great infrastructure in place at Gamston Airport, numerous jobs would be lost as well as individuals recreational activities. You are not supporting small businesses by doing this, and you can build elsewhere as there is other land available. A poor decision by Bassetlaw District Council, to throw away local business and quality infrastructure for the sake of new housing. It seems as though you have come to this decision too easily and should be spending money assisting what is already in place in the local area. If new housing is required, why is it on this scale, quality should be thought of over quantity and no businesses should be lost because of it.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP541	991264	Do not support the use of an existing airfield for new housing development. To describe Gamston (Retford) airfield as brownfield flies in the face of known government guidance. The airfield is the only one in this part of the UK capable of serving general aviation traffic. Other airfields are either too small, military, or full commercial civil airline operations sites.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP542	991336	Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP543	991990	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP544	992014	Do not support. The applicant is disregarding the need for a national infrastructure of aviation facilities around the UK.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP545	992366	Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP546	992635	Do not support. The plan will destroy nationally important aviation infrastructure leading to the loss of advanced technology and engineering businesses and pilot training. It will also leave the Children's Air Ambulance without a base in the Retford area and will result in the loss of approximately 100 highly skilled jobs.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP547	993337	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP548	993387	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
Policy 2: Housing and Economic Growth			
DBLP2	Individual Growth	Supports the number of homes proposed. Hopes it will include social housing because there is a lack of Council homes available in Worksop. Private renting is very costly. Know some young people who are in their thirties still living with their parents.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP2	Individual	Supports the proposed amount of employment land. There is not enough jobs in Worksop, why should young people have to travel to Sheffield or Mansfield, want more in the town. Worksop has been in decline since the pits shutdown.	Support for the amount of employment land noted. The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure economic growth and jobs can take place in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of employment growth in the future.
DBLP3	Individual	Fully support the proposals for housing expansion in Worksop, Harworth and the rural villages. Believe strongly that they are needed.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP4	Individual	Fully support the proposals for housing expansion in Worksop, Harworth and the rural villages. Believe strongly that they are needed.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP5	Individual	Fully support the proposals for housing expansion in Worksop, Harworth and the rural villages. Believe strongly that they are needed.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP6	Individual	Support the proposals for housing expansion in Worksop, Harworth and the rural villages. Believe strongly that they are needed.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP8	Individual	Support the proposals that future houses should be built to expand areas of Harworth and Worksop and rural villages and these are sensible and suitable for large numbers of new properties to be sited.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBPL9	Individual	Confirm that many of the Plan's proposals on future housing and employment in the District are welcome. Support the proposals for housing expansion in Worksop, Harworth and the rural villages.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP10	Individual	Confirm with the Plan's proposals on future housing and employment in the District. Support the proposals for housing expansion in Worksop, Harworth and the rural villages.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP11	Individual	Think many of the Plan's proposals for future housing and employment are well thought through and are in favour of	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		them. Support the proposals for housing expansion in Worksop, Harworth and the rural villages.	
DBLP16	Individual	Support the number of homes - new housing is needed.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP16	Individual	Would prefer the use of brownfield land for employment wherever possible	The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure economic growth and associated jobs can take place in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of employment growth in the future. This will include the use of brownfield land.
DBLP20	Individual	Many of the Plan's proposals for future housing and employment in the District are welcomed. Support the proposals for housing expansion in Worksop, Harworth and the rural villages.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP21	Individual	Many of the Plan's proposals for future housing and employment in the District are welcomed. Support the proposals for housing expansion in Worksop, Harworth and the rural villages.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP24	Individual	Supports the number of homes proposed.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP24	Individual	Supports the proposed amount of employment land.	Support for amount of employment land noted.
DBLP27	Individual	Many of the Plan's proposals for future housing and employment are welcomed. Support the proposals for housing expansion in Worksop, Harworth and the rural villages.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP28	Individual	Agree with many of the future proposals on housing and employment. Support the proposals for housing expansion in Worksop, Harworth and the rural villages.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP31	BDC Councillor	Another proposal is to ask adjoining areas such as Rotherham and Sheffield to take some of Bassetlaw's supposed government housing requirement. An increased population does not guarantee economic growth. Economic growth can be outstanding as education, business innovation and communication and IT advances and efficient work contribute to increased prosperity. An increased ageing population is likely to be a liability to Bassetlaw imposed from outside by an influx of non locals.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. Bassetlaw has a duty to cooperate with neighbouring authorities. There are no plans for the Council to ask neighbouring authorities to meet the district's housing needs at the present time as there is enough land available within Bassetlaw.
DBLP31	BDC Councillor	Does not support the number of homes proposed.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP31	BDC Councillor	Does not support the proposed amount of employment land.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP32	Individual	Supports the number of homes proposed - support the need to provide dwellings but this should take into account the use of existing buildings which are either redundant or have capacity to provide housing e.g. over shops. The overall result will be that the area will move from being rural to being urbanised.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. There is a need for housing in all areas of Bassetlaw to ensure that services in rural settlements are supported.
DBLP32	Individual	Supports the proposed amount of employment land.	Support for amount of employment land noted.
DBLP36	Individual	Understand that the total number of houses is dictated by government hope it is part of the Council's duty to question whether the figure is accurate and needed. Have lived in Retford for 40 years and Gamston for over 10 have seen employment in the area diminish year on year. Before more housing the area needs more employment, if people cannot get a mortgage having 1000's of properties does not help. Concern that there is a need for so many houses in such a rural location - currently there are over 5500 houses for sale on Rightmove within a 15 mile radius of Retford town centre. Over 1200 are 1-2 bed properties which could be starter or first homes. If there was a massive availability of people who could afford these houses then this number would be less.	Thank you for responding to the consultation. The supporting text to Policy 2 sets out the reasoned justification for the housing requirement. The Bassetlaw Economic Development Needs Assessment (December, 2018) includes the assessment of housing need.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP61	Parliamentary Candidate for Bassetlaw	Many of the proposals for future housing and employment in the District are welcome.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP61	Parliamentary Candidate for Bassetlaw	Support the proposals for housing expansion in Worksop, Harworth and the rural villages.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP67	Individual	Welcome the overall strategy reflected in the plan to locate new development in locations where the current road and other infrastructure have capacity to accommodate new development without serious negative impact on current residential areas.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP67	Individual	Support the proposals for housing expansion in Worksop, Harworth and the rural villages.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP70	Individual	Support the proposals for further housing in Worksop, Harworth and the rural villages.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP72	Individual	Support further homes being built but we think these proposals would be better suited to areas like Worksop, Harworth and other rural villages.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP73	Individual	Welcome the proposals for housing expansion in Worksop, Harworth and the rural villages.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP97	Lound Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	<p>Concerned about the extent of housing development in the village. Have organised a number of village consultation events in the past three years, including a detailed survey of residents about the future of the village and discussions about the type, number and location of new houses that might be built here. From this it is clear that the majority of residents would like to see only limited, or indeed no, new housing development in Lound. This said, most people are realistic about this issue and recognise that Lound must play its part in dealing with the present national housing shortage. Accordingly, we have noted that BDC has methodically established a 10% Requirement figure for our village as the housing need up to 2035 in accordance with the NPPF. In response have prepared a credible plan to meet this target in Lound by allocating sites and adopting a Windfall Policy. However, that to allow development beyond this level, possibly up to BDC's 20% Cap, would be unwanted and unnecessary in Lound. However, recognise that some communities, which have the need for further development, are still rightly free to plan above the Cap. Suggest that, instead of the proposed fixed percentage Cap, each Neighbourhood should, using the BDC Requirement as a minimum, be given the flexibility to plan for a maximum level of development, which might be identical to the Requirement, and that is appropriate for its area and its people. This would be a simple system, which would provide BDC with the housing requirement that it needs up to 2035. At the same time it would give individual communities direct power to develop to a greater or lesser extent in a way appropriate to their localities.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council considers that an equitable approach is appropriate because development in one village has the potential to support services in another village (as identified in national policy - NPPF paragraph 78).</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP99	Individual	<p>The information provided suggested that there were no appropriate housing development sites available in Scrooby due to highway, flooding, utilities infrastructure capacity restraints and green field limitations. Believe it would be common sense to move Scrooby to the list of 33 settlements that are deemed inappropriate for development. To suggest that Scrooby should still aim to provide sites for 15 to 25 houses is clearly a wasteful bureaucratic nonsense when set in the context of a requirement throughout the District for over 6800 such sites, the shortfall being less than 0.36% of the total requirement. Appreciate the Bassetlaw Plan has a 17 year lifespan so any future Scrooby development can be dealt with on an adhoc one off basis.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council considers that an equitable approach is appropriate because development in one village has the potential to support services in another village (as identified in national policy - NPPF paragraph 78).</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP101	William Davis Ltd	<p>NPPF para 11 states “Strategic policies should, as a minimum, provide for objectively assessed needs for housing” and that “Plans should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area, and be sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change”. Moreover, the NPPF requires local authorities to include an appropriate buffer of 5%, 10% or 20% against this minimum need (para 73.) The purpose of this is to ensure that where supply falls below the required amount, there are immediate provisions to address the deficit. This reinforces the NPPF’s expectation that local plans are to have in-built flexibility. In preparing a Local Plan that aims to address the minimum housing target with no contingency, it would be dependent on every allocation delivering on time and at capacity without fail. If one site provides fewer dwellings than expected or is delayed, then the Council would fail to deliver the minimum number of houses required to meet its need. That would fail to provide an appropriate housing strategy in line with NPPF and render the Plan unsound. The Council must establish a suitable buffer against its identified need. The Local Plans Expert Group recommended to Government in 2016 that such a buffer should be at least 20% of the identified need in order to ensure flexibility in a local plan. The NPPF does not invalidate this recommendation. The need for a buffer is essentially acknowledged within Table 3 of the draft Plan which shows a lapse rate of 25% for sites with Planning Permission for the five years up to 2015. Applying this rate to the 284 homes required in Worksop by 2035 would give 355. This figure should be the minimum residual allocation for the town within the Plan for it to be considered sound. An overarching and vital requirement of the emerging Plan is its need to be resilient and able to respond to shortfalls in the deliverability of allocated sites with additional and suitable allocations. This is particularly applicable with the Council proposing two New Settlements.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy taking into consideration comments received in response to the public consultation. The Council will be required to meet the housing requirement plus an uplift of at least 5% (buffer) to demonstrate a five year housing land supply.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>Large-scale developments such as these are synonymous with slow delivery. When considering the Bevercotes site is a nature reserve and there is no set date for the closure of Gamston Airfield, which contains a series of extant business operations, it must be accepted that the delivery of dwellings on these sites may be particularly slow. Moreover, these proposals will require Environmental Impact Assessment and subsequent pre-commencement conditions as well as lengthy Section 106 discussions which will further delay the delivery of homes on site. The Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners study "Start to Finish" (2016) noted that the average planning approval period for large sites is circa 5 years from validation to decision. Given that these sites are expected to deliver 1,000 homes by 2035, and a decision cannot be expected until 2026 at the earliest (with the Local Plan's adoption estimated at 2021) there would be a combined delivery of 111 dwellings per annum from an anticipated decision date required. This is extremely ambitious, especially when acknowledging the constraints of each site. Moreover the Bassetlaw 2018 Five year Housing Land Supply Statement estimates average build out rates for a single volume builder within the District to be 30-35 per annum (para 2.10.) This delivery rate would only provide up to 630 dwellings by the end of the plan period at these sites, assuming there to be only one outlet on site, which is standard practice for the initial development of large allocations due to infrastructure phasing. This would leave a deficit of at least 470 homes. Therefore, the allocation of more sites is required within to accommodate this anticipated shortfall in delivery during the Plan Period.</p>	
DBLP101	William Davis Ltd	To address the above shortfalls in provision within Worksop suggest that a minimum of 355 dwellings be allocated within the town. See SADBLP3	The Council is proposing to allocate land for approximately 1000 dwellings in Worksop.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP110	Cushman & Wakefield on behalf of Stancliffe Homes	<p>Refers to S20(5 (b)) and S21(1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and NPPF paras 35, 16, 31 and PPG paras 029 and 32. Sets out the approach in the NPPF/PPG to assessing OAN. Having regard to this the Plan does not meet the tests of 'soundness' and as such should not be adopted in its current form. The Five-Year Housing Land Supply Statement (2018) considers that there is a deliverable supply of 2,674 dwellings which equates to a 7.9 year supply when assessed against the housing target. This includes sites which are committed, under construction or a Neighbourhood Plan Allocation. Have undertaken an assessment of the housing land supply using Policy 2's OAN of 6630 (390dpa) and the Housing Delivery Test 2018 results of 1,348 homes delivered to 2018. Have not undertaken any work to confirm the council's supply position (2681 dwellings). Based on a deliverable housing supply of 2,674 dwellings, equates to a 6.5 year supply when assessed against the total five year housing target of 2,050 dwellings. This shows that Bassetlaw has a surplus of 624 dwellings. 6.5 years supply of housing land should not preclude sites not considered as part of this assessment coming forward for development. Chapter 6 identifies the future development needs and notes that Bassetlaw is not required to meet any unmet housing need for any neighbouring authorities. The supporting text notes a lower housing requirement than the SHMA. The SHMA recommends a housing requirement of 374. Para 6.13 notes the wider considerations on housing delivery and need from past trends, the 2017 SHMA Update findings, and the 2018 EDNA, that the Council needs to plan for more homes than the minimum standard housing result for Bassetlaw (306 dpa). Consider that a local plan housing requirement of 390 dwellings per annum 2018 - 2035 is appropriate. Policy 2 identifies a total housing requirement of 6,330 dwellings 2018 – 2035 calculated following the NPPF</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. As identified in national policy and guidance, the standard method calculation is the minimum number of homes which should be planned for. At the time of writing, this equates to 306 dwellings per annum for Bassetlaw.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>Standardised Methodology as a minimum (ie 306 dwellings per annum) taking account of the need to support modest economic growth. Policy 2 sets a District wide housing requirement of 6,330 dwellings split between each of the 5 strategy areas, with Rural Bassetlaw 1,777 dwellings. Support an uplift of the OAN figure of 374dpa to deliver c.390dpa. As recognised in recent planning appeal decisions, this figure should not be a ceiling but a minimum. Delivery of housing and economic growth above this figure should look to be supported in the policy, where it would result in sustainable development and which is supported by other policies in the plan. Policy 2 refers to 390 dwellings per annum. This is an uplift of the minimum standard housing results for Bassetlaw (374 dpa) identified by the SHMA 2017. Agree that this uplift would help to deliver housing to meet the population and economic growth but that this should not be considered as a ceiling limit for each strategy area. Propose rewording to note that these are minimum requirements: Bassetlaw District's housing requirement for the period 2018 to 2035 is as a minimum 6,630 dwellings. Change Table column 2 header Minimum provision required 2018 to 2035 and by under table add and through allocations identified in ... (Table X/Policy X). Policy 2 should include a requirement for the redistribution of the balance of housing should delivery be delayed or prevented in other locations. This can be reported/ tested every year in the AMR and five-year housing land supply assessments. Consider there are opportunities for additional housing within the strategy areas.</p>	
DBLP115	Peacock & Smith on behalf of Gleeson Regeneration Ltd	<p>The next update of the median workplace-based affordability ratio is in March 2019. Should ensure that the base standard methodology calculation is updated in light of this new data. Average housing delivery over the Core Strategy plan period 2010 - 2018 was 329 dwellings per annum (dpa), which is</p>	<p>The methods used to assess the delivery of housing fully accord with the requirements of the NPPF. Housing land supply will continue to be reviewed as necessary.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>materially below the requirement of 350. The 2017 SHMA recommended a housing requirement of 374 dpa. It is clear that there has been under-delivery of housing, which will have influenced in-migration and the ability of households to form. Given the household projections in the standard housing methodology are trend-based and constrained by housing supply consider that there is a compelling case to incorporate a sufficiently high uplift above the base methodology figure to compensate for under-delivery. Evidence base does not include an up to date assessment of the housing requirement that considers this issue. There is a risk that the housing requirement is too low, contrary to Government objectives to significantly boost the supply of new homes. The Plan incorporates an adjustment to the standard base figure to take account of economic growth. However, the midpoint OE forecast used as a basis for this adjustment, 390 dpa, is below the high growth forecast of 518 dpa. Note that the EDNA comments that given commitments in the District and the potential of the distribution market, a positive approach to development may enable a higher level growth. The 2017 SHMA sets out a high economic growth forecast of 417 dpa and recommends that this higher growth scenario is tested by the Council as the NPPF seeks to proactively and positively drive sustainable economic growth. Consider that the economic growth adjustment to the standard methodology base figure requires further justification and sensitivity testing. There is a risk that the housing requirement is too low, contrary to Government objectives to significantly boost the supply of new homes. Concerns regarding the proposed split of the housing requirement between the various settlements within the hierarchy. The equitable distribution of growth strategy fails to recognize the role and function of Worksop as the largest settlement in the District with the greatest range of shops,</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>services and employment. The plan proposes a disproportionate amount of the housing requirement to rural settlements and garden villages, this is likely to lead to unsustainable patterns of development. The logic and need for the garden villages as opposed to urban extensions to Worksop and other established settlements has not been justified.</p> <p>Concerns that the scale of housing growth proposed for garden villages, 1000 dwellings each within the plan period, is not sufficient to allow for these developments to become viable sustainable communities with associated services, shops, employment opportunities and public transport. Whilst further homes are proposed within each garden village beyond the plan period, this would be post 2035, creating a potential situation where significant numbers of homes are created without sufficient supporting infrastructure or employment.</p> <p>The proposed housing requirement needs further justification, particularly in relation to the historic under-delivery of housing in the District and the economic growth adjustment to the standard methodology base figure. The housing requirement for Worksop should be increased to reflect its status as the largest settlement in the District with the greatest range of shops and services and employment opportunities. An appropriate share would be that level set out in the Core Strategy.</p>	
DBLP127	TwelveTwenty One Planning Services on behalf of Hamlin Estates	<p>Do not support the number of homes proposed. It is considered that this will neither meet housing needs or provide sufficient flexibility to ensure delivery of sufficient housing. Any housing target should be a minimum housing delivery target rather than become a constraint to delivery. The proposed contribution of 1000 dwellings to overall housing needs from the proposed two new villages is highly uncertain for the reasons set out above. It is considered that the contribution from existing rural centres can be increased to at least 2250.</p>	<p>As identified in national policy and guidance, the standard method calculation for housing need is the minimum number of new homes which should be delivered. This equates to 306 dwellings per annum for Bassetlaw at the time of writing.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		This will help redress any shortfall in the contribution from the proposed new villages as well as helping to provide additional flexibility over overall housing delivery.	
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	The Plan correctly identifies the Standardised Methodology for calculating Objectively Assessed Need (SMOAN) as the starting point for calculating needs. Agree that 2018 is the correct starting point for the Local Plan and the housing requirement should commence in 2018. The Plans housing requirement should extend at least 15 years beyond the date of adoption in accordance with NPPF para 22. With the Plan proposed to be adopted in February 2021, this would require a plan period to at least 2036. If that adoption timescale slips by one month the plan will not be adopted until the policy year 2021/22 meaning that the plan will need to plan to the year 2036/37 as a minimum. Agree that the 2014 based population projections are to be used for the calculation of the SMOAN and that this figure provides a SMOAN of 306 dwellings per annum (dpa). Agree that the SMOAN should be considered as a minimum starting point for housing needs. Refers to PPG housing and economic needs assessments, para 10 which addresses when it might be appropriate to plan for a higher housing need figure than the standard method indicates. Agree that there is a need to consider economic growth and to ensure that enough homes are delivered to support this	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council will review the Plan period and make amendments if it is considered necessary.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	<p>The Council consider that there are a deliverable and developable supply of 3,949 dwellings within the District comprising 4,523 dwellings on sites with planning permission (as of 1 April 2018) and 193 dwellings on sites allocated in Neighbourhood Development Plans; minus a lapse rate of 26% for small sites and 25% for larger sites where those site's haven't commenced development. It is not clear what evidence the Council is relying on. The Council's latest published update for the supply of housing sites (as of 1 April 2018) appears within the Council's 5 Year Housing Land Supply Position Statement dated October 2018. Assume this is the basis for calculating the Council's deliverable and developable supply, albeit no document is referenced within the Local Plan. That statement at Appendix 2 lists those committed and under construction. They comprise 1,436 dwellings under construction, 1,579 dwellings on large committed sites (and those with a resolution to grant), 279 yet to be delivered (at 2017/18) on small sites an dwellings deliverable on NDP Allocations. The above comprises a total of 3,362 dwellings before discount or 2,897 dwellings once the above lapse rates have been taken into account. Clearly those figures have been updated, or the Council is taking into account separate figures but it is not clear where those figures have been published. It would be prudent to provide an update to the Council's identified housing land supply with an up to date list of Sites which still have planning permission and discount those where permissions have lapsed. Request that the Council published tables of supply and similar information with totals and subtotals within their evidence to enable scrutiny. Until some clarity has been provided with regards to the above, we reserve the right to make further comment on the appropriateness of the Council's identified housing land supply. If our assessment were to be correct the residual housing</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The whole plan housing trajectory will be included in the next draft plan which will include proposed site allocations.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>requirement found through housing allocations would increase from 2,681 to some 3,733 dwellings. Taking into account comments with regard to the plan period this would increase to at least 4,123 to account for at least an 18 year plan period. Should the housing requirement be uplifted to account for a mid-point growth scenario sites would need to be allocated to accommodate at least 5,131 dwellings or, if adjusted for a high growth scenario sites for some 7,183 would need to be allocated. Object to Part 1 of Policy 2 which sets out how development will be distributed across the District. A fundamental element of the Local Plan at this stage is a methodology or strategy for the selection and assessment of strategic sites that the Council will seek to allocate for development. Where Site allocations are to be allocated through a Part 2 Local Plan it is vital that the Part 1 Local Plan sets out how that process will be undertaken. Paras 6.38 - 6.48 describe the current and past economic conditions of the District and reference the EDNA. Do not have any substantial concerns regarding the assessment of the current economic circumstances within the District. Do not dispute that, if the prevailing market conditions continue and the proposed level of housing development is delivered that the overall employment needs can be readily met within the District. Do not dispute that 136ha (gross) employment land will be adequate to meet that need arising.</p>	
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	<p>Fundamentally object to the economical approach of the Local Plan which lacks the ambition of previous versions. The economic strategy of Policy 2 lacks a vision for growth or a clear expression of how the Council will seek to react to and take advantage of the economic opportunities which are presented by the District's strengths and geographical location. The key opportunities have been overlooked – an economy which is linked and connected to such a large amount of</p>	<p>The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure economic growth and associated jobs can take place in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of employment growth in the future. The spatial strategy will be reviewed to reflect comments made.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>dominant centres (Sheffield, Rotherham, Doncaster, Nottingham, Chesterfield and Lincoln) as set out in para 6.41. Para 6.47 identifies the emerging market for development along the A1 corridor within the north of the district; no doubt a market fuelled by the influence of the above over strategically important dominant centres. The Local Plan does not provide a strategy to capitalise on those opportunities or set out the threats that they may pose, and how they might be managed. It is currently reactionary to those external forces.</p> <p>The district has an abundance of employment sites in strategically advantageous locations, such as land to the south of Harworth, which can be promoted for growth to capitalise on the emerging market for distribution and industrial land. This should be expressly set out in the Local Plan. It is disappointing to see the diminishment of the aspirational approach of the 'Initial Draft' and reduction of enthusiasm to benefit from and contribute towards the levels of growth planned for the SCR and for D2N2. Whilst Policy 2 seeks to deliver 8ha employment land per annum across the plan period, this compares to an average of 11.8ha of employment land delivered every year in Bassetlaw between 2006 and 2016 which included a substantial period of recession and austerity. Welcome the expression of the development quantums within Policy 2 as a minimum level of development. Object to the allocation of 27% of housing development towards the rural area (43% if including proposed new villages), the inappropriateness of those rural allocations is highlighted by the lack of proposed rural employment land proposed to be allocated (15%). The Local Plan's proposed strategy for rural settlements risks allocating a disproportionate level of development to unsustainable locations whilst undermining the vitality of the rural hubs (Retford) which meet their needs. It is necessary to allocate current significant employment</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		commitments so as to establish a suitable baseline position for the Local Plan. Consider land to the south of Harworth should be allocated to secure its future delivery and enable the site to be brought forward flexibly through the planning system and over the course of the plan period.	
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Table 6 sets out the number of dwellings proposed to be allocated towards each of the 3 main settlement, the rural area and the garden villages. Object to the overall amount of development proposed within the plan, its distribution across the main settlements (and allocation towards the rural areas and new villages) and have concerns with the lack of evidence supplied for the committed development that the Council is relying on in column b.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council has taken the data from the housing monitoring data which includes current planning permissions. The whole plan housing trajectory will be published as evidence for the next draft Plan.
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Request clarification on the first sentence in para 6.46 where the Local Plan states a requirement to provide '8'; we assume that the word 'hectares' has been omitted.	Yes that's correct. This will be amended.
DBLP138	Bothamsall Parish Council	Does not support the number of homes proposed: the local roads in particular Main Street in Bothamsall are already unacceptably busy as a cut through during rush hour. Accommodating a large proportion of Bassetlaw's housing requirements at the garden villages will inevitably lead to a lot more traffic through the village of Bothamsall, in particular traffic destined for Mansfield and the M1. The total number of dwellings proposed is too high, and too concentrated within the Bothamsall and Gamston parishes. Bothamsall Parish Council Figures from the interactive speed sign shows that between 21/03/2018 and 10/02/2019 the number recorded was 1404 per day and this is in one direction. A similar number is recorded at both ends of the village which means we have around 2808 vehicles per day. On a yearly basis this adds up to a staggering 1,023,825 with 52.71% recorded at over the legal speed limit of 30mph. This is rural madness. Among all	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		these figures a large number of HGV vehicles pass illegally through our little rural village.	
DBLP138	Bothamsall Parish Council	Supports the amount of employment land proposed.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP142	Ranskill Parish Council	The Parish Council found the figures provided in the plan relating to growth and housing needs confusing and unclear. The ONS figures on p14 give an estimated population growth of 5000 in the plan period. The NPPF standardised methodology results in 5202 dwellings required over the plan period (306 per year). The plan intends to build 6630 new homes over the period - more than the number required by the NPPF and taking into account the ONS data more than 1 house per person. The above growth is justified by quoting economic forecast models there is practically no information as to how this economic growth is to be achieved. Would welcome further explanation. i.e. what is the strategy to attract employment to the area for these new residents, unless the intention is for Bassetlaw to provide dormitory accommodation for individuals working in Sheffield or Doncaster. If this is the case then this would be a matter for concern. Experience has shown that residents who have no previous ties to the area and move into a village because of the convenience of commuting to and from a distant work place are less likely to take a stake in the local community, something which is essential for villages to thrive. Much more focus needs to be made on creating jobs for this projected growth in population.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The NPPF indicates that the standard method calculation is a minimum housing figure. National guidance advises that Councils should consider increasing this where a recent housing need assessment identifies a higher housing need. The Council's Economic Development Need Assessment (December 2018) indicates that there is a requirement to deliver 390 dpa based on the need to support future employment growth.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP143	Persimmon Homes & Charles Church	<p>In consideration of economic growth factors and past lapse rate trends BDC has processed the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw SHMA (2017) to settle on an annual housing requirement figure of 390 dwellings. The plan doesn't state the housing growth target 6630 dwellings is a minimum requirement. Bassetlaw's assessment of economic need revised down SHMA economic growth OAN figure of 417 dwellings per annum utilising 3 economic forecast models. Given the 17 year term of the plan period and inherent susceptibility of forecast models to error it would be prudent for any OAN figure to be expressed as a minimum requirement.</p> <p>The NPPF requires the Local Plan to set out the level and type of affordable housing provision required together with other necessary infrastructure but such policies should not undermine the deliverability of the Local Plan. Affordable housing need within Bassetlaw is comparatively high with over 134 affordable homes required per annum over the plan period (SHMA 2017). To achieve this target a 35% Affordable Housing threshold would be necessary - due to the relative low net development values achievable in Bassetlaw such a target is not feasible (Policy 3 refers). The SHMA determines an uplift of 10% would be prudent to account for affordable housing demand. The current Housing and Economic Growth figures do not appear to provide sufficient detail on how the proposed OAN means to satiate demand for affordable housing within Bassetlaw. Before submission of the Local Plan, encourage the Council to act positively and push for the more ambitious growth OAN target of 417 dwellings per annum to be expressed as a minimum requirement.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. As identified in national policy and guidance, the standard method calculation is the minimum number of homes which should be planned for. At the time of writing, this equates to 306 dwellings per annum for Bassetlaw. This will be kept under review, as required by national guidance.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP144	Individual	<p>Do not support the overall strategy, including the spatial distribution of housing, for Bassetlaw. In the Core Strategy Policy CS9 made it clear that 77 villages would not be supported for development. Service/facility provision has got worse over the 8 years so why is it okay for these new houses to be built. Where are all the new jobs going to be created and how far will people have to travel. Bothamsall in the last few years have had one or two planning applications turned down which I supported, and am broadly in favour of a very small number of controlled new dwellings in the village providing they are in keeping with our small rural village. The maximum of 15 is far too high, the sewage system is failing regularly and traffic is a major issue. Figures from the interactive speed sign shows that between 21/03/2018 and 10/02/2019 the number recorded was 1404 per day and this is in one direction. A similar number is recorded at both ends of the village which means we have around 2808 vehicles per day. On a yearly basis this all adds up to a staggering 1023825 with 52.71% recorded at over the legal speed limit of 30mph. This is rural madness. Among all these figures a large number of HGV vehicles pass illegally through our little rural village.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council considers that an equitable approach is appropriate because development in one village has the potential to support services in another village (as identified in national policy - NPPF paragraph 78). Many of the rural settlements have not experienced any growth in the past few years. There is a need to support services in rural areas and this can be achieved by enabling more development in these areas.</p>
DBLP144	Individual	<p>Do not support the number of homes to 2035. The total number of dwellings is too high and concentrated within Bothamsall and Gamston Parishes. Inevitably more traffic will be racing through our village putting residents and property at risk. Must not forget the many cyclists who travel through our village on the National Cycle Route.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted.</p>
DBLP147	ID Planning on behalf of The Haworth Group	<p>Harworth is identified as a settlement that requires between 2018 and 2035 1,400 new dwellings in a settlement. Clearly the planning application for land off Scrooby Road and North of Snape Lane, Harworth will go a considerable way to meeting this target requirement, delivering the much-needed housing in the district focused on the Harworth area. Policy 11 refers to</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		a “minimum” of 1400 residential dwellings and this should be reflected in Policy 2.	
DBLP148	ID Planning on behalf of Harron Homes	Policy 2 follows through from Table 6 and identifies 853 dwellings to be distributed to Retford. The table in policy 2 highlights the number of dwellings required in Retford is the lowest number of dwellings proposed to an individual strategy strand. Object to the proposed distribution to Retford. The proposed distribution is not in accordance with the settlement hierarchy as the quantum of dwellings proposed will not support the role and function of Retford as the second largest town in the settlement hierarchy. The proposed distribution is not in accordance with spatial objective 1 which seeks to ensure that towns and villages grow at a rate and scale commensurate to their defined role. The proposed distribution to Retford should be of a similar quantum to the adopted Core Strategy proportion of 26%. The current proportion is half of the adopted figure. A reduced level of growth would not support the role and function of Retford as the second largest town in the settlement hierarchy. The distribution table shows that the majority of development will take place in Rural Bassetlaw, with 1,777 dwellings proposed to support the growth of existing villages and 1,000 dwellings to be delivered in the plan period in two new garden villages. In total 2,777 dwellings will be delivered in Rural Bassetlaw, compared to 2,453 dwellings in the two largest and most sustainable towns in the District. This approach cannot be justified, it is not an appropriate strategy in the context of sustainable development or taking into account the reasonable alternative, which is to distribute the majority of new housing to the settlements at the top of the settlement hierarchy. In the context of the proposed approach to identify two new garden villages, it is inappropriate to also distribute significant development to	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>existing villages, as this skews the proposed distribution to villages and away from the towns at the top of the settlement hierarchy despite these being the most sustainable locations for new development. It is maintained the delivery of the new garden villages should form part of the distribution to the rural settlements such that 777 dwellings will be delivered in / adjacent to existing villages and 1,000 dwellings delivered in the new garden villages (1,777 dwellings in total). The 1,000 dwellings proposed to be delivered in the new villages should not be in addition to the proposed distribution to existing villages. This amendment, along with an associated increase in distribution to Retford, would re-balance the settlement hierarchy. No justification is given for the low distribution to Retford in the supporting text to Policy 2 or in relation Table 6 which sets out the percentages proposed for each strand of the spatial strategy. The justification is set out in section 10 of the Draft Plan, which sets out the planned growth for Retford.</p>	
DBLP148	ID Planning on behalf of Harron Homes	<p>Table 6 identifies that 13% of the housing requirement will be distributed to Retford, which is identified as a rural-hub town, second in the settlement hierarchy. Worksop as the sub-regional centre will accommodate 24% and Harworth, a local regeneration centre will accommodate 21%. Two new garden villages are proposed which will accommodate 15% of the housing requirement and which is in addition to the 27% distribution proposed to be distributed to rural settlements. In total, 42% of the housing requirement is to be distributed to new and existing villages. Object to the proposed distribution to Retford. The proportion is too low given Retford's position in the settlement hierarchy as the second largest town.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.</p>
DBLP149	Fisher German on behalf of D Thorlby	<p>Note that the standardised methodology is the starting point to calculate the housing requirement. It has then gone on to uplift this in order to ensure there is sufficient workforce to meet the anticipated growth in jobs. This approach is considered positive</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Plan recognises Worksop's role as the main town within the district and apotions the highest level of housing (1600 new homes). This is not intended to be a ceiling and the policies in the plan are considered sufficiently</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>and entirely justified. If the housing uplift is not made, it could hinder the ability of growing firms to employ staff locally. This could stifle economic growth and even lead to economic decline, with firms moving elsewhere, outside of the District. Wholly endorse the housing requirement. To work out the residual requirement for allocation, the Council first discount existing supply, minus a lapse rate. The application of this lapse rate is supported. Past trends have set out that 1 in 4 permitted dwellings have not been delivered. There is no evidence that this will change - the use of this lapse rate is likely to give a more accurate indication of the forthcoming housing supply, ensuring the Council are in a position to meet all future needs and is supported. Note that the 2018 NPPF definition of deliverable has been used. The Council need to be satisfied that the work done remains consistent with the NPPF 2019, particularly in respect of the updates to the definition of deliverable. The Draft Plan allocates 24% (1,600 dwellings) of the Housing Requirement to Worksop. Of this, 1,316 are commitments, leaving a residual requirement of 284 dwellings to be allocated by the plan. This is in contrast to the Bassetlaw Core Strategy which apportioned 32% of total growth to Worksop. The Plan states that over the period 2011 to 2018 housing delivery has not met housing need in Worksop. Para 9.7 acknowledges this to be 'partly' as a result of the Council not allocating sites for housing during this period. Para 9.8 states that "given the shift in strategy to a more balanced approach, and the fact that Worksop has not met its housing requirement since the Core Strategy was adopted, it is considered appropriate to reduce the town's requirement". Note Worksop has not delivered as much housing as the Core Strategy intended, it has still delivered a significant amount of housing (1,316 dwellings), which would indicate that there is strong demand. In line with the approach of seeking to</p>	<p>flexible to enable more development where appropriate. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		encourage further employment provision in Worksop, do not believe that any future growth over and above the 1,600 requirement should be prevented. Consider that the town still should be regarded as a very sustainable and well-connected location for development which does benefit from strong levels of demand. Consider Worksop will be able to deliver additional levels of growth if required.	
DBLP151	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	The current 5 year housing land supply situation is incorrect. There are numerous anomalies within this document and in a time when we all are charged by central government to produce more homes, it is ironic that a 7.9 year supply would enable the Council to “take its foot off the pedal”. Issues surrounding deliverable sites and the true meaning of deliverable, densities of development and unrealistically high build out rates will all be challenged and hopefully resolved. Having said that, there is much in this draft which does support development and so it should. As a district Bassetlaw has much to offer. Its location adjacent to the South Yorkshire cities/towns of Doncaster, Rotherham and Sheffield make it attractive for people to live and commute and also, with more encouragement, should be able to attract industry that is sometimes relating to other industries in adjacent authorities. Also have Doncaster Sheffield Airport which is a growing asset for the whole area and with increased freight usage, opportunities will arise which should be taken, to attract satellite businesses into Bassetlaw. An attractive district wide “offer” should be published by the Council indicating both urban and rural expansion plans.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Five Year Land Supply statement is based on robust evidence. Officers have liaised with land owners to gain an understanding of the status of each site. Some information is confidential (i.e. pre-application advice) and cannot be published. Based on evidence from past delivery, which is very accurate, the Council is confident that the Five Year Housing Land Supply is sound.
DBLP153	The Haworth Group on behalf of Welbeck Colliery	Supportive of the housing distribution proposed. Note that there is no contingency/ buffer in the Housing Land Supply (HLS). The provision of a contingency/ buffer in the planned HLS will allow the Local Plan to respond to changing circumstances, provide market choice and take into account	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		any under delivery over the plan period. If a wider range of allocated housing sites are included in the Plan, it will ensure the delivery of housing growth across short, medium and long terms.	
DBLP158	Fisher German on behalf of T Strawson and D Horrocks	<p>Noted that the authority has used the standardised methodology as the starting point to calculate its housing requirement. It has then gone on to uplift this to ensure there is sufficient workforce to meet the anticipated growth in jobs. This approach is positive and entirely justified. If the housing uplift is not made, it could hinder the ability of growing firms to employ staff locally. This could stifle economic growth and lead to economic decline, with firms moving elsewhere, outside of the District. Endorse the housing requirement. To work out the residual requirement for allocation, the Council first discount existing supply, minus a lapse rate. The application of this lapse rate is supported. Past trends have set out that 1 in 4 permitted dwellings have not been delivered. There is no evidence that this will change, the use of this lapse rate is likely to give a more accurate indication of the forthcoming housing supply, ensuring the Council are in a position to meet all future needs and is supported. Note that the Council in establishing supply utilised the 2018 NPPF definition of deliverable. The Government published the updated NPPF (2019). The Council need to be satisfied that the work done remains consistent with the NPPF particularly in respect of the updates to the definition of deliverable. The Draft Plan allocates 13% (853 dwellings) of the Housing Requirement to Retford. This is just over half that being proposed for Worksop and Harworth. Of this, 416 are commitments leaving a residual requirement of 437 dwellings to be allocated by the plan. The Draft Plan at 10.6 outlines that Retford has been the recipient of "significant levels of growth since the Core Strategy was adopted in 2011". During the Core Strategy (2011), Retford was allocated 26% of</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>the housing growth total. Whilst continued periods of growth can lead to objections from local people, there is no policy within the NPPF that suggests such growth should be restricted, simply because significant growth has occurred in a locale. In reality, the strong delivery in Retford is likely to be attributable to strong housing need. Consider that Retford remains eminently sustainable, well connected and benefits from strong levels of demand. Retford is able to deliver additional levels of growth if required.</p>	
DBLP165	National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups	Welcome the commitment set out in Paragraph 6.37 to address the needs of Gypsies and Travellers, in part by a criteria-based policy. Do not accept that the 2015 Bassetlaw Gypsy & Traveller Accommodation Assessment provides an adequate basis for determining the scale of that need. Single authority assessments do not meet the NPPF requirement for joint authority working and an already 4-year old assessment will not be sufficiently up-to date. Without a new assessment, preferably undertaken with neighbouring authorities, the Plan will not be sound or effective.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the GTAA and will update it as necessary.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP162	Individual	<p>The plan is a positive step recognising the need for growth in all areas including those rural areas. See no mention of tourism or our visitor economy. Tourism accounts for nearly 10% of the UK's GDP and employs 10% of the workforce, although you do recognize growth in the hotel sector in Bassetlaw, a positive statement for our tourism sector, which is significant, and particularly with the 2020 and beyond Mayflower Pilgrim activity. The main development on new towns just off the A1 for commuters to other areas may not bring much economic advantage to the towns. Will suffer an economic loss without the airport - including its future potential - look at how Doncaster was an old disused airfield. It is losing a transport link.</p>	<p>The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure all types of economic growth and associated jobs can be delivered in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of employment growth in the future. This will include the visitor economy. The economic capacity and transport potential of the airport is being assessed and will inform the next version of the Local Plan.</p>
DBLP169	Avant Homes (Central) and Wyndthorpe Developments Ltd	<p>Policy 2 defines the housing requirement of 6,630 dwellings (390 d/pa) across the plan period. In line with the NPPF's thrust of significantly boosting the supply of housing, this should be expressed as a minimum requirement. Refer to the recently issued Inspector's Report for the Newark & Sherwood Amended Core Strategy DPD, noting that the plan requirement should be expressed as a floor and not a ceiling in order to be found sound. Policy 2 seeks a realigned spatial distribution of the housing and economic requirement from the adopted Core Strategy, largely as a result of rebalancing the housing requirement in order to direct 15% of the total quantum of development across the plan period toward the identified new villages. Cumulatively, these are envisaged to deliver a total of 1,000 units by the end of the plan period. The proposed spatial distribution is contrasted with the strategy previously found sound within Policy CS1. The two largest towns of Worksop and Retford have seen significant reductions to the overall distribution of housing from those approved under Policy CS1. In particular, the residual growth to the town of Retford has been slashed by half, from the target of 26% found sound in</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The NPPF has been reviewed and updated since the Core Strategy was adopted in 2011. It does not require a hierarchy based on the size of each settlement, it requires a more nuanced understanding of the needs of each area of the district. Local Planning Authorities must assess the development needs of their area and formulate a strategy which meets those needs in a sustainable way. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>the adopted Core Strategy to a target of 13% (expressed as being equivalent to 853 dwellings). Despite Harworth containing more limited amenities than Retford (i.e. shops, services, employment & leisure opportunities), the residual target to Harworth is identified at 21% and equivalent to a total of 1,400 dwellings. The Council's position is informed by the adopted Harworth & Bircotes Neighbourhood Plan, which commits to the delivery of the former Harworth colliery site in addition to other sites benefitting from outline planning permission at the time of adoption. Whilst those allocations (or committed sites) identified within a made Neighbourhood Plan should be respected, when such position is translated to the spatial strategy in 'Policy 2', the aim to direct both housing & economic growth to those areas deemed most sustainable is effectively distorted, with the role of the rural-hub town of Retford undermined. Such approach is contrary to the spatial strategy found sound under the adopted Core Strategy, and we refer back to the Inspector's Report following examination where it was stated:- "This overall strategy of steering development to where there are services, facilities and jobs, is consistent with national and regional guidance on the creation of a sustainable pattern of development." An appropriate buffer or contingency within the overall plan requirement could ensure greater distribution toward Retford in order to better rebalance the spatial distribution of the plan requirement.</p>	
DBLP170	East Markham Parish Council	<p>Of the opinion that the Draft Plan has been driven by housing and that insufficient detailed thought has been given to employment needs. When considering housing numbers, a lot of work has been undertaken assigning numbers to towns or parishes with the larger schemes are marked on plans. The equivalent work doesn't appear to have been undertaken for employment. For example, what are the levels of</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the employment requirements of the district and will make any necessary amendments to the plan.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>unemployment for the different areas? What is the average travel to work time for each area? What job numbers are required in the different areas of Bassetlaw over the Plan Period? What are the required job numbers in the District to create zero unemployment? There appears to be a limited ambition in the plan for local employment opportunities, there are no suggestions put forward as to where and how additional employment could arise. Would like to see greater emphasis on employment in the rural areas. East Markham has become a dormitory village with most residents travelling to work. Concerned given the increase in population the parish are about to experience there will be a lack of local employment opportunities in the village, but in the local vicinity, particularly for the young people of the village. Concerns were expressed regarding the inadequacy of public transport the buses do not run seven days a week and they stop too early in the evening. Turning to the wider aspects of the plan we find the numbers regarding housing needs and proposed development to be confusing. On Page 14, 2.4 the Office for National Statistics estimates population growth in Bassetlaw to be 5200 over the plan period. On Page 35, 6.12 Oxford Economics estimate a growth in employment in Bassetlaw of 3400 jobs in the same period. The District Council are however planning to build 6630 this equates to almost 1.3 houses per person rise in population. The NPPF standardised methodology Page 35, 6.7 results in 306 houses per year being required, a total of 5202 for the plan period. The draft plan however proposes to build 390 dwellings per year over the plan period (Page 36 6.13) making a total of 6630. Appear to be proposing this number in the hope that the District will be able to attract more employment to the area, but offer no evidence of the action the Council will take for this to happen. Is there any anticipation that one of the surrounding authorities will fail to</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		meet its housing requirements and will ask the District to absorb the overspill?	
DBLP172	dha planning on behalf of Laing O'Rourke	Welcome the commitment to allocating sites across the district for B1, B2 and B8 employment and mixed use development. For the reasons set out in these representations, this should include the allocation of land at EIP for general B1, B2 and B8 employment uses.	Employment land availability is being assessed (and will include Laing O Rourke site) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP173	Lichfields on behalf of SP Scholey and the estate of WA Scholey	Para 6.7 notes that in applying the NPPF Standardised Methodology, there is an objectively assessed need for 306 homes per annum for the Plan period and rightly acknowledges that this is not a housing requirement figure, rather a minimum starting point. Para 6.10 describes how, based on the 2017 SHMA, a housing delivery target of 417 dwellings per annum would be needed if the Council were to adopt a more ambitious economic growth target in the draft Local Plan. More recent economic forecasts however – as described at paras 6.11 and 6.12 - are seen to give rise to a lesser housing requirement of 390 dwellings per annum which is subsequently taken forward as a target within Policy 2. Building on the recognition at para 6.13 that the Council needs to plan for more homes than the minimum standard, consider it wholly appropriate for a more ambitious housing target to be taken forward. This, in turn, would ensure that the Plan has the flexibility to achieve more aspirational economic growth (should market circumstances allow) and also help ensure that much-needed affordable housing is delivered during the Plan period. Welcome – at para 6.15 – the acknowledgement of the need for the Plan to allocate more land for housing than is required; this is essential in terms of its ability to ensure a flexible supply of housing is available during its lifetime. Note that paras 6.20 – 6.23 state that in rural areas, lapsed rates are to be addressed through land allocations that are to be made in emerging and submitted Neighbourhood Plans. This	Thank you for your comments which are noted. Despite the fact that there are currently restrictive planning policies in the Core Strategy on development in many rural settlements, there has been a steady delivery of new homes (averaging at 92 dpa) since 2010. This demonstrates strong demand for housing in these areas. Given the proposal to support more development, the housing requirement (which equates to 105 dpa) is considered deliverable over the plan period. Given the direction that the emerging plan provides for neighbourhood plans, it is not expected that they will stall. The Council provides strong support and guidance to neighbourhood plan groups and this is evident in the number currently in progress.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>approach is considered to give rise to an inequitable distribution of new housing in the rural areas of Bassetlaw, with the housing supply skewed between those settlements that have (or will have) a Neighbourhood Plan in place and those that do not. The number of Neighbourhood Plans that can be seen to have already stalled on page 43 and also the uncertainty as to whether emerging Neighbourhood Plans will actually include specific land use allocations suggest the emerging Local Plan to be overly reliant on their delivery. Note that footnote 31 of Section 6 should be updated to reflect the definitions of 'deliverable' within the NPPF (as revised in February 2019). Para 6.46 states that to support economic growth, there is a minimum requirement to provide 8 ha (gross) of land for economic development per annum. This is taken forward as a target in Policy 2. Support the aspirations to achieve economic growth beyond the minimal requirement, consider this to be at odds with the level of housing growth that is proposed and, in particular, the growth caps that are proposed for individual settlements.</p>	
DBLP173	Lichfields on behalf of SP Scholey and the estate of WA Scholey	<p>The level of housing growth in Policy 2 should be increased to reflect the aspirational level of economic growth that is set out within the same policy as well as the overarching Vision for the Plan. Para 7.9 acknowledges that there has been persistent underdelivery of affordable housing in Bassetlaw. This provides further justification as to why Policy 2 should be revised to provide a more ambitious housing requirement and, in doing so, ensure that a sufficient supply of deliverable and viable sites are available to provide much-needed affordable housing.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP180	Freeths on behalf of Hallam Land	<p>In accordance with PPG, the start date for the calculation of the OAN using the standard methodology is 2018. The housing requirement period aligns with the Local Plan, commencing 2018 and ending 2035. Applying the NPPF Standardised Methodology results in an objectively assessed need for 306 homes per annum for the District for the Plan period. This is the minimum housing need figure which must be planned for, and in accordance with the NPPF this will be reviewed every 5 years. The wider considerations on housing delivery and need from past trends, the 2017 SHMA Update findings, and results of the more up to date 2018 EDNA, it is recognised that the Council needs to plan for more homes than the minimum standard housing results for Bassetlaw. A local plan requirement of 390 dwellings per annum for 2018 – 2035 is appropriate to deliver housing to meet the population and economic growth needs of the district. Following review of deliverable and developable sites, as defined by the NPPF, it is evident that housing needs cannot be met within Bassetlaw without allocating additional sites. Deliverable and developable sites identified (neighbourhood plan allocations and sites with planning permission with a discount applied for the lapsed rate) would support delivery of 3,949 homes. Bassetlaw has acknowledged that to provide choice and flexibility in the housing market, and maintain a five-year housing land supply, that it is necessary to allocate more land for housing than required. This means allocating land to account for lapsed permissions based on past trends. Figure 3: Key Diagram, indicates the distribution and number of dwellings proposed in each area with Worksop requiring to accommodate 24% of the total housing required. This equates to 1600 new dwellings within the plan period 2018 – 2035. This diagram illustrates a shift to providing a significant proportion of new homes to rural Bassetlaw with a proposed distribution of 27% providing a</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing land availability and suitability with a view to identifying sites for allocation. The site will be considered through this process.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>significant proportion of new homes in less sustainable locations. The sustainable edge of town centre location in close proximity to new employment development represents a more sustainable and accessible location reducing the reliance on the private motor vehicle. Land at Peaks Hill Farm North of Worksop would accord with the key aims of Policy 1, in that it would focus new development in and adjoining the largest town in Bassetlaw and would significantly contribute to the delivery of new housing and economic development. Would support the proposed new employment land to the north east.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP192	Johnson Mowat on behalf of Barratt Homes	<p>Objectively Assessed Housing Need and Planned Housing Requirement: NPPF (2019) should be referenced in the Local Plan going forward. Barratt Homes have had a longstanding interest in the progress of the Plan. Previous consultation responses have been submitted to earlier documents, and a Housing Need Technical Note has been submitted following the Council's publication of a Five Year Housing Land Supply Statement in October 2018, which suggested a housing need figure of 324 dwellings per annum. Whilst the Council's position in relation to the housing requirement has now changed, the Technical Note remains relevant in the analysis of the SHMA Update (October 2017). Technical Note attached.</p> <p>Supporting text to Policy 2 refers to EDNA it is not clear what the origin of the 306 homes per annum (para 6.7 of the Plan) is, nor is it clear in the EDNA. The EDNA informs that the base population is taken from the 2016-based subnational population projections (SNPP) which have concerns with, given the most recent Government advice (Government response to the technical consultation on updates to national planning policy and guidance February 2019). The latest Government position is that it thinks that the 2016-based household projections should not be used as a reason to justify lower housing need. The PPG is clear that the 2014-based household projections should be used as the baseline 2a-005-20190220: "Why are the 2014-based household projections used as a baseline for the standard method? The 2014-based household projections are used within the standard method to provide stability for planning authorities and communities to ensure that historic under-delivery and declining affordability are reflected, and to be consistent with the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes." The 2014 based Standard Methodology results in a minimum housing need of 324 dwellings per annum and this should</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The current year should be used as the starting point for calculating the housing need. This results in a requirement for 306 dpa. The 324 dpa has a base date of 2016 and is out of date for the purpose of plan making.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>remain the minimum starting point, rather than 306 dwellings per annum in the Plan. Using the NPPF methodology, the housing need of 324 dwellings per annum is based on the 2014 Sub National Household Projections (SNHP) and 2017 affordability ratio of 5.8. This figure increases to 329 dwellings per annum based on the 2014 SNHP and 2018 affordability ratio of 6.04 in accordance with the methodology set out in the revised PPG (February 2019). Further explanation is required to the Council's derivation of the 306 dwelling per annum figure contained in the Plan. Support the Council's acknowledgment that the Standard Methodology is the minimum housing need figure and welcome the recognition that the Council needs to plan for more homes than the minimum standard housing results. The PPG (paragraph 10 ref 2a-010-20190220) is clear that in supporting the government's ambitions to ensure that more homes are built it will be appropriate to assess whether the actual housing need is higher than the standard method indicates taking into account economic circumstances or other factors such as demographic behaviour and migration trends. Support the recognition that an uplift to the standard method is appropriate, question the quantum of the uplift to 390 dwellings per annum, particularly considering the findings of the SHMA Update (October 2017) which result in a 'growth scenario' need of 417 dwellings per annum, and an annual need of 670 dwellings in order to deliver affordable housing need in full. Further justification is required of the use of the midpoint Oxford Economics growth scenario resulting in 390 homes per annum, as opposed to the Cambridge Econometrics or Experian midpoint growth scenarios which result in higher annual requirements of 493 and 456 homes. Further justification would be welcome as to why a midpoint was taken, rather than a High Growth scenario which would result in annual dwelling requirements of 608, 555 and 518 (Table 16</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		EDNA). A further understanding of the minimum starting point and the quantum of uplift would be welcomed, and this should be clearly set out in the justifying text.	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP192	Johnson Mowat on behalf of Barratt Homes	<p>Support the Council's acknowledgment of the necessity to allocate more land for housing than required (para 6.15). Does not appear to have been taken on board fully in the residual housing requirement. Whilst the Council have included a lapse rate for small and large sites with permission in the calculation of the residual housing requirement there is no additional contingency to account for treating the housing requirement as a minimum target, and to provide flexibility, choice and competition in the market. An additional contingency should be included. The HBF recommend as large a contingency as possible and suggest at least 20%. This replicated a level of contingency that was recommended by the Local Plans Expert Group.</p> <p>Table 6 – Distribution of housing requirement: acknowledge the spatial strategy strands in Section 5 of the Plan. The spatial strategy has a bearing on the distribution of the housing requirement in Section 6 Policy 2, and it would be helpful if justifying text was included in Section 6 which explains the distribution. What is not clear is how the percentage requirements to each 'strand' have been assigned.</p> <p>Support the identification of Harworth as a Local Regeneration Centre and are keen to deliver much needed housing in Harworth which will assist in the regeneration of the town. In supporting the regeneration of Harworth, it is considered that the distribution of the housing requirement should be increased to include a higher proportion to Harworth. The Plan currently proposes 21% of the housing requirement to Harworth, yet the collective rural settlements receive the highest proportion in the District with 27% of the total requirement. Concerned that the Plan distributes too much development to these lower order settlements at the expense of higher order sustainable settlements such as Harworth. The over emphasis to the rural settlements potentially risks the regeneration success of Harworth. Reconsideration of the</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		distribution of the housing requirement is requested. Lifting Harworth to the second tier- the distribution of dwellings should reflect this. As a minimum a distribution of 26% towards Harworth is considered to be appropriate in order for the settlement to fulfil its role as a Local Regeneration Centre.	
DBLP193	White Young Green on behalf of Stadium Development	The number of homes proposed to be delivered in the Draft Local Plan (6,630 dwellings in total / 390 dwellings per annum) of which a minimum of 1,000 units are to be delivered at the two Garden is supported, with the balance of the total 4,000 dwellings delivered after the plan period.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP195	Fisher German on behalf of The Hospital of The Holy and Undivided Trinity	Note that the authority has used the standardised methodology as the starting point to calculate its housing requirement, utilising the 2014 housing projections in line with national guidance. It has gone on to uplift this to ensure there is sufficient workforce to meet the anticipated growth in jobs; this approach is considered to be positive and justified. If the housing uplift was not made, it could hinder the ability of growing firms to employ staff locally and stifle economic growth, with businesses moving elsewhere to find suitable levels of labour. Wholly endorse the housing requirement. To work out the residual requirement for allocation, the Council first discount existing supply, minus a lapse rate. The application of this lapse rate is supported. Past trends have set out that 1 in 4 permitted dwellings approved have not been delivered. There is no evidence that this will change. The use of	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council will continue to ensure that the Bassetlaw Plan accords with the most up to date NPPF. The Council is currently reviewing the Spatial Strategy and will make any necessary amendments.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>this lapse rate is therefore likely to give a more accurate indication of the level of housing supply, ensuring the Council are in a position to meet all future needs. This method is supported. Note that in establishing levels of housing supply utilised the 2018 NPPF definition of deliverable. Since the publication of the Draft, the Government published the updated NPPF (2019). The Council should be satisfied that the work done today remains consistent with the NPPF, particularly with the updates to the definition of deliverable. The Draft Plan allocates 13% (853 dwellings) of the Housing Requirement to Retford. This is half that being proposed for Worksop and Harworth respectively. Of this, 416 are commitments leaving a residual requirement of 437 dwellings to be allocated by the plan. Note that the Core Strategy (2011), allocated 26% of the total housing requirement for Bassetlaw to Retford. Whilst it is recognised that Retford has been the recipient of "significant levels of growth since the Core Strategy was adopted in 2011" (para 10.6 of the Plan) and that continued periods of growth can lead to objections from local people, there is no policy in the Framework that suggests growth should be restricted or limited, simply because significant growth has occurred. Actual delivery in Retford was only 20% above that set out in the Core Strategy. This overprovision cannot justify the 50% reduction proposed by the emerging plan. The strong delivery in Retford is likely to be attributable to strong housing need. Consider that Retford remains an extremely sustainable and well-connected town and benefits from strong levels of demand. Retford is able to deliver additional levels of growth above that currently proposed by the Draft Plan. Directing only 13% of the total housing requirement to Retford fails to take into account its role as set out in the Spatial Strand. The number of dwellings distributed to Retford should therefore be increased</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		to better reflect the likely housing need and sustainability of the settlement.	
DBLP195	Fisher German on behalf of The Hospital of The Holy and Undivided Trinity	<p>The level of employment land is supported. It is an ambitious, yet deliverable target reflecting latest employment projections. Support the Council's increase in housing requirement to ensure that there is a suitable workforce to support the planned economic growth. The land at North Road, Retford can deliver a minimum of 8.5ha of employment land, 6% of the Districts total. This will make a valuable contribution to the employment requirement, adjacent to a successful employment development at Trinity Park, north of Randall Way. The site currently benefits from a resolution to grant outline consent for up to 11.11ha of employment land, whilst this remains a fall-back position. Having regard to the NPPF (2019), there is an opportunity to allocate a differing amount of development, to make best use of the land. Consider the site to be suitable to deliver in the region of the below parameters;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Between 300 dwellings at 30dph and 11.5ha of employment land. • Between 400 dwellings at 30dph and 8.5ha of employment land. <p>Having regard to the imminent signing of the S106, it is prudent to allocate this site as a commitment with land to the north also allocated as Phase 2 of the wider scheme.</p>	Employment land availability is being assessed (and will include North Road Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP196	Savills on behalf of landowners of Upper Morton, Babworth	<p>Support the approach to “the rurals” in respect of the two garden villages. The Council have recognised that the OAN figure set out by DCLG is a baseline figure and through incorporating the results of the 2018 EDNA it has been emphasised that an uplift from the standardised OAN was needed. The new villages are an important element of Bassetlaw’s long term spatial strategy, and will deliver a significant amount of housing development over the plan period as well as contributing to the longer term aspirations of Bassetlaw. It is envisaged that this growth will help to meet a proportion of the needs of the local housing market in Retford. The new villages represent a large proportion of the 6,630 dwellings required between 2018 to 2035. Development in Bassetlaw is restricted due to the 300 Local Wildlife Sites and 10,000 hectares of woodland, which is nearly double the average woodland cover within an English district. The population of Bassetlaw are also concentrated to the main towns Worksop, Retford and Harworth and Bircotes. These built up areas cannot accommodate all the growth and it is seen as necessary to build two new villages which allow for Bassetlaw to succeed in the housing need figures. The new villages will represent 15% of the district’s housing requirement, providing approximately 1,777 dwellings over the plan period, making a significant contribution to the plan’s success. The new villages also represent wider opportunities, including services, facilities and employment opportunities to deliver net environmental gains. The two villages are in line with the Garden City principles as well as incorporating the three principles of sustainable development as set out in NPPF (para 8). It is considered that this emerging approach is sound and we note the ability of the land to complement and drive supporting employment opportunities in this area to the south of the district. In conjunction with an aspirational housing</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The new villages are identified as being capable of delivering 1000 new dwellings within the plan period (not 1777 dwellings). The rural settlements are proposed to deliver 1777 dwellings.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>figure it is vital that the Bassetlaw Local Plan also provides employment space to meet the growing demands of the region and achieve the economic growth aspirations of Bassetlaw. The District already benefits from good connections to the Sheffield City Region, the A1 and M1, and East Coast Mainline representing a key opportunity for employment and economic growth. The EDNA indicates that there is a requirement to deliver 136 Hectares of employment land across the District. Argue this is a baseline and that given the excellent connections, the Plan could be more ambitious. The land at Upper Morton will make a significant contribution to the overall land required over the plan period. The site will allow the delivery of new enterprises with floorplates of a size to attract national and international businesses as well as the expansion of existing businesses, providing a range of goods jobs across urban and rural Bassetlaw. The site is well connected to the two main towns of the region, Retford and Worksop, and is in close proximity to the Garden Villages which will allow the development to respond to local needs and opportunities to increase the overall employment attraction of the Bassetlaw District. The site is also well located along the A1 corridor which has been recognised as an emerging market for employment, following projects at Blyth, and looks to serve a sub-regional market for distribution and industrial land. The site represents a key long term solution to meet anticipated trends as well as current trends.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP198	Pegasus Planning on behalf of Sunnyside Dairy Farms Limited	<p>Whilst the commitment to delivering a level of housing provision above the standard methodology is welcomed, the justification for the proposed level of provision is not sufficiently clear. Unclear whether the Council, working with adjoining authorities has identified any unmet need that would need to be addressed in the Local Plan. There needs to be further clarification of level of housing provision that the Council intends to plan for. Whatever figure is identified, this should be expressed as a minimum requirement and Policy 2 should be amended to make clear that the overall provision and distribution to settlements represent minimum requirements. The Draft Plan does not include a housing trajectory and it is not clear how the Council intends to maintain a five year supply of housing in accordance with the NPPF. If housing allocations are to be identified through a Part 2 Plan, there is a risk that there may be delays in bringing sites forward. The plan needs to enable the early release of suitable and sustainable small scale sites to support housing delivery in advance of the Part 2 Plan. Policy 2 proposes that 10% of the overall housing requirement for the District will be delivered on sites of 1 hectare or less. This approach is supported. A wide range of sites will provide access to suitable land for a range of housebuilders; from small local companies to larger regional and national companies, which in turn offers a wide range of house types in order to meet housing needs across the District. The site at Normanton on Trent falls into this category. The 2019 NPPF at paragraph 68 notes the important contribution small and medium sites can make to meeting the housing requirements of an area and notes that these sites are often built-out quickly. At a) it is noted that local planning authorities should identify through the development plan and brownfield registers, land to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than 1 hectare.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The next draft plan will provide further clarification.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP199	Savills on behalf of landowners of Top Farm south, Elkesley	<p>Support the approach to “the rurals” in respect of the two garden villages. The Council have recognised that the OAN figure set out by DCLG is a baseline figure and through incorporating the results of the 2018 EDNA it has been emphasised that an uplift from the standardised OAN was needed. The new villages are an important element of Bassetlaw’s long term spatial strategy, and will deliver a significant amount of housing development over the plan period as well as contributing to the longer term aspirations of Bassetlaw. It is envisaged that this growth will help to meet a proportion of the needs of the local housing market in Retford. The new villages represent a large proportion of the 6,630 dwellings required between 2018 to 2035. Development in Bassetlaw is restricted due to the 300 Local Wildlife Sites and 10,000 hectares of woodland, which is nearly double the average woodland cover within an English district. The population of Bassetlaw are also concentrated to the main towns Worksop, Retford and Harworth and Bircotes. These built up areas cannot accommodate all the growth and it is seen as necessary to build two new villages which allow for Bassetlaw to succeed in the housing need figures. The new villages will represent 15% of the district’s housing requirement, providing approximately 1,777 dwellings over the plan period, making a significant contribution to the plan’s success. The new villages also represent wider opportunities, including services, facilities and employment opportunities to deliver net environmental gains. The two villages are in line with the Garden City principles as well as incorporating the three principles of sustainable development as set out in NPPF (para 8). It is considered that this emerging approach is sound and we note the ability of the land to complement and drive supporting employment opportunities in this area to the south of the district. In conjunction with an aspirational housing</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The new villages are identified as being capable of delivering 1000 new dwellings within the plan period (not 1777 dwellings). The rural settlements are proposed to deliver 1777 dwellings.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>figure it is vital that the Bassetlaw Local Plan also provides employment space to meet the growing demands of the region and achieve the economic growth aspirations of Bassetlaw. The District already benefits from good connections to the Sheffield City Region, the A1 and M1, and East Coast Mainline representing a key opportunity for employment and economic growth. The EDNA indicates that there is a requirement to deliver 136 Hectares of employment land across the District. Argue this is a baseline and that given the excellent connections, the Plan could be more ambitious. The land at Elkelsey will make a significant contribution to the overall land required over the plan period. The site will allow the delivery of new enterprises with medium to smaller scale floorplates, providing a range of goods jobs across urban and rural Bassetlaw. The site is well connected to the two main towns of the region, Retford and Worksop, and is in close proximity to the Garden Villages which will allow the development to respond to local needs and opportunities to increase the overall employment attraction of the Bassetlaw District. The site is also well located along the A1 corridor which has been recognised as an emerging market for employment, following projects at Blyth, and looks to serve a sub-regional market for distribution and industrial land. The site represents a key long term solution to meet anticipated trends as well as current trends.</p>	
DBLP201	JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd on behalf of the Kilner Estate	<p>The plan proposes to deliver 390 dwellings per annum based on the latest calculation of housing needs. This will result in an overall requirement of 6,630 dwellings over the plan period. The balance of housing that needs to be identified after completions commitments etc. is some 2,6821 new allocations.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>These are proposed to be split between Worksop, Retford & Harworth the rural areas and two new settlements. Two new settlements are proposed to deliver 1000 homes in the Plan period and another 3000 beyond that date. Do not consider that two new settlements on brownfield sites will deliver 1000 new homes in the Plan Period. The values in Bassetlaw and the infrastructure costs of setting up new settlements are likely to be prohibitive to this kind of approach, when combined with the CIL levy, this will not be a successful strategy. A more appropriate response would be to apportion more dwellings to be found in the rural areas in the named villages within the List in Figure 8. If the 1000 dwellings to be found in new settlements were added to the residual requirement in the rural areas this would give a total of 1438 dwellings to be found in those settlements over the plan period, which is a realistic and deliverable level of growth and development for the rural areas. This type of approach will have the benefit of maximising the existing infrastructure already available in the villages and mean that sites will be able to come forward without serious time delays and offer smaller sites to the local market which are of a scale attractive to local developers. It will enable the delivery of affordable homes in villages if the sites are of a modest scale enabling the organic growth of villages and the provision of local and affordable dwellings. It will also allow for a range of house types to be delivered which will enable existing residents to trade up to larger dwellings or seek an alternative type of accommodation to suit their needs. Support the development of small sites in Ranskill and Torworth where land is available to meet the type of housing needs. support the general concept of development in the rural areas and that of the interconnected villages as part of the interconnected spatial strategy. This is an appropriate way of dealing with development in the villages and making efficient</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		use of the social and economic resources available in the settlement strings that are identified. Consider more can be made of this approach by the inclusion of additional housing numbers to the interconnected villages and the deletion of the two new villages currently under consideration.	
DBLP202	JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd on behalf of the Hemerston Estate	The plan proposes to deliver 390 dwellings per annum based on the latest calculation of housing needs. This will result in an overall requirement of 6,630 dwellings over the plan period. The balance of housing that needs to be identified after completions commitments etc. is some 2,6821 new allocations. These are proposed to be split between Worksop, Retford & Harworth the rural areas and two new settlements. Two new settlements are proposed to deliver 1000 homes in the Plan period and another 3000 beyond that date. Do not consider that two new settlements on brownfield sites will deliver 1000 new homes in the Plan Period. The values in Bassetlaw and the infrastructure costs of setting up new settlements are likely to be prohibitive to this kind of approach, when combined with the CIL levy, this will not be a successful strategy. A more appropriate response would be to apportion more dwellings to be found in the rural areas in the named villages within the List in Figure 8. If the 1000 dwellings to be found in new settlements were added to the residual requirement in the rural areas this would give a total of 1438 dwellings to be found in those settlements over the plan period, which is a realistic and deliverable level of growth and development for the rural areas. This type of approach will have the benefit of maximising the existing infrastructure already available in the villages and mean that sites will be able to come forward without serious time delays and offer smaller sites to the local market which are of a scale attractive to local developers. It will enable the delivery of affordable homes in villages if the sites are of a modest scale enabling the organic growth of	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>villages and the provision of local and affordable dwellings. It will also allow for a range of house types to be delivered which will enable existing residents to trade up to larger dwellings or seek an alternative type of accommodation to suit their needs. Support the development of small sites in Oldcotes where land is available to meet the type of housing needs. support the general concept of development in the rural areas and that of the interconnected villages as part of the interconnected spatial strategy. This is an appropriate way of dealing with development in the villages and making efficient use of the social and economic resources available in the settlement strings that are identified. Consider more can be made of this approach by the inclusion of additional housing numbers to the interconnected villages and the deletion of the two new villages currently under consideration.</p>	
DBLP204	iba planning on behalf of Carlton Forest Group	<p>The Strategic Plan as now drafted increases the annual housing requirement (which is supported), but lowers the proportion of new housing to be provided in and adjoining Worksop – instead seeking to redistribute amongst the District's rural settlements and the two proposed new villages. Object to the Council's approach in the Spatial Strategy on grounds that Worksop is the principal and most sustainable settlement in the District where the majority of new housing and employment development should be focused. By reducing the amount of housing to be directed towards Worksop, the residual housing requirement to be met by housing allocations over the remainder of the Plan period is a nominal 284 dwellings – hardly reflective of the Council's planned approach in paragraph 9.6 to support "significant levels of housing development and growth across Worksop through planned site allocations, urban intensification and organic growth". Wishes the proportion of housing to be directed towards Worksop to return to a minimum of 32% (as in the adopted Core Strategy)</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>and considers the increased housing numbers will play a pivotal role in contributing towards the delivery of essential infrastructure (physical and social) improvements, via associated S106 contributions and CIL payments. The Council will be aware that my client has invested significantly in securing additional housing and employment development in the town along Blyth Road – and has adopted an extremely pragmatic approach with the housing developer to ensure the early delivery of housing on the site to help contribute towards the Council's housing supply.</p>	
DBLP194	Emery Planning on behalf of J G Pears Property Ltd	<p>Welcome the fact housing, and employment targets set out in Section 6 are identified as minimums. Welcome para 6.46 that it is anticipated that a proportion of the employment land requirement will involve the re-use of existing and vacant, former employment land. The Former High Marnham Power Station is one such site and should be allocated accordingly in the Part 2 Plan. Support the acknowledgement at para 6.48 that in addition to sites that will be allocated for B1, B2 and B8 employment and mixed use development that other employment sites will come forward within the Plan period. The Council's 'flexible' approach to responding to the demands of the market as they arise is welcomed.</p>	<p>Support for the approach to employment targets welcome. Employment land availability is being assessed (and will include the Former High Marnham Power Station) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan.</p>
DBLP207	Robert Doughty Consultancy on behalf of J. Travis	<p>Support Table 7 which sets out the range of quantum of development that will be supported in each settlement. This approach is in general accordance with paragraph 65 of the NPPF, which requires development plans to set out a housing requirement for designated neighbourhood planning areas. We are not clear, however, how the process for setting the targets for each settlement has been derived. We understand that the minimum Growth Target is equivalent to 10% of dwellings in the settlement at the start of the plan period, and the cap is set at 20% growth, but we do not understand why growth rates have been selected.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP205	Fisher German on behalf of P Hinds	<p>Note that the authority has used the standardised methodology as the starting point to calculate its housing requirement. It has then gone on to uplift this in order to ensure there is a sufficient workforce to meet the anticipated growth in jobs. This approach is positive and entirely justified. If the housing uplift was not made, it could hinder the ability of growing firms to employ staff locally. This could stifle economic growth and lead to economic decline, with firms moving elsewhere, outside of the District. Wholly endorse the housing requirement. To work out the residual requirement for allocation, the Council first discount existing supply, minus a lapse rate. The application of this lapse rate is supported. Past trends have set out that 1 in 4 permitted dwellings have not been delivered. There is no evidence that this will change, the use of this lapse rate is likely to give a more accurate indication of the forthcoming housing supply, ensuring the Council are in a position to meet all future needs and as such is supported.</p> <p>Note that in establishing supply the Council utilised the 2018 NPPF definition of deliverable. Since the publication of the Plan, the Government published the updated NPPF (2019). The Council need be satisfied that the work done today remains consistent with the NPPF, as updated, particularly in respect of the updates to the definition of deliverable. The Plan assigns 27% (1,777 dwellings) of the District's Housing Requirement to the 'Rural Settlements'. Of this, 1,339 are commitments/site allocations in Neighbourhood Plans, leaving a residual requirement of 438 dwellings to be allocated by the Plan/Neighbourhood Plans. For Treswell and Cottam a minimum housing requirement of 10 dwellings is identified and a capped growth target of 25 dwellings (20% of existing dwellings) is set out. It is significant that the Referendum Version Treswell and Cottam Neighbourhood Plan has not identified any site allocations for the villages. There is a</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council will continue to ensure that the Bassetlaw Plan accords with the most up to date NPPF. The Council is currently reviewing the Spatial Strategy and will make any necessary amendments.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		residual requirement for dwellings in Treswell and Cottam which the Bassetlaw Plan should allocate land for.	
DBLP208	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	Do not support. Not really. No not really at all. Do it another way. Saying that the council "will deliver" doesn't make it super. Fix the problem, not the symptom. We have not got enough housing. So where is everyone living then? Are they homeless? Some are I am sure. Build a massive drop in centre for the homeless. Clean beds, showers, mental health facilities, education facilities and ongoing support through rehabilitation back into society. That should help the homeless. As for the rest, where are they currently living? Renting, they are renting. We have enough buildings, we just can't buy them. Tax on second and third homes. Huge taxes. Stop people wanting to buy cheap homes and rent them to people who can't afford to buy the houses because they are paying all of their money to other people who own their homes. This is the problem. Fix this. Alternatively, exacerbate the problem and build more buildings that can be rented to people who can't afford to buy.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP208	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	Do not support. By closing the airport, you will force the company that I work for to move out of Bassetlaw. Will have to move my family. Do not support the amount of employment land. Am not a lorry driver, a warehouse worker, nor do I wish to work in a chip shop. Like my job working for a worldwide flight inspection company providing a service to private airport owners, governments, and militaries in more than 60 countries. Without a runway, those 136 hectares aren't going to help me or more than 100 other people forced out of the area. Also, land does not make employment. Except for farmers. But then how many of those hectares are currently farmland? You'll be getting rid of that of course! Maybe I could start my own company doing something else as high tech as what I do now. Will you provide me with the capital to build my own startup premises? If I spend the next 5 years raising that capital on my	It is acknowledged that should Retford Gamston Airport close some aviation businesses may have to relocate out of the District. However, the proposal also includes the provision of employment development. In addition employment land will be promoted elsewhere in the District. The intention is that this will provide for a range of jobs to meet the needs of the District. Wherever possible the development of high quality agricultural land will be resisted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		own, will I then have to compete with Wilkinsons/Tesco for a little corner of the 136 hectares you are turning over to wasteland. Will I have to dig a cesspit?	
DBLP210	Lound Parish Council	Broad support for the context of the plan, but have concerns in relation to the 20% cap being detailed in respect of the housing requirement allocation. We question the need for having a target housing requirement (a) followed by a further capped growth figure (b) and view that this additional number (b) could be potentially seen as a means for exploitation by housing developers to force additional housing into areas not necessarily equipped for such a substantial additional growth. We would like to suggest that, instead of the proposed fixed percentage 20% Cap, each Neighbourhood should, using the BDC Requirement as a target, be given the flexibility to plan for a higher level of development that is appropriate for its area and infrastructure, based on a location referendum included within each neighbourhood plan.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The cap is proposed as a safeguard for all rural settlements, seeking to prevent unsustainable patterns of growth. The Council is currently reviewing this policy and will make amendments if considered necessary.
DBLP217	Axis ped on behalf of FCC Environment	Support the provision of 136 hectares of employment land across the district. Figure 3 sets out that 13% (18 hectares) of this will be provided within the rural settlements and 33% (45 hectares) is to be provided within Worksop. Supported that this is a minimum figure and that it is expected that other sites will come forward within the plan period, this is in accordance with the NPPF which seeks to boost economic growth.	Support for the approach to employment targets welcome. The figures are a minimum which is intended to provide flexibility in delivery moving forward.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP218	Pegasus Planing on behalf of E Fisher and Company Limited	<p>The housing requirement is 390 dwellings per annum (between 2018 to 2035). The Council states that this is appropriate to deliver housing to meet the population and economic growth needs of the district. Acknowledged that requirement is higher than the standard methodology requirement for Bassetlaw (306 dwellings per annum), the Council have been overly cautious in arriving at this figure. The standard methodology identified the minimum number of homes to be planned and does not consider the impact that future government policies, changing economic circumstances or other factors might have on demographic behaviour. On this basis, welcome consideration given to economic growth scenarios in the EDNA. The Plan argues that the midpoint growth scenario provides the most balanced reflection of Bassetlaw's economy and is appropriate to deliver housing to meet the population and economic growth needs of the District. This is an overly cautious approach when considering the standard methodology:</p> <p>1. In addition to looking at future growth in Bassetlaw, the EDNA analyses historical employment trends in the District. Notes that between 2004 and 2017, employment in Bassetlaw increased by 21.0%. This was significantly higher than the 11.0% recorded at a UL level (Figure 40, EDNA Part 1). The 3,400 jobs resulting from the Oxford Economic midpoint growth scenario over the period 2018-2035 translates into total growth of 6.1% (or 0.3% per annum). This represents a slightly longer timeframe than the analysis of previous change (17 years versus 13 years), a jobs growth figure of only 6.1% (0.3% per annum) seems relatively low when considering how well the District has performed historically.</p> <p>2. Bassetlaw is part of two Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEP) areas, one of which is the Sheffield City Region LEP. As part of a refresh of its Strategic Economic Plan, a series of target metrics have been developed. One of which is for the Sheffield City Region to</p>	<p>At the present time, the housing requirement is considered to be sound based on the evidence from the Bassetlaw EDNA. The Council will review the housing requirement as and when required, taking into consideration any future changes to national planning policy and guidance.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>achieve annual jobs growth of 1.0%. Considered that Bassetlaw should be showing the same level of ambition for growth in its labour market, well above the 0.3% per annum opted for in the Local Plan. Conclude that the annual need for housing will need to be moved towards the higher end of the 308-608 detailed within the nine EDNA forecasts. An increase in housing numbers in the District will help ensure that supply is able to meet demand – especially from younger adult households that form and/or may move into the area. There is a risk that the Plan is underestimating the future growth prospects of Bassetlaw, which will hinder the District's long-term economic competitiveness. The proposed strategy is not positively prepared and justified as it does not provide for the most appropriate strategy for the delivery of housing across the Local Plan period.</p>	
DBLP219	Planning and Design Group on behalf of the Welbeck Estates Company Ltd	<p>Currently, the Council's approach to calculating housing requirement is, on balance, considered appropriate given the shift toward the standardised methodology for calculating a minimum housing requirement in the NPPF. This is in addition to a modest uplift to account for economic growth. Any future updates the standardised methodology will still need be actioned by the Council appropriately and it is expected that strategic policies (as drafted in the emerging Bassetlaw Plan) will require updating at least every five years. The standardised methodology, a minimum requirement of 306 homes per annum has been identified. However, a hybrid target (accounting for past trends/economic aspiration) proposes a target of 390 dwellings per annum. Totalling 6,630 dwellings between 2018 and 2035. This represents a slight uplift on the annual target of 350 dwellings per annum presented in the 2011 Core Strategy, and the 2017 SHMA target of 374</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council will continue to ensure that the Plan accords with the NPPF and PPG. The next draft Plan will include site allocations. A detailed evidence base is being produced to support this aspect of the Plan.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>dwellings per annum. Policy wording on all housing figures and delivery should use the term ‘at least’ when describing a quantum of development implying the figure is a minimum, this in order to ensure that the policy is sound and positively prepared in-line with the NPPF. When calculating the housing trajectory explicit consideration needs to be given to the NPPF’s revised definition of ‘deliverable’. Any site that falls under the above definition will need to be robustly addressed and evidenced by the Council where it is to support Local Plan assumptions. The 2017 LAA is in a summary only, with no indication of landowner or developer discussions that may support the relative ability of land to be delivered or developed. The assumption that there is currently enough land in the District to support the delivery of 3,949 homes (seemingly including all land with planning permission in Table 5) needs to be explained in more detail. Without this, the current assumptions are unsound. To ensure a flexible supply of land for housing, proposes a distinct rural and local housing requirement, which is capped at 20% growth per settlement (measured against existing dwellings as of August 2018). To meet the requirement for 10% of housing to be delivered on sites of 1 hectare or less the Council will need to make land allocations in rural areas through Neighbourhood Plans and the Plan. The positive approach toward Neighbourhood Plans is welcomed. It is clear from the strategy of that Neighbourhood Plans will play a critical role in delivering future rural housing.</p>	
DBLP221	Gladman Developments	<p>Applying the NPPF Standardised methodology based on 2014-Household Projections results in an objectively assessed need of 306 dwellings per annum for over the plan period. Support the Council recognises the need to deliver housing to meet the population and economic growth needs of the district and that the evidence concludes that an uplift against the 2014 Household Projections is required in order to align with the</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council will continue to ensure that the Plan accords with the NPPF and PPG. The next draft Plan will include site allocations. A detailed evidence base is being produced to support this aspect of the Plan.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>economic growth requirements. The addition of 84dpa annum exceeds the minimum starting point identified through the standard method and will help to secure the employment and affordability needs of Bassetlaw. It is important that this uplift is explained and supported by appropriate technical evidence. In terms of the housing supply analysis, consider that this might be better included as a supporting Topic Paper(s), rather than for it all to be set out in some detail in the Plan. A Neighbourhood Plans Topic Paper may be a more appropriate place to appreciate the contribution of housing from Neighbourhood Plans and a simple table would then suffice (with a cross reference to the topic paper) as part of the Plan. Policy 2 would benefit from a modification which makes clear that the housing requirement of 6,630 is considered as a 'minima' in rather than being a target to be achieved. Reference to the housing requirement being a minimum is supported elsewhere in the Plan and this change could be made via minor modification. As the housing requirement is considered as a 'minimum' this should be reflected in the housing requirements across the settlement hierarchy to ensure that sustainable growth opportunities are able to come forward so that the Plan can react positively to changes in circumstance which may arise over the plan period. Noted that the New Villages are expected to deliver 1,000 dwellings over the plan period with a further 3,000 dwellings post plan period. This is prudent and ensures the long-term development needs of the district are met through large scale development to help improve Bassetlaw's role in the surrounding HMA. Noted that other allocations will be made through the next Plan. Should ensure that the Plan identifies sufficient land across a range of settlements to ensure a flexible and responsive supply of housing land is available to meet local communities housing needs over the short-medium term whilst the necessary</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		infrastructure is put in place in the New Settlements. In time, there can be a cross reference as part of the Policy 2 to the allocations made in addition to current commitments that together will achieve these targets.	
DBLP215	Sheffield City Region	Generally supportive, and notes the aspirations align with the LEP's Strategic Economic Plan (SEP). Supportive of the proposals for economic growth and recognises, in a positive light, that the proposed delivery of 8ha of employment land per year is above several of the forecasts in the EDNA. "Planning to deliver employment land at the higher end of your future growth scenarios, combined with a strategy that exploits regional and sub regional assets, demonstrates the ambition for new development in Bassetlaw and the role it can continue to play in the wider SCR economy". Also supportive of proposals for growth along the A1 corridor, which aligns with the LEP's identification of this as a key growth area for the City Region, and thus keen to continue to work together to develop these proposals. Equally supportive of proposals for housing growth, including the garden villages - and recognises in a positive light that growth projections are above and beyond local housing need calculations, in line with the aspirations of the LEP.	Support for the approach to employment targets welcome. The Council will continue under the Duty to Cooperate requirements to work with the Sheffield City Region and the LEP to develop relevant proposals. Acknowledgement that housing growth is in line with LEP aspirations, is welcome.
DBLP223	Stone Planning Services on behalf of the Charterpoint Group	Paragraph 6.46 states that based on the EDNA a minimum of 136 ha gross are required over the Plan period. Employment being defined as B1, B2 and B8 uses. There is no factor for associated employment uses such as hotels, roadside facilities etc.	The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure all types of economic growth and associated jobs can be delivered in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of different types of employment growth in the future. This will include employment related development.
DBLP226	Retford Civic Society	No objection in principle to the target for housebuilding being greater than strictly necessary to reflect expected economic growth but the distribution of this additional housing should reflect where growth in employment is realistically expected. It	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		is not clear from the plan how the housing requirement has been distributed.	
DBLP229	Individual	Supports the number of homes and amount of employment land proposed. Gamston airport could also provide additional employment.	Support for the amount of employmentland proposed noted. Support for provision of additional employment land at Gamston airport noted.
DBLP232	Elkesley Parish Council	BDC is 7.9 years ahead of its building needs. It is not clear from the figures supplied if this 7.9 figure has been considered when developing this Plan. Would like to see clarity on this.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. Yes, the Plan does take this into account. The Plan is a minimum of 15 years timespan. The current housing land supply will not deliver enough housing for the 15 year period. The Council therefore needs to allocate land for housing. The Plan includes information on current supply and residual housing need.
DBLP236	Individual	When future sites are proposed for allocation within Retford I feel that Retford should not be expanded beyond its current boundaries, and that the plan should include policies that explicitly state that there will be no expansion of Retford beyond beyond the current boundaries of the town, specifically to the agricultural land adjoining Ordsall. However, having looked at the draft plan I do support the proposals for housing expansion in Worksop and Harworth.	Housing land availability is being assessed, and will include land submitted for consideration in Retford, which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Support for housing growth in Worksop and Harworth noted.
DBLP238	Individual	Agree with the need for new housing. Any new housing should be constructed away from the town of Retford. The town is almost crippled at certain points in the day due to the already strained road network. The creation of two new villages at the identified sites should be the chosen option.	Housing land availability is being assessed, and will include land submitted for consideration in Retford, which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. As part of this process the Highways Authority will be consulted on the impact on the road network. Support for the garden villages is noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP255	Home Builders Federation	<p>The housing requirement in Policy 2 should be expressed as a minimum figure. The derivation of 390 dwellings per annum is not transparent. The latest OAN is set out in North Derbyshire & Bassetlaw OAN Update Final Report October 2017. This concludes with an OAN in Bassetlaw of 374 dwellings per annum (see Table 92) based on a demographic calculation comprising of 2014 Sub National Population Projections (SNPP) plus adjustments for 10 year migration trends & household formation rates in younger age groups (340 dwellings per annum set out in Table 17) plus an uplift to enhance affordable housing delivery. There is no uplift associated with economic growth as the baseline job growth (2,600 jobs) scenario equals a housing growth of 341 dwellings per annum (see Table 30). As the Council has reset the plan start date at 2018 rather than 2014 it is assumed that housing delivery shortfalls between 2014 – 2018 have been added to the OAN of 374 dwellings per annum between 2014 – 2035 using a Liverpool approach which results in the figure of 390 dwellings per annum. Under the revised NPPG (ID 3-044) if the Council wishes to deal with past under delivery over a longer period than 5 years using a Liverpool rather than Sedgefield approach then this should be considered as part of the Local Plan Examination. It is noted that there may be a disconnection between the Council's proposed housing and economic strategies. The demographic led OAN of 340 dwellings per annum equals the baseline job growth (2,600 jobs) scenario of 341 dwellings per annum but is 77 dwellings per annum less than the 417 dwellings per annum resulting from the jobs-led (4,800 jobs) scenario (see Table 31). The OAN of 374 dwellings per annum after the affordability adjustment is also less than the jobs led scenario by 43 dwellings per annum. The missed opportunity for more housing growth should not harm economic growth ambitions. The 2019 NPPF sets out that overarching economic and social objectives</p>	<p>Paragraphs 6.5 to 6.13 of the Bassetlaw Plan set out the method used to determine the housing requirement for the District from 2018 to 2035. G L Hearn reviewed the housing requirement as part of the Economic Development Needs Assessment. This resulted in a housing requirement of 390 dwellings per annum, which is significantly more than the standard method housing need figure of 306 dwellings per annum. With regard to the 306 dpa, the Council considers that this is a minimum requirement. With regard to a contingency to the overall housing land supply, the Council has applied a discount to take into lapsed rates from 2010 onwards. This would result in an over-supply of housing by a minimum of 767 new homes (12% of the housing requirement). Further to this, the Council has not applied a windfall allowance. Windfall sites have historically provided a large percentage of the new homes delivered since 2010 because the Council has not allocated land for housing. The flexibility of local and national planning policies should enable sustainable housing development to continue to come forward on windfall sites.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>should be pursued in mutually supportive ways to achieve sustainable development (para 8). The positive and proactive encouragement of sustainable economic growth should address potential barriers to investment such as inadequate housing provision (paras 81a & 81c). The Local Plan will be examined under 2019 NPPF and revised NPPG. As set out in the 2019 NPPF the determination of the minimum number of homes needed should be informed by a local housing need assessment using the Government's standard methodology unless exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach (para 60). Refers to the standard methodology in the revised NPPG (ID 2a-004). Using this methodology the OAN is 324 dwellings per annum based on 2014 Sub National Household Projections (SNHP) & 2017 affordability ratio of 5.8 (see Table 93). This OAN figure increases to 329 dwellings per annum based on 2014 SNHP & 2018 affordability ratio of 6.04 in accordance with the methodology set out in the revised NPPG (ID 2a-004 & 2a-005). This figure is the minimum starting point. Any ambitions to support economic growth, to deliver affordable housing and to meet unmet housing needs from elsewhere are additional to the local housing need figure. The Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes remains (para 59). It is important that housing need is not under-estimated. The Council is encouraged to have an ambitious plan for housing growth in order to support economic growth. At the time of the pre-submission consultation if the Council's OAN calculation or proposed housing requirement change the HBF may wish to submit further comments.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP255	Home Builders Federation	<p>As set out in the 2019 NPPF the strategic policies of the Local Plan should provide a clear strategy to bring sufficient land forward and at a sufficient rate to address housing needs over the plan period by planning for and allocating sufficient sites to deliver strategic priorities (para 23). The Council should have a clear understanding of land availability in the plan area by preparing a SHLAA which should be used to identify a sufficient supply and mix of housing sites taking into account availability, suitability and economic viability. The policies of the Local Plan should identify a supply of specific deliverable sites for years 1 – 5 of the plan period and specific developable sites or broad locations for growth for years 6 – 10 and where possible years 11 – 15 (para 67). The identification of deliverable and developable sites should accord with the definitions set out in the 2019 NPPF Glossary. The Council should also identify at least 10% of the housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare or else demonstrate strong reasons for not achieving this target (para 68). The Local Plan should include a trajectory illustrating the expected rate of housing delivery over the plan period. A minimum 5 years supply of specific deliverable sites including a buffer should be maintained (paras 73 & 74). The proposed housing requirement will be distributed in accordance with the spatial strategy. It is noted that there is no contingency in the Council's overall HLS. Should provide flexibility in its planned HLS to respond to changing circumstances, to treat the housing requirement as a minimum rather than a maximum and to provide choice and competition in the land market. The HBF acknowledge that there can be no numerical formula to determine the appropriate quantum for a flexibility contingency but where a Plan is highly dependent upon one or relatively few large strategic sites or a specific settlement / locality greater numerical flexibility is necessary than in cases where HLS is more diversified. The HBF suggests</p>	<p>The methods used to assess the delivery of housing fully accord with the requirements of the NPPF. Housing land supply will continue to be reviewed as necessary.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>as large a contingency as possible (at least 20%) because as any proposed contingency becomes smaller so any built-in flexibility reduces. If during the Local Plan Examination any of the Council's assumptions on lapse rates, windfall allowances and delivery rates are adjusted or any proposed housing site allocations are found unsound then any proposed contingency is eroded.</p>	
DBLP255	Home Builders Federation	<p>Policy 2: Housing and Economic Growth proposes that 10% of the housing requirement will be delivered on sites of 1 hectare or less. A wide range of sites by both size and market locations should provide access to suitable land for small local, medium regional and large national housebuilding companies which will offer the widest possible range of products to households to access different types of dwellings to meet their housing needs. Housing delivery is maximised where a wide mix of sites provides choice for consumers, allows places to grow in sustainable ways and creates opportunities to diversify the construction sector. The HBF would not wish to comment on individual sites selected for allocation but it is critical that the Council's assumptions on lapse rates, non-implementation allowances, lead in times and delivery rates contained within its overall HLS, 5 YHLS and trajectory are correct and realistic. These assumptions should be supported by parties responsible for delivery of housing and sense checked by the Council using historical empirical data and local knowledge. The two new</p>	<p>The Council agrees that the site allocations, where possible, should be a range of sizes to meet the needs of small, medium, and large-scale developers. The land supply calculations are robust because they are based on historical delivery data and close liaison with landowners/developers via the Land Availability Assessment process. The Council is aware of the requirements of the NPPF and will ensure that an up to date 5 year housing land supply statement is published as required.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>settlements should be considered as part of a wide portfolio of allocated housing sites to ensure delivery of housing growth in the short and longer term. New settlements may address some of the District's housing need but delivery would be towards the end of the Local Plan period. The Council should provide evidence of its 5 YHLS position on adoption of the Local Plan. The HBF's preferences are a 20% buffer applied to the housing requirement and the recouping of past shortfalls within the first 5 years (a Sedgefield approach). If the Council wishes to deal with past under delivery over a longer period than 5 years (a Liverpool approach) then this should be considered as part of the Local Plan Examination as set out in the revised NPPG (ID 3-044).</p>	
DBLP258	Broadgrove Planning and Development Ltd on behalf of MLN Land and Properties Ltd	<p>Pleased to see a housing target which is higher than the Standard Methodology, do not consider that the target proposed is sufficient to meet housing needs in full and support unconstrained economic growth. The Initial Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan proposed a minimum housing requirement of 435 dwellings per annum. The background paper published in support identified that in order to meet the jobs target set by the Strategic Economic Plan for Sheffield, the housing requirement for Bassetlaw would need to be between 554 and 629 dwellings. No explanation has been provided as to why the economic aspirations have reduced so significantly between the Initial Draft of the Local Plan and the current draft of the Local Plan. The Plan states that the target of 390 dwellings per annum reflects an economic-led housing requirement based on an Oxford Economics midpoint forecast of labour demand. The Oxford Economics midpoint forecast has been selected as the preferred expected future economic scenario, it is notably the lowest of the three economic forecasts considered by the EDNA. An economic-led housing</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The method for calculating the housing requirement accords with the Housing and Economic Need PPG. The Council will ensure that the Plan continues to accord with the NPPF and PPG.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>requirement based on midpoint growth Experian forecasts equates to a need for 456 dwellings per annum, whilst an economic-led housing requirement based on midpoint growth Cambridge Econometrics forecasts equates to a need for 493 dwellings per annum. An average of the three different midpoint economic-led scenarios considered in the EDNA would equate to a housing requirement of 446 dwellings per annum. Contrary to the aims of the NPPF, adopting a housing requirement of 390 dwellings per annum based on the Oxford Economics midpoint forecast has the potential to restrict growth of the Bassetlaw and Sheffield City Region economies. To meet affordable housing net needs in full, the SHMA (2017) advises an overall housing requirement of 670 dpa. The proposed target of 390 dwellings per annum will fall significantly short of meeting identified affordable housing needs in Bassetlaw. It is clear, based on the available evidence, that the total dwelling requirement set by Policy 2 is not ambitious, will not support unconstrained economic growth, will not significantly boost the supply of housing and will not address identified housing needs. The Draft Plan as proposed is unsound.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP258	Broadgrove Planning and Development Ltd on behalf of MLN Land and Properties Ltd	<p>Strategic Objective 1 states that “Development in Bassetlaw will be distributed across the district, ensuring towns and villages grow at rate and scale commensurate to their defined role.” Policy 1 identifies Retford as the second largest town in Bassetlaw, only behind the largest Worksop. Figure 1 identifies Retford as being geographically located within the centre of the district and well connected to the district’s transport network – Retford is connected to the East Coast Mainline and the Sheffield to Cleethorpes/Lincoln railway line, as well as the A1. It represents one of the most sustainable settlements in the district and plays a vital role in serving the district’s rural communities. In spite of its size, position/role within the district, and its sustainable transport connections, Policy 2 allocates just 13% of the total housing requirement (853 dwellings) to Retford; the smallest requirement of any of the five strands. The NPPF and NPPG do not provide guidance on how housing need should be distributed in a Local Plan.</p> <p>Without such guidance, it is down to the Council to establish a distribution to support the Vision and Objectives of the Local Plan. The resulting distribution will inevitably represent a policy response to meeting identified need, it must be realistic, rational and soundly-based. The level of development in Retford over the 17-year plan period is less than half the number of homes which have been delivered in Retford over the past 10 years – the Council’s monitoring data shows that 1,002 homes have been completed in Retford between 2008/09 and 2016/17. It is clear that there is a strong market demand for housing in Retford, as acknowledged by paragraph 10.6. The housing target proposed for Retford does not reflect current market signals. The 2011 Census, the usual resident population of Retford was 22,023, equivalent to 20% of the district population. Of these, 21,742 lived in 9,828 households, with the remainder living in communal establishments. This</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make amendments where necessary.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>equates to an average household size of 2.2 persons per household. The households were accommodated in 10,293 dwellings which equates to a vacancy rate of 4.6%. Between 2011 and 2035 the 2014-based household projections suggest that the average household size in Bassetlaw will fall from 2.3 to 2.2 persons per household. Applying the same proportional decrease to the average household size in Retford, the average household size in the town would be 2.1 by 2035. There would be a need to provide an additional 549 dwellings to accommodate an additional 525 households within the existing population alone as people live in smaller household groups (including children moving out of the family home, older people living alone following the death of a partner, increased levels of household breakdown and young people choosing to live alone). The proposed housing requirement of 853 dwellings allows for very limited growth in the population of Retford over the 17-year plan period. Linked to its role as an important infrastructure and service centre for the wider District, the Plan recognises the importance of increasing the viability and vitality of the town centre of Retford. The housing target for Retford will do little more than maintain the status quo in terms of the population size of the town. Contrary to the objectives of the Local Plan, this will be of detriment to the viability of businesses within Retford. Having regard to the size, function and sustainability of Retford, combined with the clear market demand/need for housing in the town, level of housing in Retford is too low. To deliver its Objectives and Vision, the housing proposed to be delivered in Retford must be increased.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP266	Broadgrove Planning and Development Ltd on behalf of MLN Land and Properties Ltd	<p>Pleased to see a housing target which is higher than the Standard Methodology, do not consider that the target proposed is sufficient to meet housing needs in full and support unconstrained economic growth. The Initial Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan proposed a minimum housing requirement of 435 dwellings per annum. The background paper published in support identified that in order to meet the jobs target set by the Strategic Economic Plan for Sheffield, the housing requirement for Bassetlaw would need to be between 554 and 629 dwellings. No explanation has been provided as to why the economic aspirations have reduced so significantly between the Initial Draft of the Local Plan and the current draft of the Local Plan. The Plan states that the target of 390 dwellings per annum reflects an economic-led housing requirement based on an Oxford Economics midpoint forecast of labour demand. The Oxford Economics midpoint forecast has been selected as the preferred expected future economic scenario, it is notably the lowest of the three economic forecasts considered by the EDNA. An economic-led housing requirement based on midpoint growth Experian forecasts equates to a need for 456 dwellings per annum, whilst an economic-led housing requirement based on midpoint growth Cambridge Econometrics forecasts equates to a need for 493 dwellings per annum. An average of the three different midpoint economic-led scenarios considered in the EDNA would equate to a housing requirement of 446 dwellings per annum. Contrary to the aims of the NPPF, adopting a housing requirement of 390 dwellings per annum based on the Oxford Economics midpoint forecast has the potential to restrict growth of the Bassetlaw and Sheffield City Region economies. To meet affordable housing net needs in full, the SHMA (2017) advises an overall housing requirement of 670 dpa. The proposed target of 390 dwellings per annum will fall</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Bassetlaw EDNA provides evidence which justifies the housing requirement. The assessment accords with the NPPF and Housing and Economic Needs PPG.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>significantly short of meeting identified affordable housing needs in Bassetlaw. It is clear, based on the available evidence, that the total dwelling requirement set by Policy 2 is not ambitious, will not support unconstrained economic growth, will not significantly boost the supply of housing and will not address identified housing needs. The Draft Plan as proposed is unsound.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP266	Broadgrove Planning and Development Ltd on behalf of MLN Land and Properties Ltd	<p>Strategic Objective 1 of the Plan states that “Development in Bassetlaw will be distributed across the district, ensuring towns and villages grow at rate and scale commensurate to their defined role.” Policy 1 identifies Harworth and Bircotes as a local regeneration centre, and acknowledgement of the opportunity to focus investment and new development to support the regeneration of Bassetlaw’s third largest settlement. Figure 1 identifies Harworth as being geographically located within the north of the district and has excellent connections to South Yorkshire and the A1. It serves an important role for facilities to support a large number of rural villages in the north of Bassetlaw. Despite the focus for regeneration the level of housing is disproportionate to the level of employment land being provided across the district. Figure 3 shows that 28% of the employment land for the district is to be proposed in Harworth and Bircotes but only 21% of the housing. Given the recognition of the plan to strengthen its role as a local infrastructure and service centre for the northeast of the district this brings into question the overall housing target and lack of ambition for economic growth – contradictory to the aims of regenerating the town. There needs to be sufficient housing to accommodate and assist the potential that exists for new economic investment and development. This needs to be increased from the level proposed. The NPPF and NPPG do not provide guidance on how housing need should be distributed in a Local Plan. Without such guidance, it is down to the Council to establish a distribution to support the Vision and Objectives of the Local Plan. The resulting distribution will represent a policy response to meeting identified need, it must be realistic, rational and soundly-based. As proposed, there is a significant disparity of future development across the north and south of the district. 52% of new housing development is proposed across the south</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make amendments where necessary.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>of the district (including 2 new villages which are both proposed in the south of the district). If there is a real intent to regenerate Harworth and Bircotes and see a step change of housing delivery there should be greater focus on housing in the north of the district. A more appropriate strategy would be for greater development to be focussed around Harworth and it is questionable why two new villages are proposed to the south of the district. A more appropriate solution would be for a significant increase in growth around Harworth and Bircotes to create another rural hub town of a similar status to Retford in the north of the district. Between 2011 and 2035 the 2014-based household projections suggest that the average household size in Bassetlaw will fall from 2.3 to 2.2 persons per household. Applying the same proportional decrease to the average household size in Harworth, the average household size in the town would be 2.17 by 2035. As a result, would need to provide around 200 additional dwellings to accommodate the additional households within the existing population alone as people live in smaller household groups (including children moving out of the family home, older people living alone following the death of a partner, increased levels of household breakdown and young people choosing to live alone). Linked to its role as an important infrastructure and service centre for the wider District, the Plan recognises the importance of regeneration. The need to see a step change in housing delivery is needed to provide housing numbers but to ensure the delivery of the necessary infrastructure for to assist the economic growth. The delivery of improvements to the transport network, new education provision and other essential local services, as identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan will only be realised through significant additional housing growth. Having regard to the regeneration aspirations and economic potential of Harworth and Bircotes, that level of</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		housing to be delivered in Harworth is too low. In order for the plan to deliver its Objectives and Vision, the housing proposed to be delivered in Harworth must be increased.	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP270	Individual	<p>Page 52 confirms that “there has been persistent under delivery of housing up to year 2015/16. Over the years of the Core Strategy, the annual housing requirement has only been achieved twice (monitoring years 2016/17 and 2017/18” (7.9). New/draft formulae for calculating the 5 year deliverable supply, has enabled Bassetlaw to eradicate the backlog of delivery on account of low affordability ratios. The LPA cannot continue asking for the AH contributions put forward by the SHMA whilst at the same time scrubbing the backlog of delivery because a widely criticised and possibly short-lived formula, states that the district is an affordable place to live. The reason behind Bassetlaw’s inability to deliver sufficient housing over the previous decade has in no small part been the myopic insistence that all development should be in the urban centres. It was only the lack of five year supply that allowed development in rural locations to occur at all. The LPA should allow this successful trend to continue but must differentiate between rural settlements allowing hitherto Rural Service Centres grow by up to 30%. The “need” for Garden Villages – if there is one – should be examined by the subsequent Local Plan allowing Bevercotes and Gamston to come forward as employment sites during this LP.</p>	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP271	Individual	<p>Supported. So long as it includes social housing. We also need bungalows. In a few years time there will be more people in Worksop retiring, but will not be able to downsize due to lack of properties.</p>	<p>Policy 4 Housing Mix will ensure that all housing sites provide a mix of housing tenures, types and sizes appropriate to the site size and needs of the area. This could include affordable housing and specific house types such as bungalows. The need for different types of properties will reflect that set out in the Bassetlaw Strategic Housing Market Assessment.</p>
DBLP281	Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England	<p>NPPF para 68 refers to supporting the development of windfall sites. It is unclear how Bassetlaw intend to support the development of windfall sites given the Local Plan does not have a strategic policy on windfall sites, include any calculation</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. It is not considered necessary to include a specific windfall policy because the Plan is flexible enough to enable the delivery of this type of development.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		of the potential contribution of windfall to housing land supply or incorporate windfall options in housing policies. Windfall sites are only mentioned as an option for Neighbourhood Plan steering groups (at 8.14). There should be a strategic policy on windfall sites.	
DBLP287	Sheffield City Region	The LEPs Strategic Economic Plan sets out the economic ambitions and targets to deliver growth across the SCR seeking to create new jobs and attractive places to work, reside and spend leisure time. The SEP has a target to create 70,000 new jobs over 2015-25 and increase GVA in the City Region by 10% or £3bn and create an additional 6000 businesses. The intention is to have the revised SEP in place by summer 2019 although evidence suggests the targets are likely to remain. Analysis of the SEP targets suggests that Bassetlaw could be well placed to contribute up to 3700 of the 70,000 new jobs with particular potential in the logistics sector as well as jobs growth across the retail, tourism/visitor economy and health sectors. The Plan seeks to deliver 8ha of employment land a year – 136ha 2018-2035. This is above several economic forecasts in the EDNA and reflects the levels of growth experienced in Bassetlaw over recent years. Acknowledge the limitations in translating land requirements into absolute job figures but recognise the important contribution that these elements of the Plan would make to the economic ambitions set by the LEP and support the job targets in the SEP. Planning to deliver employment land at the higher end of future growth scenarios combined with a strategy that exploits regional and sub regional assets, demonstrates the ambition for new development in Bassetlaw and the role it can continue to play in the SCR economy. Note the positive approach taken to the A1 corridor with a focus on Harworth and Bircotes as well as proposals for two Garden Villages. The A1 Corridor is identified by the LEP as a key growth area for the City Region focused in	Support for the approach taken to employment provision and identification of links to the SEP are welcome. Recognition that the housing target reflects the LEPs growth ambitions is positive and welcomed.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>particular on logistics, with the potential to attract regional and national operations. The success of this area will add significantly to the offer of the city region and ensure a stronger and more competitive economy. As such the LEP and MCA will continue to work closely with Bassetlaw to promote their development seeking to support further investment in infrastructure to enable land to be brought forward to maximise opportunities. The LEP and MCA also emphasised the important role that housing plays in creating the right conditions for growth, seeking to support an increase in housing delivery by unlocking sites through use of infrastructure funding as well as the creation of a dedicated SCR Housing Fund. Support the housing ambitions including the two Garden Villages which would complement similar proposals in other SCR districts and create a unique residential offer for the SCR. The housing target is above and beyond the local housing need calculation and reflects the LEPs growth ambitions as well as the need to provide for current communities.</p>	
DBLP292	969674	Support for new employment land	Support for amount of employment land noted.
DBLP296	975737	No support for overall strategy.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP296	975737	Support for 6630 new homes provided that a lot of smaller homes are delivered for first time buyers and people wanting to downsize.	Policy 4 Housing Mix will ensure that all housing sites provide a mix of housing tenures, types and sizes appropriate to the site size and needs of the area. This could include affordable housing and specific house types such as bungalows. The need for different types of properties will reflect that set out in the Bassetlaw Strategic Housing Market Assessment.
DBLP296	975737	Support for employment land;	Support for amount of employment land noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP301	977042	No support for 6630 homes. Infrastructure/services cannot sustain this level of growth. More roads are needed. Bassetlaw is supposed to be green - what about green spaces?	As part of the site selection process all infrastructure providers will be consulted, including the Highways Authority to make sure that any adverse impacts on infrastructure can be mitigated. Protection of green spaces is covered by Policies 18-20
DBLP301	977042	No support for new employment. There are currently lots of empty industrial units.	The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure all types of economic growth and associated jobs can be delivered in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of different types of employment growth in the future. This includes the re-use of existing buildings where appropriate.
DBLP303	978627	Whilst I support the need to cater for increased housing demand, perhaps other locations could be considered.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP303	978627	No support for new employment. Although there may be opportunities on the periphery of Gamston Airfield.	As part of the site selection process, a range of sites will be assessed for employment use including land adjacent to Gamston airfield. This will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP308	986480	No support for more housing and employment land	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP314	987642	No support for employment policy. This should be increased so that workers do not have to commute out of the District.	The level of employment land reflects the range of need identified by the Council's Economic Development Needs Assessment. The amount of employment land identified is a minimum - a higher amount of land would not necessarily prevent residents commuting out of the District, as there will always be a percentage of people who live and work in different locations.
DBLP314	987642	While the figures can be accepted it is how you intend to deliver this by ensuring existing centers are Tuxford, Harworth, Worksop and Retford can be developed providing prosperity to very ailing heart of Bassetlaw.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP315	987680	Support proposed level of housing	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP315	987680	Support proposed level of employment. Strongly believe should be working with Gamston to make the airfield case even stronger, develop more business there, and include the community in events. Events such as fly ins, airshows, perhaps even bigger events should as concerts could be performed within the grounds. Direct access to the A1 make it perfectly located to handle masses of traffic. Should be looking to improve such sites, not remove them and build on them.	Support for level of employment noted. An analysis of the economic value of the airport is being undertaken which will inform the approach taken in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP317	987880	Support. Support housing expansion at both Worksop and Harworth and future proposals in the rural villages. Propose that when future site allocation proposals come forward for Retford the Bassetlaw plan should include planning policies that say there will be NO expansion of Retford beyond the current boundaries of the town. There should be specific reference made to agricultural land adjoining Ordsall, Bracken Lane, Tiln Lane, Bigsby Road and neighbouring streets.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing land availability, which will include land submitted for consideration in Retford. This will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP317	987880	Not sure about this as it depends where it will be. I don't agree if it's near housing and if it's really noisy.	The next version of the Local Plan will include planning policies on a range of matters including protecting residential amenity. This should help ensure that pollution and noise and the impacts on neighbours are managed appropriately.
DBLP318	987892	Support. I support the proposal for housing expansion at both Worksop and Harworth and the rural villages. I propose that when future site allocation proposals come forward for Retford the Bassetlaw plan should include planning policies that say there will be NO expansion of Retford beyond the current boundaries of the town. There should be specific reference made to agricultural land adjoining Ordsall and Bracken Lane, Tiln Lane Bigsby Road and neighbouring streets.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing land availability, which will include land submitted for consideration in Retford. This will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP318	987892	Support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP319	987959	Support for number of homes proposed.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP319	987959	No support for new employment.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP326	988057	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP326	988057	Support, but not at the expense of the loss of Gamston Airport.	Support for approach to employment land is noted. The Council has reviewed comments received and new evidence, including new sites submitted for consideration.
DBLP328	988061	Do not support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP336	988172	No support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP336	988172	No support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP339	988184	No support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP343	988216	Support	Support for approach to employment land is noted.
DBLP345	988237	Support	Support for approach to employment land is noted.
DBLP346	988247	No support. No - its just a way to keep the building trade going - look around all business parks built over the years and see just how many units empty !!!! mixed small areas of employment and homes a lot more sustainable and maybe less need for transport to work	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP346	988247	Potential support. Only if it includes leaving Gamston (Retford) Airport as a proper working airport - in which there is already employment and thriving businesses there is already land that's been derelict for years - the old colliery sat there waiting to be used - close to A1 junction !!!!	Support for approach to employment land is noted. An analysis of the aviation and economic value of the Airport is being undertaken and this will inform the next version of the Local Plan. Support for development of Bevercotes Colliery is noted.
DBLP349	988325	Support	Support for approach to employment land is noted.
DBLP351	988346	Do not believe the housing demand for this volume of new builds is required in the Retford area as opposed to Worksop. In principle some development could take place at the Gamston airfield site but should be viewed as an enhancement for air operations with any major housebuilding taking place at alternative Brownfield sites	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP351	988346	There could still be infrastructure development in the vicinity of Gamston Airport that supports employment but leaves the airfield and runways available for continued use by GA.	An analysis of the aviation and economic value of the Airport is being undertaken and this will inform the next version of the Local Plan.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP352	988350	No support. No, Retford already has a large number of housing developments, further housing is not required and in my opinion, can not be supported by the current school, infrastructure and services in the area. A housing development is likely to only benefit the construction company and not the local community.	The Council is currently reviewing land availability, which will include land submitted for consideration in Retford. This will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. All infrastructure providers will be consulted on the sites to ensure that the level of housing mitigates impacts on the area's infrastructure.
DBLP352	988350	No support for policy. I support the current employment land based at Gamston Aerodrome to which is regularly visited by many of the local residents in Retford. Destroying these businesses will be a travesty to the local community and an embarrassment to Bassetlaw District Council.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)	Cannot guarantee all Neighbourhood plans in progress will / can deliver site allocations, that means more space will need to be found. Para 6.23 the use of Windfall developments will be / must be more in existence. Unless this plan infers mandatory site allocations made by the Council only.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. There has been on average, 92 new homes per annum built in the rural areas since 2010. This is with more restrictive policies in place. Given the flexibility of the proposed policies, it is expected that this trend will continue.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)	Neighbourhood Plan Delivery: Does this mean Bassetlaw will overwrite / over-rule Parishes with Neighbourhood Plans who could not get offered site allocations that meet the criteria set by the Neighbourhood Plan area and enforce the use of those offered sites despite the express wishes of the people of the parish that they were not suitable. That action simply overrules the need for Neighbourhood Plans.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. Neighbourhood Plans are required to accord with Local Plans and national plans, this includes delivering housing to meet the needs of the community. If neighbourhood plans do not allocate sites the Council will need to consider if it is necessary to allocate suitable sites.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)	Item 4, says 18 Hectares of land is required for economic development for rural settlements. Where is the allocation by settlement of this 18 hectares, what is being impressed upon us.	The Council is currently reviewing employment land availability. This will inform the site allocation in the rural area in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)	Don't support. Can only really take your calculation for it, have no personal basis on which to make a judgement.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)	Don't support. Can only really take your calculation for it, have no personal basis on which to make a judgement.	The employment land requirement is set out in the Council's Economic Development Needs Assessment. It is based on the methodology set out in national planning guidance on Housing and Economic Needs Assessments.
DBLP359	988461	No I do not, this is not an ethical proposal. This is purely for economic demand and profit.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP360	988474	Drastically underestimates both the scale of potential job losses and the value of the airport in providing highly specialised services to the local and national economy. Section 3.2 of the plan states that "The single significant negative effect relates to the loss of employment land through cessation of airport operations. However, the scale of employment opportunities is likely to be relatively limited" and goes on to say that new jobs will be created in the 'garden village' that would replace the airport. Any jobs created in a 'garden village' are likely to be low skilled, smaller in number and far lower paid than those provided by existing airport, technology, pilot training and service industries currently based at Retford Airport. The following list has been compiled from publicly available data to describe some of the service, engineering, pilot training and technology sector businesses based at Retford airport, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A provider of full service airborne sensing solutions that operates a fleet of 10 'special mission' equipped aircraft fulfilling government and European agency contracts for airborne intelligence, surveillance & reconnaissance and aerial survey work. • The European headquarters of a multinational company who have a reputation as world leaders in providing flight inspection, navigation, communication and calibration services for air transportation. • Aircraft continuing airworthiness management, sales & contract maintenance. • Ground handling services for visiting business aircraft, passengers and pilots. • The UK & Eire distributor for aircraft manufactured by 	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>Diamond Aircraft Industries of Austria.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Five separate businesses are engaged in pilot training to European Aviation Safety Agency and Civil Aviation Authority standards, aircraft rental and trial flying lessons for local people. • An excellent café and restaurant. • A number of other local businesses, including providers of engineering and aviation services rely on the airport and visiting aircraft as a source of work. <p>Nottinghamshire Police use the site (between 12 and 15 times per annum) to deliver advanced driver training in tactical pursuit and containment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aircraft owners and the Retford-Gamston based flying schools demonstrate a socially responsible approach to engaging with the wider community to improve knowledge of STEM subjects. For example, a recent children's charity day involving educational activities and a flying experience for local children. 	
DBLP363	988482	No support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP363	988482	Support	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP364	988487	Support for the number of homes proposed	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP364	988487	No support for the proposed amount of employment	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP372	988501	Do no support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP372	988501	Support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP373	988503	Support the need for more homes, but I do not support the location of Retford Gamston Airport as a site for a new village or any location which would impact on the Airport Operations.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP373	988503	No support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP375	988527	No support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP375	988527	No support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP376	988557	Support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP376	988557	Support	Support for employment land targets welcome.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP380	988631	No support. Compared to the amount of jobs that would be lost (pilots, trainers, cafe staff, staff in other businesses), it is not enough to replace. And the majority of the new jobs would be unskilled or low skilled. These pilots have trained for years and invested thousands of pounds in their own training.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP384	988726	Subject to a fair and reasonable distribution within the area of proposed housing rather than larger developments that put pressure on local amenities	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP384	988726	Don't support. Wonder whether an annual allocation of 22.4 acres is sufficient to satisfy future annual growth ? Would like to see a greater variety of development types including for smaller and medium sizes businesses rather than all being taken up by larger distribution users. Would also like to see a wider distribution of commercial development land throughout the district , rather than too much concentration in several larger sites	The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure all types of economic growth and associated jobs can be delivered in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of different types of employment growth in the future. This includes the space for small and medium sized businesses. An assessment of employment land availability for the District is being undertaken. This will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP386	988747	Support. Yes but development to be within villages. Especially between East Markham and Tuxford.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP386	988747	Support. The employment development however should be to create real jobs not just warehousing / distribution where staff are paid minimum wage and are unable to buy homes	The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure all types of economic growth and associated jobs can be delivered in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of different types of employment growth in the future. This includes space for a range of business opportunities to ensure a diverse mix of jobs can be delivered to meet local needs and aspirations.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP387	988748	No support. 6630 extra homes - how many extra vehicles? What new roads are being built to ease traffic flow? How much extra energy needed for electricity and heating?	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP388	988749	No support. I think there should be lots more houses built than that but in existing developed areas eg East Markham, Tuxford, Askham, Darlton etc.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP388	988749	No support. Needs to be more to create sustainable communities with quality employment opportunities rather than distribution centres which only offer low quality employment.	The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure all types of economic growth and associated jobs can be delivered in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of different types of employment growth in the future. This includes space for a range of business opportunities to ensure a diverse mix of jobs can be delivered to meet local needs and aspirations.
DBLP389	988774	No support. Do not know enough to be able to answer this, just know that doing so on Retford /Gamston airport is detrimental.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP389	988774	No support. Do not know enough to be able to answer this, just know that doing so on Retford /Gamston airport is detrimental.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP391	988813	Support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP391	988813	Support	Support for approach to employment land noted.
DBLP392	988889	Do not support the concentration of housing in one area.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP392	988889	Support	Support for approach to employment land noted.
DBLP393	989007	Support. But only private development with affordable housing included.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP393	989007	Use whatever land you want so long as it is not agricultural nor recreational. Look around the world and see what other nations are doing - good example is 'Lakeside' development at Doncaster.	An employment land availability assessment is being undertaken to inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. The loss of high quality agricultural land will be minimised. The loss of recreational land will be avoided where practicable.
DBLP394	989023	No support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP394	989023	No support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP398	989658	No support. Who are these homes for? At the consultation I was told for people who live at home with their parents. Will they be affordable housing then if this is the target population? Seems unlikely.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP398	989658	No support. Insufficient to support the number of new homes and existing population.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP399	989741	Support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP399	989741	Support	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP402	990030	Don't support. It is considered that this will neither meet housing needs or provide sufficient flexibility to ensure delivery of sufficient housing. Any housing target should be a minimum housing delivery target rather than become a constraint to delivery.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP402	990030	Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP403	990043	Support. Is this enough?	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP403	990043	Support. Any new employment to the area would be a boost for communities	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP404	990059	Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP404	990059	Support	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP405	990062	Support. I appreciate that homes are needed but believe that there are better locations, especially than Gamston - the 2 power stations are due to close, how seriously have these been considered? The figure of 390 is an average not the actual number that would be built in a year and is misleading	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP405	990062	Don't support. There is insufficient information to show support or otherwise for this question. Do not know how much space is required for a business to operate so would not know if 136 hectares is appropriate. B1, B2, B8 business types all require a good road (and ideally rail) network. The local plan does not identify where this would be sited. There are 2 A roads in an east/west direction - the A57 and the A631 and in a northerly route the A1, A614 and A60 are the options. It does not appear that if the employment land is for B1, B2, B8 use that these corridors are being used - the A1 being the only one that could logically be improved to cope. 'A', C and D businesses could be located more randomly but would logically need to be in the vicinity of the significant housing developments if they are not to become large estates but this will not support the town centres. Town centres need the investment.	The Economic Development needs Assessment provides indicative guidance on the amount of floorspace that could be accommodated by different types of employment development. An employment land availability assessment is being undertaken and will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. It is acknowledged that good access is important for many businesses. The next version of the Local Plan will include policies that promote Town Centres and appropriate development within their boundaries.
DBLP410	990076	Do not support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP410	990076	Support.	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP411	990079	No support. Surely restoring/ renovating some empty properties would be better use of resources. As these properties already have the necessary services connected. Renovation could incorporate more energy efficient solutions.thus not decreasing farm land and encroaching on the countryside. Causing less impact on the environment and the wildlife it supports.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. Empty properties are already taken into account in the calculation of housing need.
DBLP411	990079	No support. No because of the impact on wildlife etc as stated above. Also surely post Brexit we need to be more self sustaining and need to use farmland more efficiently not just build houses on it !!!!!	An employment land availability assessment is being undertaken and will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. One area for consideration wil be the impact upon the natural environment including wildlife sites. The loss of high quality agricultural land will be minimised where practicable.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP415	990150	<p>The respondent does not object to the proposed housing provision of 6630 dwellings but does not support the allocation of 1000 dwellings from this total to a largely speculative new village proposal. If the Council is keen to support the new villages proposal, then it should not be at the expense of Retford which is considered to be under-provided in the emerging plan, and at the expense of flexibility in the rural settlement which individually or collectively provide essentials services and facilities that need to be preserved and where appropriate future proofed for expansion. The Draft local plan's consideration of the range of housing requirement options included an economic growth option of 417 dwellings per annum. This is not substantially higher than the currently suggested provision of 390 dwellings per annum yet could be supported to accommodate the new villages option which the respondent only considers to be feasible in a wider scenario of positive economic growth.</p>	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP415	990150	<p>The policy for rural economic growth is supported as long as Draft Policy 8 remains reflective of and compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework. Have no objection to the level of employment land proposed</p>	<p>The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure all types of economic growth and associated jobs can be delivered in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of different types of employment growth in the future. This employment in the rural area which will be consistent with the NPPF. Support for the employment land target is noted.</p>
DBLP416	990240	<p>Support. Yes, but in locations with good access to the major Road Links, not those within the Urban Areas as shown on the Plans. 136 hectares may or may not be sufficient, and could probably be met from existing "true" Brownfield Land. However, the proposal to change the Gamston Site's usage is not acceptable. Located on this Airfield are a number of highly technical business with 'high level jobs' that will be lost without</p>	<p>An employment land availability assessment is being undertaken and will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Based on the land submitted for consideration it is unlikely that the need can be made from brownfield land. Consideration also needs to be given to market demand for brownfield land. It is acknowledged that should Retford Gamston Airport close some aviation businesses may have to relocate out of the District. The</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		any guarantee that they will be replaced by jobs of a similar calibre. Gamston Site is not a 'Brownfield' site as there is an extensive use, or capability for use, as agricultural land in addition to the Industrialised Area and Employment created by the Gamston Airport based Companies.. As the UK enters the unsure grounds of Brexit we need to retain all of our current Agricultural Land for Food Production, and further encourage such use. 'Concreting over' is not the answer.	proposal is for some employment land to be provided on Gamston, it is not possible to determine the types of jobs that could be generated. The loss of high quality agricultural land will be minimised where practicable.
DBLP416	990240	Don't support. The Bassetlaw District Council has, I believe around 7.5 years of Land Stock for Housing. Added to this is the Report in September 2018 (Action on Empty Houses) that there are 1,292 Unoccupied and Substantially Unfurnished Properties in Bassetlaw, of which some 600 are classed as 'Long Term Empty' (over 6 months). These and other such properties should be brought into use before more land is taken for Housing. There has not been sufficient action taken to reduce the number of empty/underused properties within Bassetlaw.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. Empty properties are already taken into account in the calculation of housing need.
DBLP418	990387	Support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP418	990387	Support	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP419	990400	No support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP419	990400	Support	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP420	990465	Support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP420	990465	Support.	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP421	990489	Don't support. I want to see firm evidence of employment development before I would support this. The population growth figures provided in the Plan do not show that anything like this amount of housing is required. Would like to see a clear explanation for residents as to why this amount of housing is needed rather than the obscure justification given in the plan. There is a huge hole in this plan regarding the justification for building the number of houses proposed. If residents are to be asked to agree this then Bassetlaw need to	The employment land requirement is set out in the Council's Economic Development Needs Assessment. It is based on the methodology set out in national planning guidance on Housing and Economic Needs Assessments. The amount of housing required is based on a standard methodology that is provided by Government.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		give clear explanations as to why this amount of housing is necessary. The explanations for employment growth do not have anything like sufficient substance to justify the proposed housing figures.	
DBLP421	990489	Support	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP422	990506	Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP422	990506	Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP423	990541	Support. The homes are needed, but should be built in such a way as not to destroy existing infrastructure and jobs, such as those at Retford Gamston airfield	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP423	990541	Support.	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP424	990549	Don't support. There are already large new developments in South Yorkshire which are not selling; people want to live near jobs. Developing brown and greenfield sites into new houses from which people can commute to other towns and cities is counter-productive.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP424	990549	Don't support. There is already employment in the airfield which will be lost, affecting the local and wider region as fuel suppliers, maintenance companies, flight training schools, taxis and ground services lose their jobs. Bulldozing existing employment is not a good way to build new jobs.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP425	990570	Don't support. Too many.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP425	990570	Don't support. Is this code for more warehousing? Plus destroying an airfield removes existing employment land!	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP426	990571	Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP426	990571	Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP427	990577	Support. Too many people!	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP427	990577	Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP428	990594	Don't support. Too much for the area	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP428	990594	Don't support. Loss of airfield.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP429	990613	Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP429	990613	Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP430	990614	Support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP430	990614	Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP431	990633	Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP431	990633	Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP434	990659	Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP434	990659	Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP435	990666	Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP435	990666	Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP436	990682	Support. yes, but you need to think more carefully about the opportunity and ecological cost of the planned proposals Rethink the locations.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP436	990682	Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP437	990704	Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP437	990704	Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP438	990717	Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP438	990717	Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP439	990719	Don't support. There comes a point where a council has to say no to protect its residents. No everyone wants to live in a town / city we move to rural locations for a reason. The plan quotes health and wellbeing - building in rural locations does not help towards this it actually does the opposite.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP439	990719	Don't support. People dont want to work locally main communte to the citys - sheffield lincoln etc as the money and career prospects better. By moving the business from Gamston Airfield you are taking away everything you say you want to bring to the area.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP440	990764	Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP440	990764	Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP441	990783	Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP441	990783	Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP442	990799	Don't support. Are these homes really required? I think not, the Council is just complying with Government instructions.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP442	990799	Don't support. What employment? This would only apply during construction.	The Local Plan should provide for sufficient employment land to meet the needs of the District over the plan period. This is not just construction jobs but will also need to provide for jobs for those who work in offices, industry, manufacturing and other types of employment.
DBLP443	990800	Do not support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP443	990800	<p>Support the provision of 136 hectares of employment land across the district. Figure 3 sets out that 13% (18 hectares) of this will be provided within the rural settlements and 33% (45 hectares) is to be provided within Worksop. Support Policy 2 which confirms that this is a minimum figure and that it is expected that other sites will come forward within the plan period, this is in accordance with the NPPF which seeks to boost economic growth. Site at Carlton Forest does not lie in an existing rural settlement, it is located in an established employment location on the edge of Worksop. Greater support should be provided in the supporting text for sites in the rural area, but outside of rural settlements that are sustainably and well located to contribute to the Council's employment land supply. EDNA confirms that the Worksop Market has a high level of services and good transport infrastructure. The area is the key work destination concentrating 38% of the total employment of the District. Industrial activity in the district is focussed around Worksop. FCC's site which is 680m from the development boundary of Worksop is suitably located to contribute to economic growth through the provision of additional employment floorspace. The EDNA confirms there is a demand for small industrial units and that particularly for the industrial market there is high demand and short supply. Carlton Forest has outline planning permission for 6 units of circa 521m² each or 1 unit of circa 3000m² (B2 or B8 Use Class) which is able to meet this demand. A neighbouring site at Carlton Forest in the same ownership is able to deliver further employment floorspace of approximately 3,750m².</p>	<p>Support for the employment land targets is noted. Acknowledgement that this is a minimum figure is noted. The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure all types of economic growth and associated jobs can be delivered in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of different types of employment growth in the future. This will include employment growth in the rural area. An employment land availability assessment is being undertaken and will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan.</p>
DBLP444	990802	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP444	990802	Do not support. It is well-known that young people want to live in or near large cities not only for employment possibilities and access to universities and colleges but also for their leisure and retail activities. Two garden villages whilst providing new housing may not be too attractive to young employed people and so the new villages may have a predominance of older people who may not contribute directly to the local economy as much as they would if nearer to city conurbations. Many people will no doubt commute to local towns and cities and not to the Retford area. There should therefore be a focus around current centres of the population where there are appropriate employment opportunities and public services which could be expanded more easily and economically than setting up brand new standalone facilities in rural areas. Understand from local people who have lived in new villages elsewhere in the country that schools and other services and facilities are not provided until at least 10 years into a large house project.	Whilst some younger people may prefer to live and work in cities the Local Plan must make provision for those who may wish to live in other locations, or who may not be able to purchase a home in a city and may look further afield. Where possible new employment/housing will be identified in sustainable locations close to existing town centres and transport hubs. However, this is not always possible. Where sites are identified in other locations necessary infrastructure will be sought to ensure that residents have the opportunity to use other modes of transport and not just the private car. It is acknowledged that schools and other facilities provided by new development generally do not be provided until a quantum of homes have been developed when there is the funding available to support provision.
DBLP445	990806	Do not support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP445	990806	Do not support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP446	990814	Do not support. Out of the blue, villages in the area that deemed unsustainable last year are now required to have new build. No explanation for this change has been given. The plan has effectively run roughshod over many village neighbourhood plans, negating many hours of hard work.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP446	990814	Support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP447	990818	Do not support	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP447	990818	Do not support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP448	990826	Do not support. I can not support a plan for that number of new homes. The council should investigate whether other areas are better equipped to cope with an increase in new homes.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP448	990826	Support. I would be happy for the council to encourage new business to set up at the former Bevercotes Colliery site & also the Gamston airfield, as long as the roads are upgraded to cope with the increase in traffic.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP449	990829	Do not support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP449	990829	Do not support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP450	990836	Do not support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP450	990836	Support.	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP451	990837	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP451	990837	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP452	990841	Do not support. Why on earth would we need that many new homes in a rural area anyway?? There aren't the jobs or local amenities and facilities to support that number	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP452	990841	Do not support. Definitely not. People should not be put out of a job and made unemployed by any proposals.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP453		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP453	990842	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP454	990843	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP454	990843	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP455	990845	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan– Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP455	990845	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP456	990846	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP456	990846	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP457	990847	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP457	990847	Support.	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP458	990848	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP458	990848	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP459	990849	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP459	990849	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP460	990850	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP460	990850	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP461	990852	Support. Another site should be found rather than destroying the jobs and businesses at Gamston Airport.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP461	990852	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP462	990854	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP462	990854	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP463	990855	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP463	990855	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP464	990856	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP464	990856	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP465	990859	Support. But these should not be built on existing sites with businesses who are doing their best to support the community. The restaurant, many flying schools, freight and support services are still required. Do you know how many airline pilots start their training at flying schools like the ones at Gamston. The airlines don't train them. Budding pilots need places like Gamston to get their foot on the ladder to an amazing career.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP465	990859	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP466	990862	Do not support. I would support this if it doesn't destroy current infrastructure.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP466	990862	Do not support. No, the knock on effect to Retford airport seems not to have been considered.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP467	990865	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP467	990865	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP468	990869	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP468	990869	Support.	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP469	990882	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP469	990882	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP470	990884	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP470	990884	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP471	990885	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP471	990885	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP472	990886	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP472	990886	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP473	990889	Support. Local affordable housing is certainly required within the growing population of not only Bassetlaw but the East Midlands in general.	The Local Plan (Policy 3) recognises the need for affordable housing to meet identified local needs
DBLP474	990891	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP474	990891	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP475	990893	Support. Yes, but they should not be built in Gamston airfield, instead build in existing neighbourhoods or on other redundant land.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP475	990893	Do not support. Gamston airfield already provides employment so should not be built on, use land elsewhere.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP476	990895	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP476	990895	Support	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP477	990901	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP477	990901	Support.	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP478	990904	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP478	990904	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP479	990910	Support. This is a figure that supports the need for housing for a growing population nationally. However, the council really needs to consider it's commitment to economic development in providing homes, close to employment opportunities.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP479	990910	Support. Yes, this appears to be a wise approach in allocating new sites for development and employment opportunities. However, again the council needs to consider its approach to this and not utilise land currently providing employment opportunities for residential development.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP480	990912	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP480	990912	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP481	990913	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP481	990913	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP482	990914	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP482	990914	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP483	990915	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP483	990915	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP484	990916	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP484	990916	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP485	990917	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP485	990917	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP486	990918	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP486	990918	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP487	990919	Support. Yes but not on what is Gamston Airport	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP487	990919	Support. But not at Gamston Airport	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP488	990921	Do not support. We don't need more houses. What is needed is considerable analysis on areas of land that is not occupied with infrastructure currently benefiting the council. A counter productive move would be to close the airport with the amount of money it brings in catalytically to the local economy. Many councils are out of touch with this. Don't let Bassetlaw be another.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP488	990921	Do not support. You have employment land already in the Airport. Flying schools, air operators, restaurant workers and ground crew to name but a few. Extend that on to the supportive roles behind these companies such as accountants who I would believe to be close to the airport, closing such a catalyst would be a brave move.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP489	990922	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP489	990922	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP490	990926	Do not support. Too many homes, reject the plans.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP490	990926	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP491	990928	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP491	990928	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP492	990930	Do not support. Not at the airfield as above.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP492	990930	Do not support. Not at the airfield as above. The airfield already provides high skilled employment.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP493	990933	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP493	990933	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP494	990934	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP494	990934	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP495	990936	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP495	990936	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP496	990937	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP496	990937	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP497	990938	Do not support. No, traffic going down Ollerton road into Retford through Ordsall is ridiculous, there is no car parks on the Worksop side of Retford, so if you think traffic will filter through Ordsall to them go through the centre of town to get parked you are severely mistaken! They're going to cut through Retford to park at Asda, Aldi, Wilco, home bargains.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP497	990938	Do not support. Not seen any informations regarding this matter.	Chapters 1 and 2 of the Local Plan contain information on the employment strategy for the District, including employment land targets.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP498	990940	Do not support. I can see the evidence for the need of housing in Worksop however, I can see no such evidence for the need of housing of the scale proposed for Retford for the reasons explained by myself in the comment box at the bottom of the page.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Bassetlaw EDNA study identifies a need to deliver 390 dwellings per annum in the district over the next 15 years. The Plan proposes to distribute development across the district to meet the housing needs of each area. As the second largest settlement, Retford will need to accommodate development to meet its need.
DBLP498	990940	Do not support. Employment land clearly has its benefits, however as a portion of the employment land is proposed to be built on the site of Gamston Airport, cannot support the proposal. The 'Garden Village' proposed to be built on the airport will generate lower paid, lower skilled jobs than the existing successful airport. Quantity of jobs seems to be the priority of the proposal rather than the quality.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP499	990942	Support. But find the land elsewhere.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP499	990942	Support. If the employment includes the highly skilled jobs already existing at the airport. Swapping those for McJobs and call centres makes no sense.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP500	990943	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP500	990943	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP501	990944	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP501	990944	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP502	990946	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP502	990946	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP503		Do not support. The Draft Local Plan fails to provide evidence for the scale of development required nor provides a valid economic argument how it would generate the needed employment in the area.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council's Economic Development Needs Assessment indicates there is a need for housing and employment.
DBLP503		The Plan's destruction of skilled employment to build houses is contradictory to its own strategic objectives 4 and 6 for economic development and fails to recognise the opportunity the airport presents as a local economic hub. Retford Gamston Airport directly supports approximately 100 skilled jobs. The plan in Section 3.2 of claims that this will have a 'relatively limited' economic impact and new jobs will be created within the garden village. This assertion fails to define the type, skill level or numbers of new jobs that would be created, whether permanent or temporary, or what facilities will be created to house the jobs. The national tendency for large supermarkets and the move to on-line shopping indicates that retail is unlikely. Without a clear plan as to how new jobs are to be created and considering the differential in skills, and therefore income, generated from the new jobs then the new plan is simply to destroy jobs in favour of houses. The plan approach fails to consider that the airport has a wide range of users from students to executives, to aviation businesses. These highly skilled people are the current and future entrepreneurs. They are the ones likely to invest and take a risk to generate new employment for others. Removing the airport is likely to result in their move outside of Bassetlaw having a negative economic impact. Opportunity for economic regeneration Retford Gamston Airport represents an opportunity as a focus for skilled economic regeneration. Examples of other airfields in the UK and Europe show that airfields can become economic hubs. Gloucester Airport is an example of a thriving UK small airport that is owned by 2 district councils. They have	The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure all types of economic growth and associated jobs can be delivered in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of different types of employment growth in the future. An employment land availability assessment is being undertaken and will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>supported the airport and its continued growth over many years which in 2017 was home to around 180 aircraft and 40 aviation-related businesses employing more than 500 people, plus a further 2000 jobs on the adjoining business park. There is enough land and space available at Retford Gamston Airport to create a larger business park, leisure facilities and further hangars. Expanding the range of businesses at the airport to include a technology centre or similar would make it more attractive and increase economic activity. This in turn would generate more skilled jobs, demand for houses in Retford and retain the airport. The airport would complement and support housing development on its periphery and across the motorway at Bevercoates.</p>	
DBLP503		<p>Do not support. The Plan fails to provide compelling arguments for the location of the Garden villages. It does not provide any alternatives for smaller scale developments along the A1M corridor which can readily be identified with simple online mapping tools. Instead of destroying vital national infrastructure and skilled jobs Bassetlaw District Council could support the airport and build an economic hub.</p>	<p>The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure all types of economic growth and associated jobs can be delivered in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of different types of employment growth in the future. An employment land availability assessment is being undertaken and will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. An analysis of the aviation and economic value of the Airport is being undertaken and this will inform the the next version of the Local Plan.</p>
DBLP504	990949	Do not support. If you got to built make them council house.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP504	990949	Do not support. No one wants to move where before so why would they now.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan– Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP505	Individual	Do not support. I believe it would be better if homes were built in smaller pockets across all the area rather than what is proposed ,not everyone wants or even knows how to live a village life ,try converting the empty flays above the shops in towns as well .	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP505	Individual	Support. As Gamston airfield already has businesses on it ,it would be a good idea to encourage more to the site but be aware that the main road through Gamston is unsuitable for heavy traffic and the exit and entrance on and off the A1 at Twyford Bridge is inadequate to say the least .	The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure all types of economic growth and associated jobs can be delivered in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of different types of employment growth in the future. An employment land availability assessment is being undertaken and will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. An analysis of the aviation and economic value of the Airport is being undertaken and this will inform the the next version of the Local Plan. Part of the site selection process involves consulting the Highways Authority who will advise on the suitability of the road network to accomodate new development.
DBLP506	990952	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP506	990952	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP507	990954	Support. We need more housing as a nation full stop!	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP507	990954	Support.	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP508	990955	Do not support. Absolutely not, if they are to be built by the lowest possible bidder. And not if they end up being anonymous boxes the same as the housing estates up and down the country, spoiling the naturally evolving British countryside .	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP508	990955	Do not support. Absolutely not. At the cost of 10 business and more than 100 jobs at Gamston alone, hectares of wasteland with probably no utilities, left to weed, creating a perfect potential spot for the next warehousing/lorry park/retail estate eyesore! There isn't a small business that has the capital to build premises just because there is vacant wasteland.	The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure all types of economic growth and associated jobs can be delivered in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of different types of employment growth in the future. An employment land availability assessment is being undertaken and will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. An analysis of the aviation and economic value of the Airport is being undertaken and this will inform the the next version of the Local Plan. Part of the site selection process involves consulting the Highways Authority who will advise on the suitability of the road network to accomodate new development.
DBLP509	990959	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP509	990959	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP510	990961	Support. To be built on redundant brownfield land.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP510	990961	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP511	990962	Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP511	990962	Do not support. The closure of Gamston Airport will jeopardise a significant number of jobs in Bassetlaw.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP512	990964	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP512	990964	Do not support. The established businesses at Gamston Airport should be allowed to continue to provide skilled employment. For example Gamston Airport has aircraft maintenance facilities and not all airfields have maintenance facilities. This needs to be preserved as part of the national infrastructure of airfields. Gamston Airport also supports the Air Ambulance - a service that the locals might appreciate personally one day in their time of need!	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP513	990965	Support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP513	990965	Support	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP514	990980	Do not support. YOU DO NOT STATE WHETHER THESE ARE NEW BUILDS. Make yourselves clear. There are vacant properties, and other buildings, which should be converted to housing, before any more land is requisitioned. According to para. 10.7 of the Plan, Retford only needs 437 homes up to year 2035 to fulfil its requirements, yet you're proposing to build many more than that whilst destroying part of the transport infrastructure you say you're preserving and extending.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is unable to provide that level of detail in the strategic plan. More detail will be included in the next draft plan. This is likely to include both brownfield sites and greenfield sites.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP514	990980	Support. Why not keep the valuable employment land you already have which houses people gainfully employed in skilled jobs, and develop other TRULY "brownsite" areas instead??	The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure all types of economic growth and associated jobs can be delivered in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of different types of employment growth in the future. An employment land availability assessment is being undertaken and will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Available brownfield sites will be considered but it is not possible to meet the employment needs of the District on brownfield land only, some greenfield land will need to be considered. An analysis of the aviation and economic value of the Airport is being undertaken and this will inform the the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP515	991045	Do not support. Our area probably does not need this many new homes. But in any case they should be more spread out, two villages within a few miles of each other is poor spatial planning.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP515	991045	Do not support. I support the principle but cannot click 'yes' here because in good faith because your plan destroys employment land at the airport. A couple of corner shops doesn't not replace the engineering jobs that our area should be proud of.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP516	991153	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP516	991153	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP517	991157	Support. But only if it is fairly distributed.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP517	991157	Do not support. No as there will be many skilled jobs that will be lost due to the closure of Gamston airport .	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP518	991172	Do not support. This plan does not say how that figure was reached. BDC is 7.9 years ahead on building and it does not say if this figure is included in these figures or not. I am not against development but i believe for this figure to be assessed we need all the information available. This plan has also not shown any predictions on air quality in this area, which is already above average for Bassetlaw.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. Sites in the Housing Year Land Supply (which currently equates to 7.9 years) are included in the calculation of housing supply in the draft Local Plan. The next draft Plan will include a Housing Trajectory.
DBLP518	991172	Do not support. Not if it is only in the two areas that are already above average in NO2 emissions in Bassetlaw, which will increase air pollution substantially especially when it's co located with large amounts of housing. There is also the issue of enforcement which is non existent within the area at present, an increase in industrial units will only exacerbate that.	The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure all types of economic growth and associated jobs can be delivered in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of different types of employment growth in the future. An employment land availability assessment is being undertaken and will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. This will include sites across the District and not just at the Garden Villages.
DBLP519	991173	Do not support. We understand we have already reached the experience ed quoter of residential homes .	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP519	991173	Support. If your meaning building of commercial inferstructure?	Support for employment land targets welcome. Employment land refers to offices, industry and storage/warehousing as well as other employment related comercial development.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP520	991174	Do not support. This plan does not say how that figure was reached. BDC is 7.9 years ahead on building and it does not say if this figure is included in these figures or not. I am not against development but i believe for this figure to be assessed we need all the information available. This plan has also not shown any predictions on air quality in this area, which is already above average for Bassetlaw.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. Sites in the Housing Year Land Supply (which currently equates to 7.9 years) are included in the calculation of housing supply in the draft Local Plan. The next draft Plan will include a Housing Trajectory.
DBLP520	991174	Do not support. No as it's only in the two areas that are already above average in NO2 emissions in Bassetlaw, which will increase air pollution substantially especially when it's co located with large amounts of housing, There is also the issue of enforcement which is non existent within the area at present, an increase in industrial units will only exacerbate that.	The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure all types of economic growth and associated jobs can be delivered in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of different types of employment growth in the future. An employment land availability assessment is being undertaken and will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. This will include sites across the District and not just at the Garden Villages.
DBLP521	991176	Do not support. No. There whole estates of empty houses on the outskirts of Sheffield eg Dyke Vale Road. Why not re-develop these areas. Cities can cope with expansion/development - rural areas cannot without radically changing the environment.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP521	991176	Do not support. There is already enough expansion of the industrial areas, especially around Worksop - again leading to loss of wildlife habitat and countryside.	The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure all types of economic growth and associated jobs can be delivered in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of different types of employment growth in the future. An employment land availability assessment is being undertaken and will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Brownfield sites will be considered but it is not possible to provide for all employment needs on brownfield land so some greenfield sites will need to be considered. The impact on the natural environment is one issue that will be considered during the site selection process.
DBLP522	991178	Do not support. Although Worksop has a case for local Housing need , the same cannot be said for Retford which in the last 8 years has already had significant growth without the need to destroy the existing infrastructure. And at what seems the stroke of a pen it would appear Bassetlaw is now ahead of its building requirements up to 7.9 years from less than 5 is this new figure taking into account the proposed developments .	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP522	991178	Support. The 2 new proposed sites for the garden Villages would be better suited to Commercial / industrial use Existing areas struggle with access, such as the low bridge at Boughton which restricts access to the A614 to relocate businesses and create existing ones on the Brownfield sites such as Gamston Airfield they would then have clear unrestricted access to the A1 . There seems to be no discussion regarding the loss of jobs at Gamston airport which are in excess of 100 add to this the closure of both the local coal fired power stations where are all these new residents (If the proposed site is residential) going to work ? as jobs are limited in the first place and not everyone in the area is semi or unskilled .	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP523	991181	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP523	991181	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP524	991184	Do not support. In the complete absence of a clearly defined strategy within the plan to attract a large number of businesses that will create the necessary levels of employment then all that the house building programme will achieve is to provide a base for yet more commuters needing to travel outside of Bassetlaw for employment. The additional housing will therefore provide substantially reduced benefits to the local economy and add to traffic levels, noise and pollution.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP524	991184	Do not support. You could allocate half the total land area of Bassetlaw to employment but in the total absence of a strategy, or the means such as still having a local general aviation and business airport, to attract businesses to locate within the area then what do you realistically achieve?	The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure all types of economic growth and associated jobs can be delivered in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of different types of employment growth in the future. The basis of these policies will be the Council's Economic Development Needs Assessment, Strategic Economic Plans and Local Industrial Strategies. An analysis of the aviation and economic value of the Airport is being undertaken and this will inform the the next version of the Local Plan. It is not clear at this stage that the airport has attracted businesses to locate in the area.
DBLP525	991186	Do not support. I cannot accept that this level of development is required in an essentially rural area.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP525	991186	Support.	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP526	991188	Do not support. I have no comment on this.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP526	991188	Do not support. This plan involves the loss of high technology jobs at Gamston Airport.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
			Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP527	991190	Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP527	991190	Support.	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP528	991208	Do not support. I think there should be more built.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP528	991208	Support. But needs to be high quality business zones not just warehousing and distribution.	Support for employment land targets welcome. The Economic Development Needs Assessment sets out the amount and type of employment land that is required in the District. It will include warehousing and distribution but will also provide for offices, industrial and other commercial employment.
DBLP529	991209	Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP529	991209	Support.	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP530	991219	Do not support. It is far too many!	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP530	991219	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP531	991221	Do not support. I believe the council is 7.9 years ahead of its building needs and whilst I agree with some growth in the area, it should be spread over the whole council's area.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The suggested approach does not accord with national policy (NPPF) and would be an unsound approach.
DBLP531	991221	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP532	Individual	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP532	Individual	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP533	991230	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP533	991230	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP534	991231	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP534	991231	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP535	991234	Support. Please build more.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP535	991234	Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP536	991235	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP536	991235	Support.	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP537	991237	Do not support. I do not believe that there is the demand or infrastructure to support this. Nor do I believe the promised infrastructure in this plan to support the additional properties will ever be delivered.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council are working closely with infrastructure providers to identify requirements associated with new development. The Plan includes an infrastructure delivery policy to address this.
DBLP537	991237	Do not support. Again I do not believe the demand or infrastructure to support this is available.	An employment land availability assessment is being undertaken and will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process is consulting infrastructure providers who advise whether infrastructure can accommodate the development proposed.
DBLP538	991240	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP538	991240	Support.	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP539	991241	Do not support. The garden villages are far to large. The airport site would be the size of a small town. Not a village.....	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP539	991241	Support.	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP540	991243	Do not support. New homes will always be required but that should not be at the expense of local businesses. A better strategy should be created that incorporates what is already in place in the local area.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP540	991243	Do not support. It seems to me that you're using too much land. As stated new housing will always be required, however this should not be at the cost of infrastructure that is already in place. Either less land should be used, or a more space efficient housing development should be created.	The amount of land required for employment is identified in the Economic Development Needs Assessment. An employment land availability assessment is being undertaken and will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Where possible this will involve re-using brownfield land but it is not possible to meet the District's needs on brownfield sites so some greenfield land will need to be developed. Developers are encouraged to use sites as efficiently as possible, whilst meeting relevant building, design and safety standards.
DBLP541	991264	Support. But not at the expense of an existing employment and business location. New developments are meant to add to facilities and not to merely replace one existing and active facility with housing just to avoid any perception of planning issues.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP541	991264	Do not support. There is no increase or change in employment land by building on the airfield at Gamston. What will happen is that high skill and relative high wage jobs will be replaced by low skill warehousing type jobs. There is no evidence to suggest that a reduction in locations to train and recruit the future pilots that the UK needs will be economically offset by their replacement by low skill jobs in sufficient numbers to ensure this development will have a positive economic benefit to the area or to the UK as a whole.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP542	991336	Support. See above.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP542	991336	Support.	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP543	991990	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP543	991990	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP544	992014	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP544	992014	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP545	992366	Support. The Draft local plan (Page 42 for Mattersey parish shows a 10% housing requirement of 32. This requirement is in line with 2011 Census table KS401EW which shows a total of 325 dwellings for the parish. Draft Local Plan (Page 42) also shows a 20% Capped growth of 60 dwellings, which understates the correct calculation (ie 20% \times 325=65 Dwellings cap). Please correct in the next draft.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The 10% housing requirement relates to the Parish of Mattersey. Whereas, the 20% cap relates to the settlements in Mattersey Parish. It is therefore a different calculation.
DBLP545	992366	Support.	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP546	992635	Do not support. Other suitable brownfield land is available for housing development in the local area. Partial-development of the site would also be possible to capitalise on existing aviation and technology sector strengths whilst retaining an active airport that will provide more skilled jobs for local residents. The plan references the airport site as 'brownfield' however planning legislation requires this to be suitable or redundant brownfield land, which the active airport is clearly not.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP546	992635	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP547	993337	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP547	993337	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP548	993387	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP548	993387	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
Policy 3: Affordable Housing			

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	<p>The level of affordable housing which is required in the District is likely to exceed the amount of affordable housing which the Local Plan can deliver; certainly through open market led housing schemes. The Local Plan acknowledges this problem. It does not seek to quantify a potential solution to that problem. Paras 7.6 and 7.8 note that there are other mechanisms outside of the planning (S.106) system to secure the delivery of affordable housing. Those processes exist and have not delivered a significant amount of affordable housing. No evidence that there are alternate mechanisms capable of delivering of the affordable housing required. The Local Plan should set out a strategy to secure the delivery of affordable housing through those mechanisms and seek to quantify the amount and type of affordable housing that the Council envisages will come forward through those mechanisms. It is a vital part of planning for the needs of the District that the Local Plan quantifies its likely shortfalls in delivery and that mechanisms to mitigate those shortfalls are provided in planning policy. Where it is known that the Council will be relying on affordable housing schemes being delivered through grant funded schemes it will be vital to make available sites which can be accessed by Registered Providers e.g. there is no robust rural exception policy that allows for the delivery of affordable housing. Encourage such a provision. Policy 3 is too vague in how it will achieve its aims of increasing affordable housing. The affordable housing policy will require a lower level of affordable housing provision than required by the Core Strategy. Do not consider that the Policy will be effective.</p> <p>Support the Council's pragmatic approach to the assessment of viability in development proposals and welcome the realistic approach taken to understanding the viability issues within the housing market and with previously developed land. Consider that the Council can mitigate viability problems to a greater</p>	<p>The primary purpose of Policy 3 is to set out the approach to securing affordable housing through the planning system. However, it is accepted that this is part of a wider strategy to increase provision of affordable housing through other means. Further context will be added to the Local Plan to better explain how the planning system will complement other housing delivery in the District. Support for the Council's approach to viability is welcome. An update to the Interim Whole Plan Viability is being undertaken which will consider any potential changes to securing a greater level of affordable housing in different parts of the District.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		extent by encouraging development in stronger market areas in the District. Recent housing delivery demonstrates that Retford is the strongest market for housing delivery within Bassetlaw's main settlements and the Local Plan should benefit from that market strength by increasing housing provision at Retford and maximising the affordable housing provision that can be delivered through open market provision.	
DBLP173	Lichfields on behalf of SP Scholey and the estate of WA Scholey	Welcome that Policy 3 allows for off-site contributions to be made – where it is justified to do so – in lieu of affordable housing.	Support for off site contributions welcome.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP192	Johnson Mowat on behalf of Barratt Homes	<p>The Core Strategy seeks a different percentage requirement in different settlements, whereas the Plan proposes a blanket 20% requirement on Greenfield sites and 10% requirement on Brownfield sites. There is no justification in the supporting text to this policy to explain this alternative approach. Given the differing housing markets across the District, it is questionable whether a 20% requirement across the district on greenfield sites is deliverable and achievable. Following submission of site specific economic viability appraisals, in recent years there have been a number of housing developments that have delivered less than 15% affordable housing on greenfield sites. It is important that flexibility in this policy allows for site by site viability and with this in mind we request that “where viable” is inserted so that the policy reads: “The Council will require on-site contributions to be made in accordance with the following qualifying thresholds and requirements where viable.”</p> <p>Welcome the inclusion of the Council’s consideration of Open Book Financial Viability Statements where specific site viability is raised. Given the viability implications associated with the adopted Community Infrastructure Levy and the additional requirements to deliver contributions to primary school education the Council should undertake a wide ranging viability assessment of the Local Plan prior to the publication of the next iteration of the document.</p>	<p>The Interim Whole Plan and CIL Viability Assessment sets out the justification for not seeking a different affordable housing percentage in different parts of the District. However, it is expected that the next version of the draft Local Plan will provide an explanation of the proposed approach in the reasoned justification. The Assessment will be updated to inform the next version of the Plan and will take into account comments made during this consultation. However, national planning practice guidance is clear that the role for viability assessment is primarily at the plan making stage and that it is the responsibility of site promoters to take into account any costs including their profit expectations and risks, and ensure that proposals for development are policy compliant. In future, where up-to-date policies have set out the contributions expected from development, planning applications that comply should be assumed to be viable. It is the responsibility of the applicant to demonstrate whether particular circumstances, such as those identified in the PPG, justify the need for a viability assessment at the application stage.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP194	Emery Planning on behalf of J G Pears Property Ltd	<p>Para 7.5 identifies that some 39% of the District's overall housing requirement is for affordable homes. This is a very significant proportion and the Plan acknowledges it will be very difficult to achieve. Major previously developed sites could offer an opportunity to help assist in meeting some of this potentially unmet need. Consideration should be given to a policy to support affordable housing where it can be accommodated as part of wider development on major previously developed sites in the rural area. The Council's recognition of the clear need for economic regeneration and the importance of improving employment levels and incomes in contributing to reducing affordable housing need is welcomed. Support for the economic redevelopment of sites such as the Former Power Station site offer a significant opportunity to meet such a need and accordingly policies of the Plan should support such redevelopment. An exceptions clause is provided in Policy 5 for 100% Self and Custom Build Housing to be supported where it accords with the spatial strategy and other polices. This should be expanded to allow such developments on major previously developed sites. Policy 7 relating to Residential Care Homes should also include such a provision. Such sites have potential to offer a very real opportunity to provide such facilities in the form of self-sustaining extra care villages.</p>	<p>The next version of the Local Plan is expected to include several development management policies: one will include the efficient and effective use of land, such as brownfield land. Even so, the current draft Plan does not restrict development on brownfield sites. Policy 3 identifies the percentage of affordable homes expected to be sought as part of major development on brownfield sites. It is not considered necessary to include a specific policy on brownfield sites. A housing land availability assessment is being undertaken which would include an assessment of the Former Power Station site. This is considered to be the most appropriate approach for considering the development potential of this site.</p>
DBLP221	Gladman Developments	<p>Welcome the flexibility and proactive approach to meeting affordable housing needs. Only through positively planning for significant housing growth can the Council realistically tackle market signals advocated by the PPG and tackle the affordability and housing crisis. Elsewhere in the plan there are policies which could place requirements on sites over what normally be expected (which may have cost implications) and in addition to CIL and S.106, may wish to review whether the risk to affordable housing in circumstances of an acute</p>	<p>The Interim Whole Plan and CIL Viability Assessment provides an initial assessment of the viability implications of securing affordable housing, CIL, S106 contributions and other policy cost implications for a range of residential development typologies. This</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>shortage, is the appropriate balance. For example, there may be a situation where a more onerous policy requirement results in a viability case having to be run, which results in a lower affordable housing percentage rather than a relaxation in the policy requirement to more traditional standards that would enable a policy compliant level of affordable housing. Paragraph 7.13 refers to the Council undertaking a viability exercise for each site in order to confirm that the requisite affordable housing percentage would be viable. If the Council intends to complete this exercise for all of the proposed allocations then it is important that the policy requirements, infrastructure requirements and the likely S.106 and CIL costs are all factored in to the assessments. There will be the need to work alongside the promoter/landowner in order to understand any additional site specifics.</p>	
DBLP226	Retford Civic Society	<p>The number of affordable dwellings provided in recent development has been disappointing, because developers have challenged the viability of the present targets. The targets now proposed seem unduly low and it is lower than in many other plans around the country. Developers will never provide more than the target even if they could do so and still make a profit. If they buy land in the full knowledge that a higher target in the Local Plan has gone through the examination process it would be hard for them argue for an exemption or reduction on viability grounds. The target should be as high as the Council can show to be viable at a District wide level.</p>	<p>The Interim Whole Plan and CIL Viability Assessment identifies that the affordable housing requirements in Policy 3 are appropriate for the District and can be achieved as part of a viable development.</p>
DBLP255	Home Builders Federation	<p>Under Policy 3 sites of 10 or more dwellings or 5 or more dwellings in Designated Rural Areas on-site contributions will be required of 10% for brownfield and 20% for greenfield subject to viability. In circumstances where specific site viability is raised, the developer will be required to provide an Open Book Financial Viability Statement in accordance with Policy 23. It is noted that for sites of 5 or more dwellings in Designated</p>	<p>The Interim Whole Plan and CIL Viability Assessment provides an initial assessment of the viability implications of securing affordable housing, CIL, S106 contributions and other policy cost implications for a range of residential development typologies. This assessment is being updated to inform the next version of the Local Plan. Further information on the requirements for Designated Rural Areas will be added to Policy 3.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>Rural Areas commuted sum payments may be more appropriate than on-site provision as set out in the Written Ministerial Statement 28 November 2014. Under the 2019 NPPF the Local Plan should set out the level and type of affordable housing provision required together with other necessary infrastructure but such policies should not undermine the deliverability of the Local Plan (para 34). The cumulative burden of policy requirements should be set so that most development is deliverable without further viability assessment negotiations (para 57). It is the Council's responsibility to robustly viability test the Local Plan in order that the cumulative burden of policy requirements are set so that most development is deliverable without further viability assessment negotiations (para 57) and the deliverability of the Local Plan is not undermined (para 34). Viability assessment is highly sensitive to changes in its inputs whereby an adjustment or an error in any one assumption can have a significant impact on the viability or otherwise of development. It is important that the tests the influence of all inputs on viability as this determines if land is released for development. The final report should include detailed background evidence to substantiate used assumptions and to facilitate thorough examination of the Council's viability assessment by other parties.</p>	
DBLP273	Friends of Woodlands and Coachwood Green Ltd	Residents of Shireoaks identified during the Neighbourhood plan development the desirability of maintain the desired property types in particular the need for more retirement bungalows and more affordable housing.	Policy 3 and Policy 4 seek to deliver a mix of housing types and affordable housing to meet local needs. The need is set out in the Council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment. A Neighbourhood Plan could also include a housing mix policy where there is evidence which demonstrates a requirement for a particular type of home in the neighbourhood plan area.
DBLP281	Nottinghamshire Campaign to	The Local Plan does not comply with national planning guidance. The NPPF paragraph 62 "Where a need for affordable housing is identified, planning policies should	It is acknowledged that Policy 3 could better reflect the details of national policy and the content of the Council's Strategic Housing

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
	Protect Rural England	specify the type of affordable housing required, and expect it to be met on-site unless: a) off-site provision or an appropriate financial contribution in lieu can be robustly justified; and b) the agreed approach contributes to the objective of creating mixed and balanced communities." Policy 3 does not adequately reflect the requirement for 'robust' justification of off-site provision or specify criteria regarding what Bassetlaw would regard as a justification. 3C weakens 2. The policy wording should be clearer and stronger setting out what Bassetlaw would regard as a justification and what as 'sufficient' evidence.	Market Assessment. The next version of the Local Plan will address the points raised.
Policy 4: Housing mix			
DBLP55	Individual	Need more flats/apartments in the Bassetlaw area, as many single people are unable to afford the prices to rent/buy houses in Bassetlaw, other than council properties which are few. More flats/apartments would provide adequate housing for the District whilst not taking up as much land causing us to cut down trees and lose our parks/lands and such. There are many flats in the town centre but the parking is obviously an issue and many people want to stay in the villages in the surrounding areas where they have grown up where flats are not available. Many of the new houses being built are being built on smaller sections of land but still have many houses on, causing the houses to be small with no gardens. Looks like trying to cram as many houses as possible into tiny plots of land.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The district is very varied in terms of housing need and it is difficult to prescribe in any detail the type of housing which is required. The Council will utilise the evidence (e.g. SHMA or Neighbourhood Plans) available to inform planning decisions on housing mix.
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Support the flexible approach taken to the provision of a mix of housing across the District. Must ensure that development proposals are appropriate to the local area and the context in which the application is made. It will not always be appropriate to provide a mix of housing across the spectrum of housing at every Site.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP142	Ranskill Parish Council	Welcome the statement made in the Plan regarding housing mix, and understand that the Neighbourhood Plan can be used in this context would like to see a firm commitment from BDC to fulfilling local housing needs and note that the statement made on p55 “The Council does not wish to be prescriptive regarding the specific mix of properties to be built on sites as this is likely to be influenced by many factors, which may include viability” which appears to undermine what is said elsewhere in Policy 4. Concerned that the majority of houses recently given permission or proposed in Ranskill are for large 4/5 bedroomed properties which appear to be targeted at commuters. Does not wish to see Ranskill becoming a dormitory village for commuters and instead want to see accommodation for younger residents buying their first property or older residents seeking to downsize, alongside employment opportunities for Bassetlaw residents.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP173	Lichfields on behalf of SP Scholey and the estate of WA Scholey	Agree with the ambition of Policy 4 to provide mix of housing on individual residential sites. As part of this, the Plan should look to allocate housing sites that, in accordance with its strategy for achieving economic growth, are capable of delivering both affordable and aspirational homes. Such is the case at Folly Nook Lane, Ranskill .	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP221	Gladman Developments	Supportive the approach which seeks to provide a range of mix of housing types to meet the ever-growing needs of the District. In particular, support that the policy does not set out a prescriptive approach regarding the specific mix of properties. As acknowledged in the supporting text development proposals can be influenced by many factors and a criteria based approach should be used to meet the demand for market and affordable homes. Reference to Neighbourhood Plan policies should not be referenced in the text of the policy. The approach advocated by the Council is better suited to dealing with housing mix, tenures, types and sizes. If a	Thank you for your comments which are noted. Neighbourhood Plan groups are in a better position to analyse in more detail the housing needs of their area. Where NP's have included a policy on housing mix, the Council will require developments to meet the needs of the area. This will be reaffirmed in the policy.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		Neighbourhood Plan were to come forward and sought to impose specific requirements in their neighbourhood area following the adoption of the Local Plan, then this would remove the flexibility provided by Policy 4.	
DBLP317	987880	Support for housing mix policy. I wish more bungalows were built, there are lots of people like my husband and myself who wish to downsize.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP318	987892	Support for Mixed Housing policy. Please build more bungalows.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
Policy 5: Self and Custom Build Housing			
DBLP101	William Davis Ltd	<p>It is accepted that there is a requirement for the emerging Plan to accommodate self and custom build housing in accordance with section 1 of the Self Build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 this must be based on a clear evidence of need and subject to applications held on record within a District Register. Self / custom build plots on larger housing allocations which only changes housing delivery from one form of house building to another without any clear justification is not supported. The Council should also analyse the preferences of these entries as often only individual plots in rural locations are sought as opposed to plots on larger housing sites. If serviced plots are not developed by self / custom builders then these undeveloped plots are effectively removed from the Housing Land Supply. Before introducing Policy 5 requiring a portion of all large sites to accommodate self/custom builds the Council should consider the practicalities of health & safety, working hours, length of build programme, etc. as well as viability assessing any adverse impacts. Moreover, allocating such plots</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The policy does not require sites to deliver self or custom build plots. It simply states that the Council will support this if the developer is looking to deliver plots.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		will incur the loss of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) contributions as self / custom build properties are exempt.	
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Welcome the support for self-build and custom housing where supported by other policies within the Local Plan.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP149	Fisher German on behalf of D Thorlby	Objections to this policy, which looks to enforce the delivery of self/custom build housing as a proportion of estate developments. It is well established that such criteria are largely unworkable on modern housing developments and do not serve to provide additional units. In reality, such requirements may impede development unnecessarily, adding to developer burden without even delivering additional housing units. Self-builders do not want to buy serviced plots within or adjacent to a modern housing estate. Experience is that for the most part that they are instead looking for more bespoke rural opportunities. Some housebuilders provide a custom build option as part of their product, this cannot be expected across all sites and the sector as it may not be within the business model of many housebuilders. Such requirements could dissuade housebuilders from operating and delay development while policy requirements are negotiated. It is a further fallacy to consider that because there is demand self-build plots on a self-build register, that they would all build their own property, even if suitable land was available. The reality is the difficulty and lack of needed skills will mean only a small percentage of those on the register will ever develop a self-build property.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The policy does not require sites to deliver self or custom build plots. It simply states that the Council will support this if the developer is looking to deliver plots.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP151	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	<p>This market is growing evermore and is to be encouraged by this Council and it is pleasing to see it included in the draft plan. It follows on from strong guidance and advice from central government but in a recent Planning Committee meeting it was clear that senior Councillors neither support this policy nor believe it produces dwellings, rather the contrary. Local planning authorities are charged to keep registers showing self build plots available and applicants seeking such plots. These should be matched together so that development may proceed. It is wrong for the Council to have such a planning policy and for Councillors to have such a diverse view and use that diverse view to make decisions on applications. If this policy is to be adopted then it needs the full support of Councillors.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted.</p>
DBLP158	Fisher German on behalf of T Strawson and D Horrocks	<p>Objections to this policy, which looks to enforce the delivery of self/custom build housing as a proportion of estate developments. It is well established that such criteria are largely unworkable on modern housing developments and do not serve to provide additional units. In reality, such requirements may impede development unnecessarily, adding to developer burden without even delivering additional housing units. Self-builders do not want to buy serviced plots within or adjacent to a modern housing estate. Experience is that for the most part that they are instead looking for more bespoke rural opportunities. Some housebuilders provide a custom build option as part of their product, this cannot be expected across all sites and the sector as it may not be within the business model of many housebuilders. Such requirements could dissuade housebuilders from operating and delay development while policy requirements are negotiated. It is a further fallacy to consider that because there is demand self-build plots on a self-build register, that they would all build their own property, even if suitable land was available. The</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The policy does not require sites to deliver self or custom build plots. It simply states that the Council will support this if the developer is looking to deliver plots.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		reality is the difficulty and lack of needed skills will mean only a small percentage of those on the register will ever develop a self-build property.	
DBLP195	Fisher German on behalf of The Hospital of The Holy and Undivided Trinity	<p>Object to this policy, which looks to enforce the delivery of self/custom build housing as a proportion of estate developments. It is well established that such criteria are largely unworkable on modern housing developments and do not serve to provide additional units. In reality, such requirements may impede development unnecessarily, adding to developer burden without even delivering additional housing units. Self-builders do not want to buy serviced plots in or adjacent to a modern housing estate. For the most part that they are instead looking for more bespoke rural opportunities. While some housebuilders provide a custom build option as part of their product, this cannot be expected across all sites and the entire sector as it simply may not within the business model of many housebuilders. Such requirements could dissuade housebuilders from operating within the district and delay development while policy requirements are negotiated. It is a further fallacy to consider that because there is demand self-build plots on a self-build register, that they would all build their own property, even if suitable land was available. The reality is the difficulty and lack of needed skills will mean only a small percentage of those on the register will ever develop a self-build property.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The policy does not require sites to deliver self or custom build plots. It simply states that the Council will support this if the developer is looking to deliver plots.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP221	Gladman Developments	Support inclusion of this policy but further clarity can be provided. From the stated information it is in rural locations where there appears to be greatest demand for self-build plots, which are likely to be as part of small developments, but the policy advocates plots within larger developments. A greater amount of evidence is required and a clearer explanation included to demonstrate how the needs are reflected in this general policy and in the site allocations. It is evident that much of the demand may be location specific, which should also be taken into account and translated into policies. It is not apparent at this juncture whether 8% of the housing requirement (and an expectation that this will be mostly market self-build housing) reflects the actual needs for the plan period and that these needs could be addressed as part of the larger allocations at all.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The policy does not require sites to deliver self or custom build plots. It simply states that the Council will support this if the developer is looking to deliver plots.
DBLP245	Individual	Some self and custom build housing applications are being made as a means of avoiding affordable housing. Strong conditions should be applied to ensure that properties built are genuinely occupied by the applicants for a minimum of five years. More consideration should be given to providing a safe and carefree environment by grouping appropriate housing types rather than ad hoc mix of housing types.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP273	Friends of Woodlands and Coachwood Green Ltd	The importance of the separate rural identity of Shireoaks and Rhodesia villages as distinct from the neighbouring urban identity of the town of Worksop. The recent extensive development of housing and industrial properties is blurring the boundaries and upsetting the desired balanced pattern of growth across urban and rural areas. The separation needs to be maintained and the differing characteristics encouraged to survive.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Plan is seeking to maintain the character of settlements. Policy 8 Rural Bassetlaw has a strong focus on the retention of character in rural areas.
Policy 6: Specialist Housing			

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP101	William Davis Ltd	In accordance with the 2015 Ministerial Statement specialist or adaptable housing should only be required through a Local Plan where there is an established and clear evidence of need. NPPF 2018 para 57 makes reference to planning applications that comply with up-to-date Local Plans should be assumed to be viable. Therefore, for the Plan to be found sound at examination stage, viability testing for required levels of on-site specialist housing must be undertaken. The evidence base for the Local Plan shows no viability assessment or justified need for the proposed requirement of 45% of on all dwellings on major sites to be accessible or 10% to of on-site homes to be wheelchair accessible to the M4(3) standard.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The 2017 SHMA provides evidence of a need for specialist housing. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment will review this policy to ensure that the requirements of Policy 6 can be achieved.
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Object to Policy 6. The evidence relied on does not appear to match evidence now presented for the housing requirement. It is not clear what the evidence is for the requirement of a minimum of 45% of new dwellings on major development sites to be developed to the (optional) Building Regulations standard M4(2). Consider that the planning system should not seek to supersede the provisions of Building Regulations. Apply the same comments to Part 3 of Policy 6 which requires 10% of new dwellings on major development sites to meet Part M4(3) of the Building Regulations. It is not clear how the Council has sought to assess the impact of such requirements on the viability of major development schemes.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The 2017 SHMA provides evidence of a need for specialist housing. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment will review this policy to ensure that the requirements of Policy 6 can be achieved.
DBLP143	Persimmon Homes & Charles Church	Accept and support the need for a mix of housing to meet a range of needs, but it needs to be recognised that this has to be primarily market-led. Development will reflect unmet demand which will fluctuate over time. Policy should not seek to be overly prescriptive rather flexible to safeguard its relevance. If the Council wish to adopt the higher optional standards for Building Regulations Part M Category 2 accessible and adaptable homes (M4(2)) and Category 3 wheelchair user homes (M4(3)) then this should only be done in accordance	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The 2017 SHMA provides evidence of a need for specialist housing. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment will review this policy to ensure that the requirements of Policy 6 can be achieved.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>with the 2018 NPPF (para 127f & Footnote 42). The Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) dated 25th March 2015 stated that “the optional new national technical standards should only be required through any new Local Plan policies if they address a clearly evidenced need, and where their impact on viability has been considered, in accordance with the NPPG”. The % of people aged over 65+ is increasing with the majority of existing property lacking Part M4(2) & (3) features like level approach routes, accessible front door thresholds, wider internal doorway and corridor widths, switches and sockets at accessible heights and downstairs toilet facilities usable by wheelchair users. Had the government considered the evidence of an aging population to be sufficient to warrant the higher M4(2) and M4(3) standard it would already be incorporated within Building Regulations. Before a higher standard can be considered by Bassetlaw it must first provide up to date evidence demonstrating specific need. The requirement for M4(3) should only be required for dwellings over which the Council has housing nomination rights as set out in the NPPG (ID 56-008). Any requirement for higher optional standards especially M4(3) should be thoroughly viability tested.</p>	
DBLP149	Fisher German on behalf of D Thorlby	<p>Concerned by this policy's requirement that on major development sites, a minimum of 45% of dwellings must be assessable and a minimum of 10% must be wheelchair accessible. Whilst it is noted that the Council's SHMA Update (October 2017) identifies a need for 1,350 dwellings for older people, do not believe that the Council's rationale for why the implementation of 'higher building regulation standards' via this policy will help to secure these dwellings. It is not clear from the evidence base whether the financial implications of providing accessible dwellings has been fully understood to ensure that this will not place undue burden on developers.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment will review this policy to ensure that the requirements of Policy 6 can be achieved.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		This policy (in addition to the policy of affordable housing) must take account of general issues with viability which are currently experienced in the District, especially if the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is to be continued.	
DBLP150	Individual	Not all older people want to go into care homes what they require are more bungalows. No developer will volunteer to build bungalows they take up more land which means lower profits. Would like to see the plan force developers building more than 10 properties, to be allocate a percentage to bungalows in the same way they have to affordable housing.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council will continue to work with developers in seeking to deliver the right type and mix of new homes. However, the Council cannot force developers to deliver bungalows.
DBLP151	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	Research has shown that there is a need for affordable housing and housing for the elderly in urban and rural areas. It is not always the case that affordable housing is required. The housing stock may well be adequate but the occupancy is the problem. Numerous family homes are occupied by senior citizens who cannot find a suitable smaller single storey bungalow to relocate into. If we provided more of this type of structure within both urban and rural locations it would inevitably release family homes back into the market. It is not simply a case of providing a definitive number of homes. Research could easily be undertaken through the Neighbourhood Plan process with a simple question or two:- 1. How many couples over the age of 55 live in family homes? 2. Of these couples, how many would relocate into a new bungalow in the same village or suburb? (thus keeping communities together which is very important). Aware that according to developers, bungalows are very expensive to build but then often developers do squeal the loudest - sometimes justifiably - if land prices remain high which they will if supply, particularly in rural areas, is limited. Of course it doesn't just have to be single storey. The Council used to provide 2 storey structures with a flat on the first floor for more able bodied couples/small families and the ground floor was dedicated as	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council will continue to work with developers in seeking to deliver the right type and mix of new homes. Agree that the Neighbourhood Plan process is better suited to assessing the more detailed housing needs of the local community.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>senior citizen accommodation. Such designs could be revisited if the need is proven. The proposed policies on all aspects of specialist housing appear to suggest that such housing will be mandatory on various sizes of sites and permission will only be granted if this provision is included. This approach does not consider the community issue that senior citizens often cling to. In social/community care circles often encouraged to bond with and visit elderly people who often do not see anyone they know. Moving such sensitive members of the public out of their known community group and locating them elsewhere because planning policy required 3 bungalows to be built in Mattersey (example) is not considerate. Encouragement rather than policies is required. Do the research and identify sites where senior citizen accommodation can be built then keep the community or at least some friends together. Such inclusions will undoubtedly put developers off and make certain sites unattractive.</p>	
DBLP158	Fisher German on behalf of T Strawson and D Horrocks	<p>Concerned by this policy's requirement that on major development sites, a minimum of 45% of dwellings must be assessable and a minimum of 10% must be wheelchair accessible. Whilst it is noted that the Council's SHMA Update (October 2017) identifies a need for 1,350 dwellings for older people, do not believe that the Council's rationale for why the implementation of 'higher building regulation standards' via this policy will help to secure these dwellings. It is not clear from the evidence base whether the financial implications of providing accessible dwellings has been fully understood to ensure that this will not place undue burden on developers. This policy (in addition to the policy of affordable housing) must take account of general issues with viability which are currently experienced in the District, especially if the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is to be continued.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. This policy will be assessed through the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Amendments will be made where necessary.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP169	Avant Homes (Central) and Wyndthorpe Developments Ltd	<p>Sets a prescriptive requirement for sites of 10 or more dwellings to provide for a minimum of 45% of dwellings to meet (M4(2)) standards and a minimum of 10% of dwellings to meet (M4(3)) standards. Not reflected in the Council's Interim Whole Plan and Viability Study, which has benchmarked viability assumptions on the basis of 10% of dwellings to meet M4(2) standards and 4% of dwellings to meet M4(3) standards. It is noted that the viability study only assumes a marginal cost of £1-2 per m² to meet M4(2) standards and £4 per m² to meet M4(3) standards respectively. Refer the Council to previous work undertaken by EC Harris during the Government's Housing Standards Review, to which the cost impact of M4(3) was estimated at around £26,816 per dwelling, significantly above the cost inputs assumed in this instance. It is vital that the plan wide viability is robustly assessed and as per the requirements of the NPPF, policies should not undermine the deliverability of the plan nor should policy requirements require further viability testing at application stage. It is imperative that any policy expectations are accurately reflected within the plan viability study, as failure to properly assess the impact of such requirements puts the deliverability of the plan requirement at risk.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. This policy will be assessed through the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Amendments will be made where necessary.</p>
DBLP175	The Planning Bureau on behalf of McCarthy and Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd	<p>The section is confusing - in some places it deals with application of the optional technical standards and the need to provide bespoke specialist housing for the elderly such as retirement schemes and extra care schemes (as listed in the policy) as "one and the same". There is a need to consider the need for accessible housing as part of wider development and the need to provide purpose built specialist older persons housing options separately. Reinforced by the SHMA which considers specialist housing and wheelchair accessible housing separately and presents different figures for application</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The policy is considered to be appropriate for the delivery of housing to meet the needs of people with accessibility restrictions, subject to assessment through the Whole Plan Viability Assessment.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		through policy. If this is not done, it may prevent the needed specialist housing options from coming forward.	
DBLP175	The Planning Bureau on behalf of McCarthy and Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd	<p>States: The Government is very keen to see Local Authorities addressing the needs of the older people in terms of housing type, design and delivery. In seeking to address this, the Government has published a series of optional technical standards. Government is keen to address the needs of older people. NPPG Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment and in respect to the delivery of housing to meet the needs of older people states: The need to provide housing for older people is critical as people are living longer lives and the proportion of older people in the population is increasing. The age profile of the population can be drawn from Census data. Projection of population and households by age group can also be used. Strategic policy-making authorities will need to consider the size, location and quality of dwellings needed in the future for older people in order to allow them to live independently and safely in their own home for as long as possible, or to move to more suitable accommodation if they so wish. Supporting independent living can help to reduce the costs to health and social services, and providing more options for older people to move could also free up houses that are under occupied. (emphasis added) There is a need to address this through specialist housing for older people. Wheelchair accessibility will not achieve what is required by the NPPG. The reference in Para 7.23 “in seeking to address this” suggests otherwise. It is recommended that this reference be deleted</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. It is not considered necessary to remove “in seeking to address this” from paragraph 7.23. A combination of measures are required to address the needs of older people. This is just one way the Government is seeking to address this issue.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP175	The Planning Bureau on behalf of McCarthy and Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd	Provides a calculation for a reduced requirement for specialist housing for older people based on a reduced timeframe of the Local Plan and the delivery of 50 units. The undersupply for the last four years (50 bungalows against the target of 67 x 4 = 268) means the annual requirement is higher. It is recommended that this annual requirement is stated to underline the need to address provision and to assist in monitoring	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP175	The Planning Bureau on behalf of McCarthy and Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd	Paragraph 7.28 sets out that new housing developments will need to provide specialist housing but Paragraph 7.29 immediately goes on to state: "The Council considers that the best way to achieve this is through the implementation of the higher building regulation standards on a percentage of new homes". The approach is wrong. The Plan needs to consider the need for, and provide for, where that need is identified for specialist housing for older people such as Retirement Housing and Extra Care and separately for accessible housing. Para 7.29 suggests that such schemes will only be supported where they come forward as part of larger developments. Most bespoke schemes are more likely to come forward through windfall and brownfield developments on sites close to existing town centres but face a number of difficulties in doing so. Para 7.29 needs to be amended to provide support for this. Recommended that para 7.28 is prefaced as: "The development of specialist housing for older people including retirement schemes and Extra Care Housing will be supported". Para 7.29 should be amended by the deletion of the first sentence, namely "The Council considers that the best way to achieve this is through the implementation of the higher building regulation standards on a percentage of new homes".	Thank you for your comments which are noted. Proposed to amend the wording "the best way to achieve this" to "one way to achieve this".

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP175	The Planning Bureau on behalf of McCarthy and Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd	A new sentence should be added at the beginning of the Policy as: "The development of specialist housing for older people including retirement schemes and Extra Care Housing will be supported	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP192	Johnson Mowat on behalf of Barratt Homes	Proposes a minimum of 45% of dwellings on major development sites to be accessible (M4(2) Building Regulations) and a minimum of 10% of dwellings on major development sites to be wheelchair accessible (M4(3) Building Regulations). This appears an inflexible and rigid requirement and request that flexibility is built into the policy. The Council are required by the WMS dated 25th March 2015 to provide clearly evidenced need for adopting the higher optional standards. It is not clear from the justifying text where the minimum 45% and 10% requirements are derived. Further justification is required. The viability impacts of this policy requirement needs to be understood. Note the HBF concerns with this policy and reserve the right to make further comments at later iterations.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The 2017 SHMA update provides evidence to support this policy. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment will assess the policy and amendments will be made where necessary.
DBLP195	Fisher German on behalf of The Hospital of The Holy and Undivided Trinity	Concerned by this policy's requirement that on major development sites, a minimum of 45% of dwellings must be accessible and a minimum of 10% must be wheelchair accessible. Note that the Council's SHMA Update (October 2017) identifies a need for 1,350 dwellings for older people, do not believe the Council's rationale for why the implementation of 'higher building regulation standards' via this policy will help to secure these dwellings. It is not clear from the evidence base whether the financial implications of providing accessible dwellings has been fully understood to ensure that this will not place undue burden on developers. This policy (in addition to the policy of affordable housing) must take account of general	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment will assess the policy and amendments will be made where necessary.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		issues with viability which are currently experienced in the District, especially if the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is to be continued.	
DBLP221	Gladman Developments	<p>It would be beneficial to confirm whether this policy means that 55% of major development sites should be to M4(2). In principle, recognise the importance of delivering housing to assist in meeting the needs for older people and those with mobility issues. However, the NPPF is clear that planning policies for housing should make use of the Government's optional technical standards for accessible and adaptable housing only if this would address an identified need for such policies and where these standards can be justified. Refers to the PPG which provides guidance on the use of the optional technical standards. Will need to ensure through its evidence that Policy 6 is in line with the guidance and that the justification and specific detail of the policy take account of the various factors which the PPG refers to: "Based on their housing needs assessment and other available datasets it will be for the local planning authority to set out how they intend to approach the need for Requirement M4(2) (accessible and adaptable dwellings), and/or M4(3) (wheelchair user dwellings), of the Building Regulations. There is a wide range of published official statistics and factors which local planning authorities can consider and take into account, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The likely future need for older and disabled people (including wheelchair user dwellings); - Size, location, type and quality of dwellings needed to meet specifically evidenced needs (for example retirement homes, sheltered homes, or care homes); - The accessibility and adaptability of existing stock; - How needs vary across different tenures; and - The overall impact of 	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing this policy, taking into consideration the results of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Amendments will be made where it is considered necessary.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>viability." The application of M4(3) standards should only be required for dwellings that the Council is solely responsible for as required by the PPG. These technical standards have deliberately been set as optional standards which, if to be included as a policy in the Local Plan, would need to be justified by robust evidence that is based on more than an age profile. It is accepted that evidence suggests an ageing population in the district, this does not justify the use of optional building regulations to such high percentages. When reconsidering this policy, the Council need to be aware of the impact that these requirements can have on the costs of construction (per dwelling) and scheme viability and the knock-on effects that this could have on the delivery of much needed housing (and potentially affordable housing levels through viability issues). Flexibility in the policy wording should be included which provides 'support' for provision of M4(2) but does not set a policy requirement which could impact development viability to the detriment of affordable housing delivery. Would object to this policy as the percentages are not sound and/or supported by robust and detailed evidence on the accessibility needs. Similarly, it would not appear that the Council have properly considered the additional cost implications for housing with these requirements within the viability work. The viability assessment only tested on the basis of 10% M4(2) and 4% of M4(3) at a cost assumption of £1.2 per square meter and £4 per square meter respectively. Through the Government's Housing Standards Review EC Harris estimated the cost impact of M4(3) per dwelling as £15,691 for apartments and £26,816 for houses. It will also be necessary to consider the relative priorities in meeting affordable housing and/or meeting M4(2) and M4(3) needs and how this translates into the policies. Similarly, where M4(2) and M4(3) requirements will be met through schemes of specialist accommodation for older people</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>then the needs for allocations should be reduced accordingly. Given the age profile, a more appropriate strategy to meet the needs would be to properly understand the detailed needs across the range of specialist accommodation types and then allocate sufficient sites to meet these needs. Any percentages to achieve the optional building regulation standards should take account of the delivery of that accommodation, which will have to comply with those standards in order to be fit for purpose anyway. Given that the housing requirement is 6,630 it would be unreasonable to impose more onerous requirements on the allocations to make up for the fact that around 50% of the requirement is already committed without these requirements. It may be beneficial to consider how other Councils have addressed these matters within recently adopted Local Plans. Policy 6 should also be subdivided as it relates to 2 different requirements, one being the need for specialist accommodation and the other for accessible homes as part of the residential allocations.</p>	
DBLP226	Retford Civic Society	<p>Welcomes the higher standards of internal access in dwellings. The population is aging and more people will need homes designed to accommodate impaired mobility.</p>	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP255	Home Builders Federation	<p>Policy 6 on sites of 10 or more dwellings a minimum of 45% of dwellings must meet Building Regulations Part M Category 2 accessible and adaptable homes (M4(2)) standards and a minimum of 10% of dwellings must meet Building Regulations Part M Category 3 wheelchair user homes (M4(3)) standards. If the Council wishes to adopt the higher optional standards for M4(2) and M4(3) then this should be done in accordance with the 2019 NPPF (para 127f & Footnote 46). The WMS 25th March 2015 stated that “the optional new national technical standards should only be required through any new Local Plan policies if they address a clearly evidenced need, and where their impact on viability has been considered, in accordance with the NPPG”. Footnote 46 of 2019 NPPF states that planning policies for housing should make use of the Government’s optional technical standards for accessible and adaptable housing where this would address an identified need for such properties. The Council should apply the criteria set out in the NPPG (ID 56-005 to 56-011). Should gather evidence to determine whether there is a need for additional standards in their area and justify setting appropriate policies in the Local Plan. In determining the quantum of M4(2) and / or M4(3) homes the Council should focus on the ageing population living in the District compared to national / regional figures and the proportion of households living in newly built homes. All new homes are built to Building Regulation Part M Category 1 (M4(1)) standards which include level approach routes, accessible front door thresholds, wider internal doorway and corridor widths, switches and sockets at accessible heights and downstairs toilet facilities usable by wheelchair users. These standards are not usually available in the older existing housing stock (if built circa more than 10 years ago) and benefit less able-bodied occupants. The population aged 65+ in Bassetlaw is increasing but if the Government had intended that evidence</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council’s 2017 SHMA Update indicates a need for accessible and adaptable homes and this forms reasoned justification for Policy 6. In terms of viability, the Council will ensure that all relevant policies, including policy 6, are included in the whole plan viability assessment. The Council will make any necessary amendments to the policy taking into consideration evidence in the whole plan viability assessment.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>of an ageing population justified adoption of the higher M4(2) and M4(3) optional standards then such standards would have been incorporated as mandatory in the Building Regulations which the Government has not done. It is incumbent on the Council to provide a local assessment evidencing the specific case for Bassetlaw which justifies the inclusion of optional higher standards and the quantum in Policy 6. As set out in the 2019 NPPF all policies should be underpinned by relevant and up to date evidence which should be adequate and proportionate focussed tightly on supporting and justifying the policies concerned (para 31). The Council is reminded that the requirement for M4(3) should only be required for dwellings over which the Council has housing nomination rights as set out in the NPPG (ID 56-008). Any requirement for higher optional standards especially M4(3) should be thoroughly viability tested. In September 2014 Government's Housing Standards Review EC Harris estimated the cost impact of M4(3) per dwelling as £15,691 for apartments and £26,816 for houses. The Council's viability assessment only tested on the basis of 10% M4(2) and 4% M4(3) at a cost assumption of £1 – 2 per square metre and £4 per square metre respectively. This policy requirement should be modified before publication of the pre-submission Local Plan.</p>	
DBLP265	Individual	With an increasing aging population missing a golden opportunity to lead the way by ensuring that the older generation of Bassetlaw is cared for by creating a retirement village where bungalow and facilities are considered at one of the possible development sites, thus freeing up larger family homes , filling the need for a variety of sized bungalow	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP284	Doncaster Council	Support inclusion of the optional building Regulations revolved around the M4(2) and M4(3) accessibility standards, and feel the policy is appropriate to improve the quality of new homes and better housing choices for disadvantaged groups in the	Thank you for your comments which are noted. In terms of viability, the Council will ensure that all relevant policies, including policy 6, are included in the whole plan viability assessment. The Council will

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>region. The evidence provided in the “North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw Strategic Housing Market Area OAN Update” is appropriate with regards to the robust evidence base required in the NPPG (NPPG para 007, Ref ID 56-007-20150327). This evidence has the potential to be strengthened further through looking at some of the other appropriate sources outlined in the Government’s guide to disability data. From assessing Bassetlaw’s “Interim Whole Plan & CIL Viability Assessment 2018”, it seems that a lower percentage than what is included in the policy was used for the appraisal assumptions. To make sure the policy adheres to the viability assessment requirement in the NPPG, any update to the viability assessment should reflect the percentage of accessible housing outlined in the policy as a minimum. The wording reflecting the inclusion of the M4(3) wheelchair accessible standards should be reassessed. This is in light of the two different distinctions of the M4(3) standard and the wording in the NPPG which states that Plan policies for wheelchair accessible homes should be applied only to those dwellings where the local authority is responsible for allocating or nominating a person to live in that dwelling (NPPG para 009, Ref ID 56-009-20150327). For the policy to be applicable to private market dwellings, the policy should ask for the requirement of wheelchair adaptable dwellings.</p>	make any necessary amendments to the policy taking into consideration evidence in the whole plan viability assessment.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)	Housing Mix and Policy 4 – Mixes of housing types based on needs / local evidence, but also must meet the requirements of the applicable Neighbourhood Plan.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)	Can only be satisfied by major developments for the old, disabled, wheelchair accessible need. Unless a specific individual is building for his / her own / family member sole use.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
Policy 7: Residential Care Homes			
DBLP221	Gladman Developments	Consider that the Council should consider the full range of specialist accommodation that falls in a C2 Residential Institution Use Class and seek to allocate sufficient sites across these different models that is commensurate with a detailed needs study in suitable locations. At para 7.33 the Council state that the affordable policies will meet the needs of Bassetlaw but as stated previously the level of housing proposed and the proposed policy levels for affordable housing, will not met the affordable needs of Bassetlaw as per the Strategic Objectives.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP245	Individual	Where residential homes are required it would be more appropriate to build in proximity of amenities such as hospitals.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
Policy 8: Rural Bassetlaw			
DBLP1	Individual	All past development in Tuxford has been carried out to the other side of the town which has brought lots of congestion all in one area of town. Strongly believe that the future development should come to the south of the town to balance it out including my site No 124 which is a brownfield site and which has no topsoil (tests have been done) as the original use for the site was a brick yard. My views as to why the site is very suitable to be developed. 1. It is close to the windmill to which is the main local and tourist attraction and it would bring the town together. 2. It is one of the main bus routes. 3. It has full access to the countryside. 4. It will bring more integration into the neighbourhood. 5. All the main services are on site. Site location plan attached.	Tuxford Town Council has prepared a Neighbourhood Plan and are now in the process of reviewing it to consider locations for new development. Recent consultation with people in Tuxford stated that they would like to see a balance of new development around the town.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP23	Individual	There are too many houses in the small villages when there are no amenities. People have to travel to town for everything i.e. supermarkets, banks, petrol, schools, doctors, post office - the list is endless and is adding greatly to global warming. There is nothing for young people, older and the infirm. They cannot get to town in the evening because there are no public transport.	The majority of new development will be in the three main towns where it is considered most sustainable. However, Rural parts of Bassetlaw will also be encouraged to grow to help meet housing needs in those areas and to support existing services and employment.
DBLP23	Individual	Those houses should be put in Retford, Worksop, Harworth, affordable ones where there is work, thus saving global warming. These houses should be affordable for all. They will also have all the amenities.	The majority of new development will be in the three main towns where it is considered most sustainable. However, Rural parts of Bassetlaw will also be encouraged to grow to help meet housing needs in those areas and to support existing services and employment.
DBLP26	Individual	As a joint owner of land in Styrrup welcome the changes this plan is recommending and feel a more positive approach to planning in rural settlements is well over due. By allowing villages to grow it can bring opportunity with it in regards to supporting and enhancing local services and the increase in revenue for local businesses, whilst recognising the need for more homes as populations increase.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP31	BDC Councillor	The risk of death and serious injury is HIGH RISK in and between the rural villages. Policy 8 to increase village and rural housing has been put forward without a risk assessment. There is serious dangers on country roads inadequate for modern traffic but lethal for increased numbers of residents. More people should not be put at risk by unsuitable roads which were not designed for safe modern living.	When considering the level and distribution of new development relevant infrastructure providers such as the Highway Authority are consulted. In terms of detailed highway issues and improvement, these will be detailed and agreed through any planning application process.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP31	BDC Councillor	<p>The approach is a complete reversal of the previous plan in sustainability in the Rural Areas and villages. Previously development was unsustainable in the rural villages. Many residents are old people and the services and care that they require are not easily or safely provided in rural areas. The roads are historic having been created for horses with many bends and features especially in bad weather. Many health workers in Retford are not comfortable driving on dangerous roads in bad weather. The roads have a higher incidence of accidents, injuries and deaths. The parish Councils tend to concentrate on the village streets it is the roads between the villages that claim the most lives because the vehicles are travelling at speed between villages. Safety on the roads has not been taken into account in the new approach. In Headon there has been 3 deaths on a junction on the Rampton Road outside the village in my lifetime - no improvements have been made. Other residents have been killed on rural roads e.g. at Cottam. Increasing traffic on these roads is going to increase deaths and injuries and this has not been taken into account in the sustainability policy.</p>	<p>The change in approach is largely in response to some communities asking for growth where it has been constrained in the past. In addition, a number of communities are positively planning for new development through the development of Neighbourhood Plans.</p>
DBLP35	Dunham, Ragnall, Fledborough and Darlton Parish Council	<p>The parishes welcome the opportunity for sensitive planning applications in Dunham, Darlton and for the first time Ragnall. It is understood that any application would have to comply with existing or new guidelines, however for rural communities such as ours welcome the chance for limited new development in order that villages continue to thrive.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted.</p>
DBLP56	Gainsborough Town Council	<p>Disappointed to not find more reference and ambition for development of the A631 given the significance of the route and volume of traffic. It is a major route to the coast and provides linkages to the A1, given the lifespan of the draft plan very concerned not to see any content in relation to development of this road.</p>	<p>The A631 forms part of the Transport Study which is part of the Local Plan evidence base. The transport and traffic issues have been assessed through this document.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP59	Styrrup with Oldcotes Parish Council	The Villages of Oldcotes and Styrrup have been "no growth" villages since at least 1978 and to now suggest they are limited growth (subject to policy) is a nonsense. Both villages lack adequate facilities, schools, doctors and shops, and Styrrup has inadequate drainage to sustain any further growth. The Parish Council does not accept the figures derived for unmet need WITHIN the villages given the substantial housing developments at Harworth, Langold and Carlton in Lindrick. To classify Oldcotes and Styrrup in the same category as Langold from a growth perspective is a nonsense and ill thought out.	The level of growth has been distributed to settlements across rural Bassetlaw that are considered sustainable to see some limited development. There is an opportunity for the community in Styrrup and Oldcotes to plan for this development appropriately through a Neighbourhood Plan.
DBLP81	GPS Planning and Design Ltd	Agree that Scrooby should rightfully be included in the list of settlements at Figure 8 where growth is supported. Whilst we concur that there should be minimum housing requirement set for each of the rural settlements, it is our opinion that a precise quantum 'cap' for housing growth, in the case of Scrooby at 25 units, is far too restrictive.	the development of 25 units equals a 20% increase in dwellings which is consistent with other settlements within rural Bassetlaw.
DBLP85	Individual	Normanton on Trent needs more new housing to keep its school viable. It is wrong just to allocate a set number to our village, there is loads of infill space. Over the last 10 years far more family properties have been built but we still need a few more and a designated park area would be great. Many new residents travel to London to work, our "widows row" - alms properties, now house younger people, the demographics have totally changed. Well aware Rampton hospital, one of the largest employers in Bassetlaw is struggling to attract staff. Why not consider the brown site of the now disused High Marnham power station as a new village? It has good links to A1. It would be possible to cycle there at that distance, very green! Finally if any large development is allowed anywhere in this part of Bassetlaw, please make the developer bring us all mains gas!	Normanton on Trent is supported to grow up to a 20% increase in residential dwellings. Bassetlaw District Council are encouraging communities to undertake Neighbourhood Plans so that the local community can have a greater say in where the development is located and the type of development needed. The Local Plan is also considering the appropriate uses for existing brownfield sites such as High Marnham Power Station.
DBLP92	Individual	As a joint owner of land in Styrrup would welcome the changes this plan is recommending, and feel a more positive approach	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>to planning in rural settlements is well over due. By allowing villages to grow, it can bring opportunity with it, in regards to supporting and enhancing local services and the increase in revenue for local businesses, whilst recognising the need for more homes as populations increase.</p>	
DBLP101	William Davis Ltd	<p>Intends to place 1,777 homes delivered in the rural areas. For the minimum target to be delivered the rural areas would have to provide 105 dwellings per annum, with the draft Plan stating the average number of rural homes delivered each year for the previous 8 years to be to be only 92. The Bassetlaw AMR (March 2017) shows, within Table 4, that the average number of homes delivered per annum within rural areas for the years 2005-2010 to be as low as 55. The draft Plan is extremely ambitious and there is no certainty that the target is achievable within the Plan Period. The Draft Plan acknowledges this, stating within the 8 Neighbourhood Plans under development, 7 show shortfalls against the residual requirement; the largest of which being with the Parish of Langold, showing a shortfall of 94 dwellings against the required growth target. Policy 8 envisages the use of windfall sites to be a catalyst for development within the rural settlements, with single housing proposals of no more dwellings than 5% of any settlement emerging to provide a minimum of 10% growth to each Village. This would require 2 separate sites to be proposed, allocated and built out within each settlement by 2035. This is a complex and difficult strategy to successfully deliver as there are a number of existing limitations to development within rural settlements. Vast areas north of Retford, west of Gainsborough and east of Tuxford are within Floodzone 3 which limits and prohibits development within the affected settlements. Moreover, the Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment (2009) emphasises conservation upon two large swathes to the East and South West of the District further constraining</p>	<p>The spatial strategy has now been revised. The level of growth within the rural area is now 1500 requirement for the identified Large Rural Settlements and 667 for the identified Small Rural Settlements. The majority of this growth is being planned through the development of Neighbourhood Plans across the rural areas.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>development potential; there is also Clumber Park which will affect development potential for nearby and surrounding settlements. Beyond this, a general lack of facilities, amenities and infrastructure, as well as existing conservation areas, listed buildings and tightly drawn limits are restrictive on the growth potential for smaller settlements. If development were to come forward successfully and deliver on target this would provide up to 356 new affordable homes within the rural areas in accordance with Policy 3. Villages and smaller settlements are far less sustainable and have a weaker public transport network than the main towns of the District. New residents would have less access to employment, facilities and education as well as having a reliance on the private car. The Bassetlaw Sustainability Appraisal (January 2019) states the objective of 27% rural growth will impact negatively upon cultural heritage, landscape, transport, air quality and climate change as the increase in residential development in rural settlements will increase pressure on already limited rural transport services and could lead to increased traffic congestion and air pollution within rural communities (para 4.22.) Focussing development across a range of more isolated and less well serviced locations is not in accordance with the overarching goal of sustainability within NPPF para 8. Suggest that based on past delivery trends an acceptable, achievable and sustainable housing target for the rural areas would be around 75 dpa. This would delivery 1,275 homes across the rural areas throughout the Plan Period. The remaining 502 homes should then be allocated and directed towards the sustainable town of Worksop.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP129	Sturton le Steeple Parish Council	<p>Sturton le Steeple broadly accepts the proposed target of between 10 and 20% growth till 2035. However, the benchmark for this calculation is not clear. There is at present planning permission for 10 houses, plus three others built in the last 2 years. Can you please clarify a) what is the cut-off date for recently built houses to be included in the baseline for calculating the 20% value and b) will houses built after that date be included in the overall 20% future development.</p>	<p>The 20% increase in dwellings is based on the number of existing dwellings in the parish as of August 2018. In addition, any new residential dwellings permitted since 1st April 2018 will contribute towards meeting the 20% requirement.</p>
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	<p>Object to the approach taken to the planning for the rural areas of Bassetlaw. Have significant concerns in relation to the overall quantum of development that has been directed towards the District's villages. Para 8.3 sets out the logic behind the approach to allocating development towards the rural area which has evolved from the "Functional Cluster" approach from the Initial Draft. Note that the overall allocation of development for the rural area (1,777 dwellings) is based on the minimum 10% being achieved at all of the 73 villages identified as being appropriate for growth. The premise by which the Local Plan has sought to allocate development is flawed. Support the need to maintain the viability and vitality of rural services, this needs to be planned for by understanding the health and hinterlands of those services and the level of development that is needed to support them (and through locating that level of development in a location accessible to those services). This assessment is true where a village cluster is located adjacent to or even around a main service centre. Many of the 73 villages identified for growth do not have any notable services to meet their day to day needs. Whilst they may form part of a 'cluster' that could access a GP Surgery in another village or a convenience shop in another, this does not constitute a sustainable pattern of living. It is not sustainable to encourage more households to live in remote locations where they are encouraged to travel in sporadic patterns to access</p>	<p>The spatial strategy has now been revised. The level of growth within the rural area is now 1500 requirement for the identified Large Rural Settlements and 667 for the identified Small Rural Settlements. The majority of this growth is being planned through the development of Neighbourhood Plans across the rural areas.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>remote facilities. It is much more sustainable for those villages to be sustained by their rural hubs (the main settlements) where trips can be linked and journeys made by public transport. Taking the Retford village cluster, of the 8 settlements in the cluster there are 2 villages which have services that might reasonably sustain some of the day to day needs of their populations. Clarborough has a shop, post office and a primary school. Sutton-cum-Lound has a post office and a primary school. Ranby has a primary school. Support a level of development in those villages that would support the longer-term viability and vitality of those services.</p> <p>Development should relate to the settlement itself. It is not a forgone conclusion that those services would benefit from additional development; for example, Clarborough School is already significantly over its capacity (163 pupils within a school of 140 capacity) and Ranby School is at capacity (110 pupils). Aside from Clarborough (which has its own constraints regarding school capacity to overcome) and Sutton-cum-Lound there are no other settlements in the cluster that would benefit from additional development. Additional development in other villages where no services exist would not benefit the viability of the small service villages above, but simply locate more development within relatively unsustainable locations away from either rural services or main town settlements. In the Retford cluster, can see no evidence to suggest that residents of surrounding villages will not simply commute into Retford to meet their day to day needs. Note that the cluster of villages does not include a GP Surgery. The Retford Cluster is proposed to be allocated some 184 dwellings as a minimum with 82 of those allocated towards Clarborough and Suttoncum-Lound. Some 100 dwellings will be allocated to the detriment of the sustainability of the borough, away from</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		services and facilities that are provided within Retford. This pattern of allocation is repeated across the District.	
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Object to Policy 8 as it proposed a minimum allocation of 1777 dwellings to the rural villages. The plan will direct a significant amount of housing to the least sustainable locations within the borough and will not enhance their sustainability but increase the number of homes which are located unsustainably. The Council should abandon its policy of allocating a minimum level of development across the majority of its rural villages and should, target a modest level of growth to villages with existing services and facilities that require support to maintain their existing levels of vitality and viability. It is not clear why Part 1 of Policy 8 goes on to enable development to come forward on non-allocated sites outside the settlement boundary when this is not a policy mechanism used elsewhere within the Local Plan at more sustainable locations for growth (such as the three main settlements). The above approach, twinned with a 'cap' on the development that is double the minimum requirement (20% of the existing settlement) could lead to over 50% of the district's development being located within the rural area, away from jobs, services and facilities. Strongly object to this being a sustainable approach to planning.	The spatial strategy has now been revised. The level of growth within the rural area is now 1500 requirement for the identified Large Rural Settlements and 667 for the identified Small Rural Settlements. The majority of this growth is being planned through the development of Neighbourhood Plans across the rural areas.
DBLP142	Ranskill Parish Council	With regard to Ranskill the Parish Council notes that the 10% cap is 60 houses the 20% cap 119 properties, that we already have 48 planning permissions granted which gives an outstanding figure for growth of 71 dwellings.	Any permissions for residential development granted after 1st April 2018 will contribute towards the 20% requirement for Ranskill.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP143	Persimmon Homes & Charles Church	<p>Past delivery of homes in Bassetlaw rural settlements over the past 8 years has averaged circa 100 homes per annum. It is unclear from the available evidence whether the Local Plan is right to align its Spatial Policies (27% of housing or 1777 homes) with past organic market led development. Unclear how the perpetuation of rural intensification is maximising sustainability? The homes being sold in rural communities are typically less affordable, reduce opportunities for modal shift away from car dependency, dilute village character, residents may struggle with poor access to essential services and often stretched local infrastructure. Rural intensification appears contrary to broad sustainable principles.</p>	<p>The spatial strategy has now been revised. The level of growth within the rural area is now 1500 requirement for the identified Large Rural Settlements and 667 for the identified Small Rural Settlements. The majority of this growth is being planned through the development of Neighbourhood Plans across the rural areas.</p>
DBLP145	Individual	<p>Appreciate that the 10% housing increase and 20% cap is an across the district starting figure for identified settlements, strongly believe that Clayworth is too small a village with a uniquely well and seldom seemed preserved village layout, community and architectural heritage to be able to support these figures of increased housing. Clayworth is a unique conservation village, in a conservation setting and landscape. It is special in that farms and open spaces mix in with residential in a way rarely found in most Bassetlaw villages. Infill and suburban development styles have taken too much away from too many villages already in the district. To have development on the scale proposed would have a permanent negative impact on the village, its sense of place and special nature. Some of the sites previously suggested in 2017 for housing allocation are completely inappropriate. The field identified in the centre of the village, which lies alongside the village hall, is a unique breathing space in the linear ribbon structure of the village. It provides views over the farming landscape to which the village is intricately wedded, both historically and currently. It is a link to the canal, which encircles the village and for which the village setting is known</p>	<p>The spatial strategy has now been revised. The level of growth within the rural area is now 1500 requirement for the identified Large Rural Settlements and 667 for the identified Small Rural Settlements. The majority of this growth is being planned through the development of Neighbourhood Plans across the rural areas.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>for, bringing in many visitor, walkers and wildlife enthusiasts. When walking on the canal, and onto the public footpath that runs across this field and the grass field beyond, can look from the footpath into this field and onto the beautiful old cottages beyond, on the opposite side of the road to this field's edge and gateway. To build here would ruin this natural view that links the community, village and surrounding to its landscape and heritage. It would ruin a local and widely known rambling route and the cottages facing this field would face development completely out of keeping and context to their vernacular architecture. Would like to point out that do not live near this field or any these areas of the village. What safeguards are to be put in place to ensure any new development is for the benefit of village families and their children? Any development without it seems only to benefit district housing targets and not the village and villagers of Clayworth. Building without safeguarding and restricting access to new homes for village families is wrong and severely taking advantage of the village community. Large 'executive' and 'town house' style homes are not required for Clayworth, nor would they benefit villagers. They would simply serve to draw in wealthy people from outside the village, who are probably at a later stage of their life and have no housing needs whatsoever. Have neither a school nor a shop. Where are families to send their children to school, should new homes be built? The good village schools nearby are all at capacity and to assume parents would want to simply send their children to the catchment primary school in Clarborough is naive. Can even Clarborough school cope? The 'main road' through the village narrows significantly as one heads from the Retford end to the northern end of the village. Housing figures on this scale, and on the sites previously submitted in 2017, would dramatically increase the amount of traffic on the road and</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>create significant road safety issues. Walking with children or in a group is already difficult and with added risk where the pavements are narrow, in and around the end of the village with the church especially. As a mother with two young children that increased volumes of traffic on the B road running through the village, alongside very narrow pavements with bends which fit a village rooted in an ancient layout, will only lead to awful accidents. Increased volumes of traffic would make walking far more dangerous and drastically impact on the rural and peaceful nature of the village. Access points onto the village's roads are often dangerous and with poor visibility. Development would increase the risk of accidents. Increased road signage, or safety features that currently aren't necessary but would be with development, would negatively impact on the rural nature of the village and would fly in the face of the conservation status. The issue lies in the overall setting, village-scape and its setting within its heritage and landscape. Increased housing in so many areas of the village would have far reaching negative impacts that would permanently impact on the village, its heritage and its community. The quality of any development is also a concern. Too much new housing is simply 'shoved in' and looks like something that has been dropped on a village site. Such developments are from a house builder's pattern book, with no consideration for local vernacular architecture and no effort whatsoever to create something unique and complementary for the village in which these developments have 'landed'. Clayworth deserves better. The village sits within a natural dip or shallow 'valley', bounded by Gringley beacon on one side, Haughgate Hill on the Wheatley side, Clayworth Common and finally the Chesterfield Canal, which forms a loop around the village. From all these vantage points and from aspects closer to and within the village, the village's ribbon development is clearly</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>seen and fits within its landscape of agriculture fields and woodland, all of which are immediately accessible from this ribbon development along Town Street, to necessitate the agricultural economy upon which the village is founded. To break from this ribbon development with a lump of housing would jar with the settlement pattern. It would negatively impact on the ancient feel to the village and its natural flow northwards up towards to the church at the top of Town Street. This is an ancient end of the village - walkers, visitors and locals find themselves naturally drawn and needs to be conserved. The village has SSSI along the Chesterfield Canal. It has a great deal of wildlife and varied native biodiversity that has been able to coexist alongside its human population for centuries. Barn owls, short eared owls, cuckoos, swifts, grass snakes, ancient colonies of bats are heard and seen in and around the village. Grass snakes are spotted in the summer on the pavement verges of town street. There must be consideration of the village's natural environment and its biodiversity. It needs conserving. Some of the grass fields suggested for development in the 2017 calls for sites are home to large amounts of flora and fauna, which any environmental survey would illustrate.</p>	
DBLP150	Individual	Support developing rural areas in line with their Neighbourhood plans.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP151	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	<p>This policy follows the traditional route of previous policy concerned with rural housing but if, as predicted, the reliance, provision and general use of petrol/diesel cars is to be drastically reduced in the near future, it does not really matter where housing is sited as the trips to and from the schools etc will be via sustainable transport methods. One aspect that continues to be ignored is the fact that most services, groceries, libraries, pharmacy, hairdressers, hot food, nearly all the day to day requirements are now delivered so the travel journeys to town are more to do with work and school and some social. These visits are reduced even more when one considers senior citizens as they have all retired and none of them have children at school. A rethink is therefore required. Figure 7 gives a list of villages where growth is not to be supported, primarily due to their size and location being away from service provisions and having none within the village. This description is generally correct but Bevercotes is a glaring anomaly. With recent permissions, this hamlet will, when complete, have approximately 75 dwellings. It has a cafe/restaurant and shop with employment, its own electricity generation scheme that provides renewable energy to at least 70 of these dwellings and a major tourist/leisure facility with Springvale Fisheries. 66 of the dwellings are single storey structures of which the majority will be occupied by over 55 year old residents. This site at present already enjoys all of the home delivered services mentioned earlier. The reasoning why this village cannot accept further development is flawed.</p>	<p>The emphasis is to place development in the most suitable and sustainable locations. The figures for the number of dwellings in Bevercotes was taken from August 2018. At this time, the number of dwellings in Bevercotes parish was small. Lound Hall/ Springvale development is located within Bothamsall Parish. Some dwellings are also located in West Markham Parish.</p>
DBLP170	East Markham Parish Council	<p>With regard to housing in East Markham, acknowledge the 10% cap is 52 houses and the 20% cap is 100 properties. Have 93 planning permissions granted and will only need to provide land for seven more properties. Concerned that the majority of houses granted are for large 4/5 bedroomed properties on what are inappropriately small plots, which results in an</p>	<p>The calculation for the 20% cap was based on the number of dwellings in East Markham parish in August 2018. Any residential development permitted since the 1st April 2018 will contribute towards meeting the 20% requirement.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>appearance of overcrowding that is not in keeping with the village, this is very apparent on Beckland Hill. Request that the seven additional permissions will be for small starter homes or properties suitable for older residents to downsize to, on suitably sized plots. This is in line with our Neighbourhood Plan. The Council should take more cognisance of the Neighbourhood Plan with regard to parking on new sites. The plan indicates a number of parking spaces per property. It is not just that there should be sufficient parking spaces, but additional room for manoeuvring on the site is required, so that residents do not have to reverse on to the narrow main roads. The District Council would not approve parking for a Company in such circumstances.</p>	
DBLP173	Lichfields on behalf of SP Scholey and the estate of WA Scholey	<p>Policy 8 should be revised to remove the blanket housing requirement and arbitrary 20% growth cap for settlements in Rural Bassetlaw and criterion j) and k) in the policy should be removed for the same reason. Para 6.36 acknowledges that housing delivery and demand has, in recent, been greatest in rural parishes of Bassetlaw so arbitrarily limiting the growth of these areas would, significantly undermine the deliverability of the Plan's proposed housing supply. Reject the approach set out at para 8.16 that states for areas not developing a Neighbourhood Plan, will only seek to allocate sites in rural areas up to one hectare in size, unless the regeneration benefits of a larger site can be clearly demonstrated. Such an approach is flawed as it ignores the other important benefits that can be achieved as part of larger scale forms of development and which are supported by other policies (e.g. the delivery of affordable housing and community facilities - policies 3, 23 and 24). The approach set out in para 8.16 should not be taken forward.</p>	<p>The spatial strategy has now been revised. The level of growth within the rural area is now 1500 requirement for the identified Large Rural Settlements and 667 for the identified Small Rural Settlements. The majority of this growth is being planned through the development of Neighbourhood Plans across the rural areas.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP186	Natural England	Support the strategic criteria for rural settlements, in particular, support criteria E – to retain where possible or mitigate for changes to natural boundaries.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP187	Individual	The best people to decide where and how much development should take place is the community itself, and not an arbitrary 20% cap. Take Dunham and Ragnall. Dunham has seen a significant increase in the number of houses in living memory and suitable areas for development are now limited. Ragnall has seen a 25% reduction in houses in living memory. A 20% allocation will not even see Ragnall back to where it was in the 1970s. Let the people decide!	The community has the opportunity to plan for where the new development is located through the development of a Neighbourhood Plan.
DBLP191	National Trust	Helpful in protecting the open character of the countryside and providing several additional criteria to protect the countryside, including: c) It would not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside and farmland e) The site retains where possible or mitigates for changes to natural boundaries such as trees, hedgerows, embankments, water courses and drainage ditches	The open countryside is heavily protected throughout the policies in the Local Plan. There are also policies that encourage the redevelopment of brownfield sites and sites/land in larger settlements across the District.
DBLP194	Emery Planning on behalf of J G Pears Property Ltd	The support offered by the Plan for development at both High and Low Marnham is welcomed. Note how tightly the settlement boundaries are drawn and the 'cap' placed upon levels of residential development. The use of a 'cap' on the levels of development is discordant with the aims and objectives of the Framework which provides a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Each case for development should be considered on its own merits and with regard to other material considerations. It may be that some places will require additional growth over the Plan period for specific purposes, such as supporting local infrastructure. Placing a 'cap' on levels of development would prohibit potentially appropriate and necessary development and greater flexibility should be provided in this regard. Greater support should also be provided in this Section for the redevelopment of major	The spatial strategy has now been revised. The level of growth within the rural area is now 1500 requirement for the identified Large Rural Settlements and 667 for the identified Small Rural Settlements. The majority of this growth is being planned through the development of Neighbourhood Plans across the rural areas. However, if a community wants to plan for further growth, then this is possible through the justification and development of a Neighbourhood Plan.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>previously developed sites in the countryside for a full range of potential uses. Para 8.23 highlights that the Council is keen to support sustainable patterns of economic growth and states that whilst there is no requirement to allocate land for employment, the policy supports sustainable economic development of an appropriate scale in rural areas. It goes on to state that in non-NP areas, growth is potentially possible, but will be character-driven. It is not clear from the Plan what is meant by 'appropriate scale' or in non-NP areas 'character-driven'. Language used in the Plan should be as objective as possible and offer greater clarity for users. As set out above, this section of the Plan should make clear that the redevelopment of major previously developed sites in the countryside will be permissible. Policy 8 (2) relating to Economic Growth allows for: "Proposals for economic developments within close proximity and easy access to the A1 corridor, or comprehensive redevelopment of a major brownfield site that will meet an unexpected demand, will be supported if it can be demonstrated to the council's satisfaction that it will deliver a high quality, exemplary scheme that will increase the overall number, quality and skills level of local jobs." In general this is welcomed concerned with several elements of the phraseology. To require 'comprehensive redevelopment' of a major brownfield site may not always be appropriate or achievable, particularly given the scale of some such sites. The term 'to the Council's satisfaction' is vague and offers no certainty to applicants as to what will be policy compliant. The requirement for development to be 'exemplary' is also disproportionate and superfluous given the policy already requires development to be 'high quality'. Finally, with regard to Policy 8 the requirements for new employment to "increase the overall number, quality and skills level of local</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		"jobs" is considered to be excessively restrictive and should instead be expressed in terms of 'or' rather than 'and'.	
DBLP197	IBA Planning Ltd.	The Council's general approach is acceptable – would like to see a little more flexibility built in to ensure the housing cap does not unduly/arbitrarily rule out a perfectly acceptable and sustainable windfall site in the centre of a village in circumstances whereby the settlement has been allowed to grow up to the cap via peripheral sites that have been developed on land that necessarily formerly comprised part of the open countryside. Understand the need for a general cap, but there will no doubt be circumstances arising during the Plan period whereby the application of a strict cap will present an illogical restriction on a perfectly acceptable windfall site in the centre of a village unless the policy is worded to incorporate the necessary flexibility.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP198	Pegasus Planning on behalf of Sunnyside Dairy Farms Limited	Supportive of the overall strategy, which for Rural Bassetlaw, seeks to support proportional growth through a careful mix of planned and managed organic development to support the living, working and environmentally diverse landscape of the district. The Council is proposing a positive approach to development in rural communities and clearly distinguishes between settlements where growth is (Figure 7) and is not (Figure 8) supported; based on settlement size and potential impact of development, as well as the ability to enhance and maintain the viability of rural communities by supporting local services. Normanton on Trent is a settlement where growth is supported. This approach is supported and is in accordance with paragraph 78 of the 2019 NPPF, which seeks to promote sustainable development in rural areas by locating housing where it will enhance and maintain the vitality of rural communities. Paragraph 78 continues that planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Table 7 of the	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>Draft Local Plan sets out the residual requirement and capped growth number for each settlement, and for Normanton on Trent confirms that there is a housing requirement of 24 dwellings, capped growth of 41 dwellings, a residual requirement of 24 dwellings and 12 planning permissions at 1st April 2018. As with Policy 2 which sets out the overall housing requirement for the District, the housing requirement for each settlement at Table 7 should be expressed as a minimum. Land north of Gracefield Lane provides an opportunity to meet housing requirements in Normanton on Trent.</p>	
DBLP200	Savills on behalf of landowners of Top Farm, Elkesley	<p>Support the approach to “the rurals” in respect of finding the residual requirement beyond the garden villages of 438 dwellings through deliverable, developable sites in Neighbourhood Plan areas. The Council have recognised that the OAN figure set out by DCLG is a baseline figure and through incorporating the results of the EDNA it has been emphasised that an uplift from the standardised OAN was needed. Growth in the village of Elkesley ranges from between 36-66 new homes over the plan period (Table 7) and as such new sites are required to be brought forward following the undevelopable nature of the 33 units identified in the current adopted Neighbourhood Plan (related to refused application 18/11/00004). Subject to a masterplanning exercise the sites offer the ability to directly meet this need through accommodating the new homes across both or one parcel. It is important that rural settlements such as Elkesley are allowed to manage growth in positive way through allocating deliverable sites to meet the needs and help sustain the critical mass and ensure facilities and services continue to thrive and younger generations are able to afford new homes, to this end additional allocations within Elkesley are supported in order to meet this need on deliverable sites. In accordance with</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		paragraph 77 and 78 and PPG Paragraph: 001 Reference ID: 50-001-20160519.	
DBLP203	NJL Consulting on behalf of Caddick Land	Supports the overall objectives in the Plan, particularly Policy 8 and Policy 9 where they encourage economic growth and development which responds to market demand. The forthcoming Site Allocations consultation should go a step further and specifically allocate the site for logistics, manufacturing and ancillary uses. Such an approach would build on the Bassetlaw Economic Development Needs Assessment which specifically identifies this area for demand led major, long term, market facing, logistics and manufacturing uses. The Local Plan must respond to clear market signals and allocate the site.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP205	Fisher German on behalf of P Hinds	The policy states that the delivery of 1,777 new dwellings will be supported in the rural settlements of Bassetlaw. Note that the policy states that this requirement is a minimum. This is supported. Support the housing requirement for Rural Bassetlaw will be delivered through existing permissions and sites allocated through the Neighbourhood Plan and Local Plan site allocation process. In areas without site allocations (including made Neighbourhood Plan areas), have concerns that the criteria in Policy 8 as currently proposed are too restrictive on the size of non-allocated sites that can come forward. The Council should be proactive now and allocate sites to meet village housing requirements. This will assist delivery of the Council's housing requirement and assist in contributing to a robust five year housing land supply.	The spatial strategy has now been revised. The level of growth within the rural area is now 1500 requirement for the identified Large Rural Settlements and 667 for the identified Small Rural Settlements. The majority of this growth is being planned through the development of Neighbourhood Plans across the rural areas.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP207	Robert Doughty Consultancy on behalf of J. Travis	<p>We note the approach, outlined in paragraph 8.16 and Policy 8, that the Local Plan will only seek to allocate sites in those areas that do not benefit from a Neighbourhood Plan. This is a reasonable approach that will help support those communities engaged in Neighbourhood Planning and reduce any conflict between the two types of plan. We are concerned that in those circumstances where the Local Plan does make allocations in "Rural Bassetlaw" it will only allocate sites to meet the minimum growth target for the settlement. We do not consider this approach to be justified. The most appropriate allocations in a specific settlement may exceed this growth target. Rigid adherence to this target may result in the allocation of the most sustainable sites.</p>	<p>The spatial strategy has now been revised. The level of growth within the rural area is now 1500 requirement for the identified Large Rural Settlements and 667 for the identified Small Rural Settlements. The majority of this growth is being planned through the development of Neighbourhood Plans across the rural areas.</p>
DBLP210	Lound Parish Council	<p>Broad support for the context of the plan, but have concerns in relation to the 20% cap being detailed in respect of the housing requirement allocation. We question the need for having a target housing requirement (a) followed by a further capped growth figure (b) and view that this additional number (b) could be potentially seen as a means for exploitation by housing developers to force additional housing into areas not necessarily equipped for such a substantial additional growth. We would like to suggest that, instead of the proposed fixed percentage 20% Cap, each Neighbourhood should, using the BDC Requirement as a target, be given the flexibility to plan for a higher level of development that is appropriate for its area and infrastructure, based on a location referendum included within each neighbourhood plan.</p>	<p>The spatial strategy has now been revised. The level of growth within the rural area is now 1500 requirement for the identified Large Rural Settlements and 667 for the identified Small Rural Settlements. The majority of this growth is being planned through the development of Neighbourhood Plans across the rural areas. Each of the identified rural settlements will have a requirement of 20% growth.</p>
DBLP218	Pegasus Planing on behalf of E Fisher and Company Limited	<p>Not considered that the housing numbers adequately reflect the future growth prospects of Bassetlaw and its long-term economic competitiveness of the District. The proposed objectively assessed need should be in the higher region of the identified range of 308- 608 dwelling per annum. As such, the identified need for housing in Rural Bassetlaw would need to</p>	<p>The spatial strategy has now been revised. The level of growth within the rural area is now 1500 requirement for the identified Large Rural Settlements and 667 for the identified Small Rural Settlements. The majority of this growth is being planned through the development of Neighbourhood Plans across the rural areas.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>increase respectively. There will be greater scope to allocate an identified growth target for individual sustainable villages within the District, including Langold. Comment on the restrictions facing those development sites that are unallocated in the Local Plan or Neighbourhood Plan. Imposing a cap on the level of growth in a rural village is highly restrictive. Policy 8 is amended as follows: In areas without site allocations which address the housing requirement, in the defined rural settlements will generally be supported where it does not harm the surrounding open character of the countryside and contributes the sustainability of that settlement alongside satisfying or satisfies the following strategic criteria: b) It would not result in unacceptable coalescence with any neighbouring settlement; and c) It would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside and farmland; and d) The proposal is of a scale and in a location that respects the pattern of development of the settlement that is in keeping with the core shape and form** of the settlement and will not adversely harm its character and appearance; and f) The site conserves sustains and enhances local heritage and environmental characteristics; The approach of capping development as part of a Local Plan strategy is something that has been tested by the Planning Inspectorate at Examination. The NPPF states that “to support the Government’s objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed.” The Inspector at East Riding of Yorkshire Council, stated proposed caps would do the opposite and instead “deliberately suppress the level of housing that would otherwise be delivered through the consistent application of the broad approach to housing distribution chosen by the Council.” The imposition of a ‘cap’ to development is highly</p>	<p>Each of the identified rural settlements will have a requirement of 20% growth.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		restrict and contrary to the objectives of national policy. Policy 8 does not meet the requirement of the tests of soundness because it is not consistent with national policy and is not justified in its approach.	
DBLP221	Gladman Developments	The policy sets out a list of criteria which must be met for development to come forward in areas without site allocations to address the housing requirement in the defined rural settlements. Largely supportive over the criteria raise concerns with the following: "j) It does not, through a single housing proposal, increase the numbers of dwellings in the settlement by 5% or more. k) It does not, through a housing proposal, cumulatively increase the number of dwellings in the settlement by 20% or more when in combination with other development built or committed in the settlement." The approaches listed above are considered to be onerous and would set a development cap on settlements across Rural Bassetlaw without any consideration of the sustainability merits of a development proposal. Should the proposed growth levels be reached in individual settlements, Policy 8 would effectively act to arbitrarily preclude the delivery of sustainable development proposals from coming forward. This would be contrary to the explicit requirements of the NPPF which makes clear that sustainable development should go ahead without delay in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The housing requirement in Policy 1 seeks to meet a 'minimum' housing requirement and this should be reflected in the policy wording for lower order settlements. Recommend that criteria J and K are deleted as they are not considered to be positively prepared.	Policy 8 has now been revised (Policy ST2) in the Local Plan. This policy requirement has also been amended to add further protection and guidance for potential developers and for the creation and revision of Neighbourhood Plans.
DBLP228	Individual	Bevercotes is listed as a settlement where growth is not supported. The Draft Plan is therefore contradictory. Bevercotes is in fact a rural, isolated area, and is best suited to reversion or re-wilding. Bevercotes is better suited to habitat	Bevercotes Parish is considered too small to accommodate future development. Noted regarding the suitability for habitat creation and biodiversity gain

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		gain and biodiversity offsetting funded through S106 agreements from other development around Bassetlaw.	
DBLP229	Individual	It is proposed to deliver at least 1,777 (27%) new homes in the rural villages and Hayton is suitable to accommodate proportionate new development through the plan period.	Yes, Hayton will support up to a 20% increase in residential dwellings over the plan period.
DBLP230	Individual	Am a resident of Gamston which is in close proximity to the suggested Garden Village on the site of the current Gamston Airport. Gamston is a pleasant village of 87 dwellings with a population at the 2011 Census was 246. It is designated a conservation village with no identified development planned or expansion beyond the current village boundaries. The local has a year group pan of 14 and the current pupil count is 102. There are no other services in the village and there is a limited bus service to and from Retford and Newark. The plan suggests a proposed increase of 20% inline with all other areas of the district. This increase would amount to an increase of 49 residents, it is predicted that this could be achieved by identified sites within the curtilage of the present village as well as bringing back into use empty properties and redundant farm buildings.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP231	Clarborough & Welham Parish Council	Extremely concerned that the current, and any future, Neighbourhood Plan (NP) will retain its relevance for only 2 years after a Referendum! (para 14 of the 'NPPF'). The implication from this is an almost constant need to refresh a NP. Neighbourhood Plans are developed by volunteers - in this Parish 8 out of the 10 members of the Steering Group were retired. It is unreasonable to expect these volunteers to be, effectively, almost full-time unpaid workers. The 2011 legislation indicates that they are relevant for 15 years. This timescale allows the Parishes or Forums which work on the original Plan to have time to follow-up and implement the Plan. The new 2 year proposal will allow no 'down time' from the	The Clarborough and Welham Neighbourhood Plan is a currently made plan and is still the most up to date policy document for the community. The emerging local plan has set a requirement for additional growth (from 1st April 2018) at 20% increase. This would be a good time for the Neighbourhood Plan to be reviewed, alongside the Local Plan, to plan for this growth.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>stress of creating the Plan nor any time to implement the Policies of the Plan. This proposal will 'kill' the Neighbourhood Plan movement! The ethos of NPs is the development of the Plan by local residents, a taking back of local control for local development. There needs to be the establishment of a local resource base for advice and data collection beyond that which is currently available to NP Steering (planning) groups. Current provision in Bassetlaw is good on advice but the new need for constant refreshment requires a more practical input of resources to take on some of the practical tasks which a NP requires. This could be a 'Project Manager' working with and for a number of different NP groups perhaps 1 day per week for each group. This would be in addition to those professional planning consultants employed via 'Locality' grants etc, employed for specific tasks eg writing a character assessment.</p>	
DBLP231	Clarborough & Welham Parish Council	<p>Broadly accepts the suggestion of the 10% requirement of housing land site allocation. Can see no disadvantages in this for either our own Parish. This is especially the case in view of the details on this provided in Policy 8. Reservations concerning both the site allocation and/or 'windfall' cap to 93 houses in the Parish in order to achieve the 20% 'cap'. Taking into account the single site allocation of 38 houses in the NP and the existing 3 sites which have Planning Consent, there are a remaining 52 houses requiring sites according to the Plan. Policy 8 allows sites no larger than 5% of the current housing stock ie 25 in our Parish. What is the basis of this 5% figure? Surely the size of this maximum should be left to the individual Neighbourhood Plan to determine and not be pre-determined by either a developer or the District Council. Some Parishes may have sites suitable for this size of development but others will not, or may not wish to have sites this large. The essence of a Neighbourhood Plan is in the wishes of residents. An allowance of 5% of existing housing stock on a single site may</p>	<p>Policy 8 has now been revised (Policy ST2) in the Local Plan. This policy requirement has also been amended to add further protection and guidance for potential developers and for the creation and revision of Neighbourhood Plans.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>be far too large for the character of some Parishes including Clarborough & Welham. Concerns over the infrastructure pressures which development to 20% will place on two villages. The Primary School has only recently been extended to accommodate all those pupils who wish to attend it, the village shop copes with present population, the Post Office is only part-time and the bus service is barely adequate. The A620, which takes all traffic to Retford is very busy as are the peripheral roads on the north side of Retford. This will only get worse with existing Planning Consents or proposed planning applications for housing on the north side of Retford. The 20% 'cap' should be reduced to 15%. Even this does not allow for the existing diversity amongst the rural parishes. But it would give Parishes a greater chance to preserve their rural nature, a feature of Bassetlaw, and much valued by residents and visitors. Excessive growth in these communities will spoil the variety of the landscape evident within the village structure across the 103 villages of the District. This is the character of the area. A variety of older villages which have retained the very nature of their origins and other villages with sympathetic developments. This character should be preserved. The 5% maximum size per single development should be reconsidered at, perhaps, 2%. This would allow Parishes to manage development through their NP to produce more cohesive, integrated, less dominant and intrusive developments.</p> <p>Alternatively, suggest that where there is no NP in place or the NP is no longer taken to determine planning applications, the Parish Council should have a formal role, not just the comment role it currently has, into the overall control of the planning process for any development of more than 5 houses that falls within the 10% to 20% range of additional housing. Want to ensure all housing development and business development is consistent with the vision and policies set out in the</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		Clarborough & Welham Neighbourhood Plan. Want to ensure all development retains the character of our Parish and the two separate villages. It is not convinced that some of the proposals of the 'Draft' Strategic Plan allows this to take place in a way which is beneficial to our Parish.	
DBLP251	Individual	Support the proposals for housing in the rural villages.	Thank you for your comments.
DBLP261	On behalf of All Saints Parochial Church Council, Eaton and Gamston	Eaton and Gamston are pleasant villages of 28 and 87 dwellings respectively with a population at the 2011 Census of 103 and 246 respectively. Gamston is designated a conservation village and both villages have no identified development planned or expansion beyond the current village boundaries. The local Church of England (VA) Primary with a year group pan of 14 and the current pupil count is 102. There are no other services in either village other than All Saints Church in Eaton. St. Peters Church in Gamston closed in 2014, the post office and shop closed in the 1980's and there is a very limited bus service to and from Retford and Newark. The draft plan suggests that the local population will be subject to a proposed increase of 20% inline with all other areas of the district. This increase would amount to an increase of 69 residents, it is predicted that this could be achieved by identified sites within the curtilage of the present village as well as bringing back into use empty properties and redundant farm buildings.	Thank you for your comments.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP262	Anglian Water Services Ltd	Policy 8 requires development within the rural areas to demonstrate that suitable infrastructure provision is available. Reference is made to surface water and foul drainage but not water supply and sewage treatment consistent with Policy 16 of the Local Plan. Criterion (h) of Policy 8 should refer to water supply as well as foul drainage and sewage treatment. h) It can be served by sustainable infrastructure provision such as water supply, surface water, waste water drainage, sewage treatment and highways; and... Ask that the Local Plan makes it clear that new and improved infrastructure provided by Anglian Water which supports development outside of the existing settlements is supported in principle.	Thank you for your comments.
DBLP281	Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England	Welcome Policy 8 as it offers protection against speculative, out of scale and unsympathetic development, and recognizes the value of open countryside and settlement form.	Thank you for your comments.
DBLP283	Clayworth Parish Council	The Housing requirement figure for Clayworth Village of 14 in the period to 2035 is considered to be a maximum figure and one at which growth should be capped. The Parish Council has a preference for 'Brownfield' sites to be developed. The Parish Council is opposed to development on 'Greenfield' sites due to the Conservation nature of the Village. Any development that does take place should take into account the Character of the Village, the existing buildings and also the amenities that are available.	The proposed 20% growth requirement is capped at 20%
DBLP286	Kenneth Dyer Associates	One issue that is important to all Conservation Areas and not just the village of Clayworth where I live. The application of a percentage increase in dwelling numbers across the area and the fact that this is applied to a location or village Conservation Area, when the particular location etc., does not have a Local Plan in place. As somebody who has worked hard to achieve 'some' development in the Conservation Areas, of the right sort and of appropriate design am concerned at 'throwing	Impact on heritage is an important issue and policies in the Local Plan deal with this from a strategic and development management point. However, the detail of any scheme will be determined through the planning application process where there is more detail to assess potential impacts on heritage assets.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		down' on a percentage in any Conservation Area, without a huge effort by everybody to make this work and not just wreck the very thing that has been protected for many years now. Many conservation areas, by their very nature are an asset to the area and not just for the residents of that location. They help give good feeling to a general area and help promote tourists or visitors. But every development, small or large, should be considered carefully on its merits, both locally and generally for the area. When a major location is being thought through and the requirements are being satisfied with schools, medical centres and transport considerations is it going to make a difference if this has 1000 houses or 1100 houses? This extra 100 houses would save the spread across a number of Conservation Area locations. Keeping and protecting the work carried out by many of your colleagues 'on our behalf' over a number of years.	
DBLP298	975897	No support for any policy. Building more houses increases climate change and destroys vital countryside. The Plan will do the opposite of what you propose. The Council needs to concentrate on deprived areas, like Worksop and Harworth rather than build out of area. Rural locations need protection, not building on.	Thank you for your comments.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)	Note 4km is an "only just" for Scrooby	Thank you for your comments.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)	Then why have a neighbourhood plan if Bassetlaw District Council is going to tell us where to build! The last sentence says "The Council may also allocate sites in areas without neighbourhood plans or where neighbourhood plans do not intend to allocate sites, as and where appropriate", this is wrong....	The revised Local Plan is not intending to allocate any sites within the rural areas except from Tuxford. Although this is just to help inform the review of their Neighbourhood Plan.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)	But if a developer is only doing small sites of 1 or 2 homes they will not have the resources or profitability to provide these infrastructure enhancements and so they will not build. There must be some sort of collaboration / grouping together for these enhancements.	Thank you for your comments.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)	Cross reference to the SNAP Plan. In Figure 8, Scrooby is defined as a Rural Settlement where growth is supported, subject to compliance to the Policy	Thank you for your comments.
DBLP384	988726	Support for rural housing which has been restricted in previous years	Thank you for your comments.
DBLP400	Nottinghamshire County Council - Highways	1.j) and k) There is a risk that these sub-policies will result in a number of adjacent small developments with separate access arrangements when a larger well connected development could be more sustainable and safer in overall highway safety terms.	Thank you for your comments.
Policy 9: Worksop			
DBLP2	Individual	Would like better shops what cater for larger size folk. Don't want no takeaways. What the town centre needs is a Primark something to draw people in, it also wants a bit of a facelift, some of the shops are outdated, looking a bit tatty. If you are proposing to build new homes then the town centre has got to grow too. It cannot remain as it is. If the town centre stays the way it is then all it will do is drive more people to Meadowhall or Crystal Peaks. Its alright building new homes for families but then you want them to come into our town centre and spend money, which they don't do. Worksop needs to be put back on the map. We want Worksop to be not just a nice place to live, but a great place to shop.	The Bassetlaw Retail and Leisure Study states that there is no need for additional floorspace in Worksop Town Centre. The Council works with property owners and through other schemes to enhance the town centre environment.
DBLP125	Individual	Live on Mansfield Road close to Lady Lea Lane where there was planning put forward to build 275 houses and make a road by the side of our houses onto a new estate. The planning was	A housing land availability assessment is being undertaken for the next stage of the Local Plan. The site has been submitted for consideration as a housing site in the Land Availability Assessment

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>refused. Still object to this site being used for housing partly because of the impact on the road. Mansfield Road is a busy road, the traffic is constant and queues along the road past our houses. The roundabout onto the A57 bypass and going into town, which had major works on it a couple of years ago, has made the roundabout safer but has not eased the congestion. It is dangerous to get in and out of our drive and the constant traffic noise is horrendous. This would be all around if a new road down the side of our house went onto a new estate. With 275 new houses, multiplied by 3 for the amount of vehicles each day, 825 vehicles more on Mansfield Road with the noise and pollution that go with it. Mansfield Road would be a bottleneck and would make St Annes estate a rat run for people avoiding the queues, making roads on that estate unsafe. The road coming from that estate onto Mansfield Road is difficult to get in and out and can be dangerous. One of the main reasons for the planning being refused was the Manor Lodge and farm on Lady Lea Lane which is Grade 1 listed. Lady Lea Lane is a lovely country lane used by local residents for walking, dog walking, running, horse riding as it is a bridleway. This is a beautiful setting for the Manor Lodge. Not spoil the setting of historical assets by putting houses close to them but in keeping they are considered. There have also been many comments put forward before about the flood risk closer to the river and at the edge of St. Annes estate.</p>	<p>which will inform site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	<p>The housing requirement across the borough should be increased and that growth should be directed towards the main settlements, including Worksop. The level of development for Worksop is 1,600 homes (24% of the overall housing requirement) which is less than the rural area. There is extant permission for some 1,534 dwellings at April 2018 which, even taking into account a lapse rate, would leave only 284 dwellings to be allocated for the remainder of the plan period (17dpa). Given that the extant permissions will need to commence development within the 3 – 5 years of the plan period (depending on whether full or outline permission has been sought) the allocation will lead to the undue restriction of development towards the end of the plan period and leaves no reasonable flexibility in the supply of housing land through the plan period to respond to change. Worksop is expected to deliver 33% of employment land in the District and that the town has successfully attracted a variety of employers in recent years, including manufacturing and distribution companies. It will be vital that the above economic growth is supported by sufficient housing growth. The policy will not support that growth. The housing requirement for Worksop comprises a circa 9% increase in the number of homes within the District's largest settlement. That increase is below the proportionate level of growth that the Local Plan directs towards rural settlements notwithstanding the major role that Worksop is intended to have in meeting the district's economic needs.</p>	<p>Whilst the residual housing requirement for Worksop is low, it is a minimum figure. The Local Plan is seeking to allocate a large urban extension to the north of Worksop (approximately 750 new homes). There are also a number of smaller, mostly brownfield sites within the town. The current supply of housing in Worksop will also deliver a significant amount of housing to ensure a step change in economic growth in the town and the district.</p>
DBLP149	Fisher German on behalf of D Thorlby	<p>States that the Council will support the delivery of sustainable development to meet the needs of Worksop over the plan period. Where applicable, a number of criteria (a. to g.) must be satisfied by developments. Consider these to be typical of development policies across the country, as well as being consistent with national policy. Note that the policy states that the requirement for 1,600 dwellings in Worksop is a minimum</p>	<p>Support for the approach to Worksop is noted. A housing land availability assessment is being undertaken. This site will be considered as a housing site - the outcome will inform site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Further consideration will be given to the assessment of non allocated sites adjacent to settlement boundaries.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>and that this will be delivered through existing planning permissions and new site allocations. This is supported. Land at Gateford Toll Bar is an available and deliverable site which is suitable for allocation in the emerging Plan. Policy 9 also states that the Council will support new housing on non-allocated sites within the development boundary of Worksop. Support this, consider that the plan should also contain policies that ensure flexibility should the housing requirement not be met and which facilitate development on unallocated sites adjoining the development boundary, subject to meeting a number of criteria. This would enable the Council to refuse inappropriate development, whilst meeting its housing needs should any of the allocations not deliver.</p>	
DBLP172	dha planning on behalf of Laing O'Rourke	<p>Welcome the recognition that 45ha of the district's employment land requirement will need to be delivered "in and around Worksop from 2018 to 2035" (our emphasis). This should include a formal allocation at EIP.</p>	<p>Support for 45ha of employment land in Worksop is noted. An employment land availability assessment is being undertaken to inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan.</p>
DBLP171	Indigo Planning on behalf of Columbia Threadneedle Property Investment	<p>Represents the owners and managers of The Priory Shopping Centre, located in Worksop Town Centre. It comprises 40 units and a large car park. The Priory provides a primary retail role in the town centre, with a range of tenants, in a highly accessible location by car and sustainable transport including cycling, walking, bus (0.4 miles from Worksop Bus Station) and train (0.5m from Worksop Train Station). Currently preparing an application for the partial redevelopment to upgrade the retail provision, servicing and access. Welcome the protection and enhancement of the Town Centre, and support its development and rationalisation to ensure its future resilience as a retail destination. Chapter 9 acknowledges that Worksop is Bassetlaw's largest town (para 9.5). The centre has recently experienced an increase in vacant units, which is negatively affecting the vitality and viability of the town centre. A number of shop units have become vacant due to broader trends in the</p>	<p>Support for Policy 9, particularly the approach taken to the impact assessment and sequential test is welcome. It is not considered appropriate to add the text suggested as this may adversely affect the ability of other town centres in the District to secure retail uses. However, it is expected that the next version of the Local Plan will provide more context about the future of Worksop town centre, including opportunities for change.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>retail industry and a number of retailers have recently gone into administration. The closure of the M&S Foodstore shows that the town centre is under threat. It is key that town centre uses, including retail, are encouraged into Worksop Town Centre above other, out of centre, locations. Para 9.1 seeks to revitalise the town centre through “reorganising the centre to create distinct retail and leisure zones”. Policy 9 acknowledges that in terms of retail hierarchy, Worksop is the largest Town Centre and will support town centre developments which maintain and enhance its vitality and viability. The town centre contains a mix of retailers. A common factor across the Town Centre retail units is that they are of below average size.</p> <p>Welcome requirement of an impact assessment for new out of centre retail units, of a lower floorspace threshold (929sqm) than in the NPPF. This will require a greater number of proposals to demonstrate that they will not have a significant negative impact on town centre retail. Welcome requirement for a sequential assessment to be undertaken for town centre uses proposed out of the town centre. Although the importance of the town centre's vitality and viability is acknowledged, consider additional wording should be included to ensure that main town centre uses, including retail uses, are provided within the town centre first, in accordance with the NPPF: “A sequential test will be required for edge of centre or out of centre main town centre proposals, as defined and identified by the NPPF. ‘Retail uses should be provided first within Worksop town centre, Bassetlaw Council’s largest town, including ‘The Priory Shopping Centre, in accordance with the NPPF’.”</p>	
DBLP186	Natural England	<p>Support the inclusion of increasing climate change resilience through good quality design and protecting, conserving or enhancing Green Infrastructure in developments in Worksop.</p>	<p>Support for Policy 9 a and g are welcome.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP203	NJL Consulting on behalf of Caddick Land	<p>Supports the overall objectives in the Plan, particularly Policy 8 and Policy 9 where they encourage economic growth and development which responds to market demand. The forthcoming Site Allocations consultation should go a step further and specifically allocate the site for logistics, manufacturing and ancillary uses. Such an approach would build on the Bassetlaw Economic Development Needs Assessment which specifically identifies this area for demand led major, long term, market facing, logistics and manufacturing uses. The Local Plan must respond to clear market signals and allocate the site.</p>	An employment land availability assessment is being undertaken and will include this site. This will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP217	Axis ped on behalf of FCC Environment	<p>States that the Council support the delivery of sustainable development to meet the needs of Worksop over the plan period. With regards to economic development, the policy confirms that at least 33% (45 hectares) of the District's employment land needs will be delivered in Worksop. It goes on to confirm economic development proposals will be supported in appropriate locations in the existing settlement boundary. Support the inclusion of the subsequent paragraph which sets out that proposals for economic development in close proximity to Worksop, that will meet an unexpected demand, will be supported if it can be demonstrated that it will deliver a high quality, exemplary scheme that will increase the overall number, quality and skills level of jobs. FCC's site which is located in close proximity to the settlement boundary will clearly deliver these aspirations. This is in accordance with NPPF Paragraph 80 which confirms that planning policies should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. Significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development. It goes on to confirm that the approach taken should allow each area to build on its</p>	An employment land availability assessment is being undertaken and will include this site. This will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		strengths, counter any weaknesses and address the challenges of the future.	
DBLP221	Gladman Developments	<p>Supportive of the approach contained in each of these areas which seeks to ensure sustainable development to meet needs. Note that housing development not identified in the Local Plan will only be supported if it is located in the development boundary. Caution with this approach and do not consider the use of built up area boundaries to be appropriate as this would effectively provide a blanket restriction policy for development lying outside of the built-up area and within ‘the open countryside’ without assessing the sustainability credentials of a development proposal. It is recommended that a flexible stance is taken so development proposals not identified in the Local Plan are able to come forward. Recommend incorporating a criteria based policy to achieve this linked in Policy 1 and the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Such an approach would allow the Plan to protect itself against unsustainable development at the same time as being flexible to additional development opportunities to come forward to meet identified needs. Refers to the submission version of the Harborough Local Plan, Policy GD2 which states: “In addition to sites allocated by this Local Plan and neighbourhood plans, development within or contiguous with the existing or committed built up area of Market Harborough, Key Centres, the Leicestershire Principle Urban Area, Rural Centres and Selected Rural Villages will be permitted where...”</p>	Further consideration will be given to the assessment of non allocated sites adjacent to settlement boundaries.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP251	Individual	Support the proposals for housing in Worksop	Support for Policy 9 welcome.
DBLP356	988409	The draft local plan makes a case for local housing need in Worksop (9.7) but does not provide the same level of evidence for Retford. Indeed, the plan states that Retford has already experienced significant housing growth in recent years since 2011, this being without the need to destroy existing infrastructure.	Policies 9 and 10 contain the same type of information. Both identify the housing requirement f and the number of new dwellings expected to be provided over the plan period.
DBLP443	990800	States that the Council support the delivery of sustainable development to meet the needs of Worksop over the plan period. Policy confirms that at least 33% (45 hectares) of the District's employment land needs will be delivered in Worksop. It confirms economic development proposals will be supported in appropriate locations within the existing settlement boundary. Support the inclusion of the subsequent paragraph which sets out that proposals for economic development in close proximity to Worksop, that will meet an unexpected demand, will be supported if it can be demonstrated that it will deliver a high quality, exemplary scheme that will increase the overall number, quality and skills level of jobs. FCC's site is located in close proximity to the settlement boundary will clearly deliver these aspirations. This is in accordance with NPPF Paragraph 80 which confirms that planning policies should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. Significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development. It confirms that the approach taken should allow each area to build on its strengths, counter any weaknesses and address the challenges of the future. Additional employment floorspace at Carlton Forest is able to respond to market demand and contribute to rural sustainable economic growth.	An employment land availability assessment is being undertaken and will include this site. This will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
Policy 10: Retford			
DBLP3	Individual	Strongly feel that the existing boundaries to Retford and Ordsall should be maintained with no further expansion given the recent concentration of new housing and the load on infrastructure, schools, roads and access to the town centre. Oppose the agricultural land adjoining Ordsall, Bracken Lane and the area around Tiln Lane, Bigsby Road and neighbouring streets being developed for housing.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers including the Highways Authority and Education Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required. Another area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land.
DBLP4	Individual	Strongly feel that the existing boundaries to Retford and Ordsall should be maintained with no further expansion given the recent concentration of new housing and the load on infrastructure, schools, roads and access to the town centre. Oppose the agricultural land adjoining Ordsall, Bracken Lane and the area around Tiln Lane, Bigsby Road and neighbouring streets being developed for housing.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers including the Highways Authority and Education Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required. Another area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land.
DBLP5	Individual	Strongly feel that the existing boundaries to Retford and Ordsall should be maintained with no further expansion given the recent concentration of new housing and the load on infrastructure, schools, roads and access to the town centre. Oppose the agricultural land adjoining Ordsall, Bracken Lane and the area around Tiln Lane, Bigsby Road and neighbouring streets being developed for housing.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers including the Highways Authority and Education Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required. Another area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP6	Individual	Propose that when future site allocation proposals come forward for Retford the Bassetlaw Plan should include planning policies that explicitly state that there will be no expansion of Retford beyond the current boundaries of the town. Specific reference should be made to the agricultural land adjoining Ordsall, Bracken Lane and the area around Tiln Lane, Bigsby Road and neighbouring streets.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers including the Highways Authority and Education Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required. Another area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land.
DBLP7	Individual	The plans to build houses off Tiln Lane will feed numerous cars etc. onto the horrifically congested Tiln Lane. The diversion of heavy lorries past the school on Tiln Lane was a terrible decision. To get caught up with two Tomlinson's six axle 50 tonners is quite intimidating. There is a terrible accident waiting to happen outside the school, these giants cannot stop should a child dash into the road. What is needed if you decide to authorise any houses, is a new road from the far end of Tiln Lane across to Welham Road bridging the canal if necessary. Not a single house should be built until the problem has been solved.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers including the Highways Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required.
DBLP8	Individual	There are areas on the outskirts of Retford, specifically on agricultural land i.e. Ordall, Bracken Lane, Tiln Lane, Bigsby Road and neighbouring streets that should be in the Bassetlaw Plan that should include planning policies that explicitly state that in fact there will be NO expansion of Retford beyond the current boundaries of the town. Otherwise it would be creating a sprawling town out of control! This would be extremely detrimental to Retford with huge traffic problems and an overloading of existing services i.e. schools and doctors to name but two!	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers including the Highways Authority and Education Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required. Another area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBPL9	Individual	Propose that when future site allocation proposals come forward for Retford the Bassetlaw Plan should include planning policies that explicitly state that there will be no expansion of Retford beyond the current boundaries of the town. Specific reference should be made to the agricultural land adjoining Ordsall, Bracken Lane and the area around Tiln Lane, Bigsby Road and neighbouring streets.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. An area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land.
DBLP10	Individual	Propose that when future site allocation proposals come forward for Retford the Bassetlaw Plan should include planning policies that explicitly state that there will be no expansion of Retford beyond the current boundaries of the town. Specific reference should be made to the agricultural land adjoining Ordsall, Bracken Lane and the area around Tiln Lane, Bigsby Road and neighbouring streets.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. An area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land.
DBLP11	Individual	Concerned that some current planning applications in the Retford area are on land outside of the current boundaries of the town and an urban sprawl without key infrastructure being put in place would be highly undesirable. Live close to the agricultural land adjoining Bigsby Road and adjoining roads and object strongly to such land being used for housing when it is not in fact needed by the Council to fulfil its housing quotas.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers including the Highways Authority and Education Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required. Another area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land. Policy 10 states that 853 new homes are required over the plan period to meet the housing requirement for Retford. This helps meets the overall housing figure established by Government.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP12	Individual	Re: the proposal to build houses at the bottom of Bigsby Road. A lot of problems would be made with the extra traffic on Tiln Lane and the main road into town. This should be given consideration.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers including the Highways Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required.
DBLP14	Individual	Recently attended a meeting by our MP John Mann where he outlined the details of future housing in Retford. He drew our attention to the future planning policy which explicitly states that there will be no expansion of Retford beyond the current boundaries of the town, and he said that specific reference should be made to the agricultural land around Tiln Lane, Bigsby Road and the neighbouring streets. With that in mind, I thoroughly agree with the Draft Plan.	Housing land availability is currently being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. An area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land. The proposed development boundary for Retford will only be available as part of the next Local Plan.
DBLP15	Individual	Hope that proposed plans from developers to build 171 dwellings on land adjoining Tiln Lane and Bigsby Road does not go ahead. There are many reasons but the most important one is that there is only one access to this town. This will be for all the 178 occupants of the new estate (Badgers Chase - already passed) and the 171 on Tiln Lane. All these people will have two cars each - most going past the school along with heavy lorries avoiding the low bridge at Clarborough. They must be made to see that this is madness with only one narrow access to the town. Come and see the congestion we have already when the school turns out at 3.30. Developers should be looking at the land on which stands the soon to be demolished Cottam Power Station.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers including the Highways Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required. The Assessment will only consider sites that have been submitted by landowners/promoters.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP17	Individual	Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers including the Highways Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required.	Housing land availability is currently being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers such as the Highways Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required. The proposed development boundary for Retford will only be available as part of the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP18	Individual	The need for economic development in this area is crucial for the growth of Retford with the closure of two Power stations in the near future, and the job losses at the airport. Know of businesses currently located on the airfield that have worked very hard and invested heavily to build a secure future for their company and employees from the local area. If Gamston Airport is to close and with its prime position of the A1 surely it could be better used for business expansion rather than housing development which would help fulfil the EDNA requirements.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP20	Individual	Propose that when future site allocations come forward for Retford, the Plan should include planning policies that explicitly state that there will be no expansion of Retford beyond the current boundaries of the town. Specific reference should be made to the agricultural land adjoining Ordsall, Bracken Lane and the area around Tiln Lane, Bigsby Road and neighbouring streets.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. An area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land. The proposed development boundary for Retford will only be available as part of the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP21	Individual	Propose that when future site allocations come forward for Retford, the Plan should include planning policies that explicitly state that there will be no expansion of Retford beyond the current boundaries of the town. Specific reference should be made to the agricultural land adjoining Ordsall, Bracken Lane	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. An area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land. The proposed development boundary for

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		and the area around Tiln Lane, Bigsby Road and neighbouring streets.	Retford will only be available as part part of the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP27	Individual	Propose that when future site allocations come forward for Retford, the Plan should include planning policies that say there will be NO expansion of Retford beyond the current boundaries of the town. Specific reference should be made to the agricultural land adjoining Ordsall, Bracken Lane and the area around Tiln Lane, Bigsby Road and neighbouring streets.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. An area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land. The proposed development boundary for Retford will only be available as part part of the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP28	Individual	Propose that when future site allocations come forward for Retford, the Plan should include planning policies that say there will be NO expansion of Retford beyond the current boundaries of the town. Specific reference should be made to the agricultural land adjoining Ordsall, Bracken Lane and the area around Tiln Lane, Bigsby Road and neighbouring streets.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. An area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land. The proposed development boundary for Retford will only be available as part part of the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP33	Individual	In principle the proposal of the 2 garden villages is a brilliant idea and has my support BUT the Retford boundary NOT be extended either prior to or after the garden villages have been built, i.e. no development on the fields between Ordsall and Eaton/Morton. Must discount using Jockey House Lane for vehicle access to and from the Gamston garden village as yet again Ordsall will be hit with the rising number of vehicles using the road to get into Retford. Will object to any development that increases traffic flow on to Jockey House Lane and High Street at Ordsall.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers including the Highways Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required. An area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land. The proposed development boundary for Retford will only be available as part part of the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP33	Individual	Was told that building isn't likely to commence on the Gamston garden village until approximately 2025 and that the required amount of housing up until 2025 would be on land earmarked	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>for building in the Land Availability Assessment. There is substantial land earmarked on the edge of Ordsall (LAA276, LAA270, LA141, LAA246, LAA247 & LAA067). Ordsall: High Street: Vehicles park at all timesmaking this a single lane over most of the length making it difficult driving conditions. This is a busy road and not suitable for increased volumes of traffic. This is confirmed when a chemist shop on High Street was refused in 2014 due to concerns about increased traffic levels. Goosemoor Bridge: links Ordsall to Goosemoor Lane & on to London Road is inadequate for today's traffic, the current volume of cars and buses & heavy commercial vehicles. The new pedestrian footbridge is a big improvement. Ollerton Road/Welbeck Road: The area around the Post Office/Co-op is congested every day with limited off-road parking. Further housing in or around Ordsall will make this worse. There are numerous children using this area to and from school and using local facilities. West Hill Road: During school drop off times West Hill Road is reduced to single line traffic due to parked cars for Ordsall Infant & Junior School. This is a difficult road to negotiate at these times of day and will be acute should traffic volumes increase. River Idle: The fields at the bottom of Bankside frequently flood. High Street regularly floods with persistent rain as the drains cannot cope. The main sewer runs down High Street and even with several housing developments, no changes to the main sewer have been undertaken. More houses will lead to more flooding on High Street and into Retford and the villages in the Idle Valley. The more fields that are built on, the more drainage problems we will have.</p>	<p>the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers such as the Highways Authority and Education Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required. An area of consideration will be the potential flood risk.</p>
DBLP35	Dunham, Ragnall, Fledborough	<p>The Plan did not appear to address the impact on Retford i.e. clearly more people could/should be better for the businesses of the town. All of which would be welcomed but have concerns about the level of infrastructure in place. There are</p>	<p>Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
	and Darlton Parish Council	already traffic delays in and out of Retford which would be exasperated by two developments of this size. There are insufficient spaces for existing residents served by the businesses of Retford, let alone any additional numbers created by two developments of this size.	infrastructure providers such as the Highways Authority and Education Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required.
DBLP51	Canal & River Trust	Welcome reference to the canal in part 3 with regards to enhancing Chesterfield Canal's visual and functional relationship to the town centre. An improved relationship between our network and the town centres would help these communities benefit from the presence of the canal including access to the wellbeing benefits our network can bring. The policy does not fully explain how the functional relationship of our waterways to the town centres can be achieved. This could significantly harm the deliverability of the policy aim, as the policy does not make it clear how the enhancement of the relationship between our canal and the town centres should be achieved. There is a need for the Local Plan to provide a more precise guide to how development should address the waterways in Worksop and Retford. Without this will be unable to determine how best to guide development next to Chesterfield Canal would best achieve the overall aims of part 3. An effective policy could be achieved if additional supporting text is included to explore how development within these towns should address waterside spaces. Measures include: - ensuring development along the canal integrates with the waterway; - ensuring development is designed to improve access to, along and from the waterway; - ensuring development optimises natural surveillance of the waterway; - ensuring development will not have an adverse impact on the amenity of the waterside environment. This could be an additional paragraph in the supporting text as opposed to being within the policy itself, to keep the policy succinct.	The next version of the Local Plan will include a policy that better explains the approach to be taken to Retford town centre. This is expected to include more guidance on the town centre's relationship to the canal.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP59	Styrrup with Oldcotes Parish Council	The use of the word Train station in respect of Retford and Worksop railway stations is naive and childlike and not in keeping with an official document such as this.	The Plan is written in an easy to understand format so that it is accessible to as many people as possible. However, for consistency reference will be made instead to railway stations.
DBLP61	Parliamentary Candidate for Bassetlaw	Propose that when future site allocation proposals come forward for Retford the Plan should include planning policies that explicitly state that there will be no expansion of Retford beyond the current boundaries of the town. Specific reference should be made to the agricultural land adjoining Ordsall, Bracken Lane and the area around Tiln Lane, Bigsby Road and neighbouring streets.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. An area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land. The proposed development boundary for Retford will only be available as part of the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP62	Individual	In June 2018 we purchased a home on Sunningdale Road, Ordsall, as first time buyers. One of the driving factors was easy access to the countryside - surrounded by agricultural land, a golf course and woodlands - from Ordsall all the way to Clumber Park to the side, and Gamston to the front. Chose this over new build due to its location and how desirable the estate is to live on, and how overpriced all new builds are with no benefits over an older house. Expanding the borders of Retford specifically Ordsall towards Eaton/Gamston, would not only devalue our property significantly but would encourage us to sell our property and move out of Retford. This may seem insignificant but we are young professionals born in Retford and have chosen to invest in Retford town and live here for the foreseeable future. Expanding Retford's borders would not encourage young people to stay here and invest, but instead move from the town. The new builds being built are not affordable for young people even with government grants/schemes/help to buys and are only catering for commuters or people with significantly higher incomes than the young people of Retford. Retford is not able to cope with the amount of traffic that on the roads due to the expansions that have happened in Retford over the past few years on the Oval in Ordsall, Bridon in Ordsall, Whitehouse's Retford, King	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers such as the Highways Authority and Education Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required. An area of consideration will be the potential flood risk. All new housing development of 10 or more dwellings will need to provide a percentage of affordable housing to meet local needs.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>Edwards school Retford and Retford Leisure centre, and multiple more sites currently being built. To drive less than 2 miles from Ordsall to Retford town centre from 8am-10am and 3:30pm-5pm can take up to 45 minutes on weekdays. There is no resolution to this with no viable options to create new routes or expand on the current routes. Expanding the current borders would cause major disruption to the current residents of Retford but it would create significant safety hazards in areas like Ordsall primary school, Retford Oaks secondary school and Welbeck Road with the local shops like the Coop. Strongly oppose any border expansion of Retford borders particularly the edge of Ordsall, and feel that the opinions of Retford's current residents should be a high priority.</p>	
DBLP67	Individual	<p>Object to further substantial housing development beyond those numbers already agreed in Retford, as anything other than small in-fill developments, preferably on brownfield sites, would add unacceptable further pressure on roads that are designed and built for very much smaller vehicle movements, and which are already dangerously congested at peak times of day. In particular in Retford, there should be no more developments, either housing or industrial, which feed traffic onto Tiln Lane and the residential roads in the north-east quadrant of Retford. Oppose rural business developments off Smeath Lane, because they will feed more vehicle movements onto Smeath Lane and Tiln Lane, roads that are already inadequate in view of both car and HGV movements. Cannot conceive any new proposal for HGVs to use a small rural road being approved, thus the existing anomalous necessity must be addressed as a matter of urgency. Oppose any developments outside the current boundaries of Retford, particularly to the north and east of the town. Object to any further loss of agricultural land in the areas outside Retford's current boundaries. Urge that a long-term solution be explored with</p>	<p>Housing and employment land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers such as the Highways Authority and Education Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required. An area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land. The proposed development boundary for Retford will only be available as part of the next version of the Local Plan.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		highways agencies and Network Rail to enable HGVs to use the A620 main route into Retford and thus stop the use by HGVs of the narrow, bendy and dangerous route via Tiln Lane/Smeath Lane. Surely lowering the road under the Welham bridge would be cost-effective! Urge an immediate analysis and action to address the dangers to children and parents of car and HGV movements past Carr Hill School, Retford.	
DBLP69	Individual	It is important that the current boundaries of Retford are protected in order to avoid the town losing its geographic identity and merging with Welham, Hayton, Bolham, Barnby Moor, Little Gringley, and Eaton etc. Suggest that the Approved Plan should include policies which will specifically ensure the boundaries of Retford are safeguarded from future expansion. Specific reference should be made to protect the land adjoining Tiln Lane and Bigsby Road from further development. As residents of The Drive we are acutely aware of and affected by the existing pressures on local infrastructure in the Tiln Lane/Bigsby Road area, namely traffic and pedestrian volumes in and around the Carr Hill School.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers such as the Highways Authority and Education Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required. The proposed development boundary for Retford will only be available as part of the next version of the Local Plan.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP70	Individual	As a resident of Bigsby Road, Retford, it is of utmost importance that the Bassetlaw Plan should explicitly state that there is to be no expansion of Retford beyond the current town boundaries. Specifically the agricultural land adjoining Bracken Lane and Ordsall. And importantly Tiln Lane, Bigsby Road and the neighbouring streets. This is essential because the safety of the traffic infrastructure is particularly compromised in this area, due to HGV use and the school.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers such as the Highways Authority and Education Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required. An area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land. The proposed development boundary for Retford will only be available as part part of the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP73	Individual	When future site allocation proposals come forward for Retford, the Bassetlaw Plan should include planning policies that explicitly state that there will be no expansion of Retford beyond the current boundaries of the town, making specific reference to the agricultural land adjoining Ordsall and Bracken Lane.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. An area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land. The proposed development boundary for Retford will only be available as part part of the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP72	Individual	Like to see that future site allocations proposals for Retford should also include planning policies that explicitly state there will be no more expansion of Retford beyond the current boundaries with ref to the agricultural land Tiln lane/Bigsby rd/Palmer rd, Bracken lane and Ordsal. Traffic is already a real problem for this small market town.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers such as the Highways Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required. An area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land. The proposed development boundary for Retford will only be available as part part of the next version of the Local Plan.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP93	Individual	<p>Should promote the use of Retford Town as a development area for a wide variety of residential accommodation and housing. The town centre and the immediate locality have a significant number of properties and sites that are vacant or only partially occupied. Encouraging development of these properties as accommodation would ensure the town centre thrives economically but also the greater number of people living in the area would improve security and reduce anti social behaviour. Development would need to be sympathetic to the character of the town but there are already some developments that have achieved this objective and more should be promoted. The Plan does not set this as an objective and it should do so. Once it is adopted innovative ways should be initiated by the Council to encourage owners and developers to make proposals for development rather than the long term deterioration that is occurring in some properties.</p>	<p>Policy 10 states that new housing will be supported in the development boundary on non allocated sites where appropriate. This would include sites in the town centre.</p>
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	<p>The level of development proposed for Retford is 853 homes (13% of the overall housing requirement) is less than any other housing requirement despite being the second largest settlement in the district. There is extent permission for 511 dwellings at April 2018 which, after applying a lapse rate, would leave only 437 dwellings to be allocated for the plan period (26dpa). This will lead to the undue restriction of development towards the end of the plan period and leave no flexibility in the supply of housing land through the plan period to respond to change. The rationale behind such an extraordinarily low level of growth is not justified in the Local Plan and will undermine the role of the town as a key service centre for its population and its rural hinterland. The housing requirement for Retford equates to circa 50dpa over a 17 year plan period. Only once in the past 12 years (Table 2 in the 2016/17 AMR) has Retford delivered less than 50 dwellings a year and that in 2009/10 in a recession. Notwithstanding the</p>	<p>The Local Plan is proposing to deliver the same level of growth on an annual basis in Retford as the adopted Core Strategy. The Bassetlaw Core Strategy (2010 to 2028) identifies a requirement of 1574 dwellings for Retford. This equates to 87.4 dwellings per annum. The RSS found this was an appropriate amount for Retford. Projecting this forward to 2037 gives a housing requirement of 2360 dwellings from 2010 to 2037. Since 2010, 1057 dwellings have been delivered in Retford. There is currently land with permission for 571 dwellings in Retford and resolution to grant permission for a further 316 dwellings. The Council is proposing to allocate enough land to continue to meet the needs of Retford at 87.4 dwellings per annum (enough land to accommodate 420 dwellings). In addition to this, it is expected that there will continue to be a good supply of windfall sites.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>recession, from 2005/06 to 2016/17 Retford averaged the delivery of 110dpa increasing to 152dpa in the 6 years since 2010/11 when recovery from the recession commenced. Retford has provided the backbone for the district's housing delivery which has struggled to meet its Core Strategy housing requirement. It is perverse for the Council to seek to deliver a level of growth at Retford which is below those seen across the recession, at a level less than a 1/3rd of delivery in the last 6 years (less than half delivered in the last 12 years) and which has been the best performing market area across a district that has struggled to deliver its housing requirement. That unduly low level of development is even more difficult to understand by failing to provide any substantive evidence for such a reduction and with excellent supply of suitable and developable Sites including land adjacent to the south of Retford identified as suitable in the LAA. In light of the Council's aspirations to connect with the SCR and D2N2 LEP regions, and to facilitate sustainable commuting patterns, it is unclear why it has not sought to boost the population above local needs at a town that para 10.3 identifies as having "excellent public transport links from Retford Bus Station, Retford Train Station [which provide] local and regional connections (...) to many towns and cities both regionally and nationally, including Worksop, Doncaster, Sheffield, Lincoln and London." The housing requirement for Retford also comprises only circa 9% increase in the number of homes in the District's second largest settlement; below the level of development proposed in the rural areas.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	<p>The development criteria in Policy 10 (a-g) are vague and there is little guidance as to how those development criteria will be applied - it is not clear when it would 'be applicable' for a development to have to (must) improve access and connectivity across the town by sustainable modes of transport. Encourage such provision where practicable however, the policy test for what is required and when is not clear. Support Part 1 of Policy 10 which notes that "Greenfield extensions to the built-up area of the town must be designed so as to enhance the urban-rural interface". The policy could be positively worded to encourage such extensions where there is an opportunity to enhance the urban-rural interface. Land to the south of Retford provides such an opportunity. Part 2 of Policy 10 (supported by para 10.8) lacks meaningful direction or aspiration for the economy of Retford. It apportions 15% of overall economic growth towards Retford with no meaningful strategy for doing so.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that greater clarity and context for the development criteria would be beneficial. Support for Part 1 noted. The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure all types of economic growth and associated jobs can be delivered in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear strategy for economic growth including in Retford. The basis of the 15% target is the Council's Economic Development Needs Assessment.</p>
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	<p>Disagree with para 10.4 that the planned approach for Retford will deliver new housing and employment to meet the needs of the local community whilst supporting the role of the town centre. The level of growth proposed will have the contrary effect through unduly restricting growth at the town.</p>	<p>The approach taken to the spatial strategy is being reviewed in light of comments made during the Local Plan consultation.</p>
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	<p>Para 10.7 notes the importance of Retford as a core rural hub town and the need to deliver a significant amount of housing development over the plan period. It considers 853 dwellings to be an 'appropriate' level of development for the town. Disagree with that conclusion. Agree that growth should be delivered on sites in and on the edge of Retford. This is reiterated within Part 1 of Policy 10 which we support.</p>	<p>The approach taken to the spatial strategy is being reviewed in light of comments made during the Local Plan consultation.</p>
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	<p>Para 10.10 sets out that it will require 'necessary infrastructure improvements' to be delivered by developers. Should be amended to clarify that those infrastructure improvements must directly relate to the proposed development to conform</p>	<p>Accept that developers will only be required to make provision for infrastructure where it conforms with the three tests set out in the CIL Regulations 2010. Paragraph 10.10 will be amended accordingly.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		with the planning obligation tests set out at Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended).	
DBLP143	Persimmon Homes & Charles Church	The second largest town within Bassetlaw, Retford enjoys a strong market town economy with good rail links, road network connections via the A1, good choice of schools with multiple employment sites. The Local Plan only seeks to apportion 853 homes to the area, of which 437 homes remain based on the proposed OAN figure. The Local Plan highlights past growth from 2011 – 2018 has been strong in Retford demonstrating strong market demand for housing in the town and yet the Local Plan apportionment of homes to Retford is comparatively low. The SHMA identifies Bassetlaw should allocate a total of 136Ha of Employment Land in order to sustain the continued economic growth of the District. Retford is required to accommodate 20Ha of employment land. 1ha of employment land per 48 homes delivered (6630 OAN / 136 Ha Employment = 48 homes per employment ha). Based on the Local Plan evidence the minimum housing target of 853 homes should read 975 homes (48 homes x 20 employment ha) if employment growth forecasts are to be supported in full. Given the strong performance of Retford to support the delivery of new homes in conjunction with SHMA employment growth evidence the comparatively low apportionment of homes for Retford over the plan period is contrary to evidence raising further questions on the effectiveness of the proposed spatial strategy model.	The approach taken to the spatial strategy is being reviewed in light of comments made during the Local Plan consultation. However, it should be noted that growth within the villages has been restricted in the Core Strategy so it is inevitable that Retford, as well as Worksop and Harworth experienced higher levels of growth as a consequence.
DBLP148	ID Planning on behalf of Harron Homes	Sets out the Council's planned approach for Retford, which is to deliver new housing and employment to meet the needs of the local community, whilst also supporting the town's role as a core service centre for residents, surrounding rural communities and visitors, whilst conserving and enhancing the historic character or the market town. Support the planned	The approach taken to the spatial strategy is being reviewed in light of comments made during the Local Plan consultation.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		approach set out for Retford in principle, but maintain the proposed housing distribution set out in Policy 2 does not support the planned approach set out in paragraph 10.4.	
DBLP148	ID Planning on behalf of Harron Homes	Sets out principles for development and growth in Retford. The first bullet point states that where necessary the existing boundary around Retford will be redefined to accommodate site allocations. The second bullet point states that housing development and growth will be supported across Retford through planned site allocations and organic growth of a scale necessary to sustain and enhance the town's role as a rural-hub. Support these principles for the development and growth of Retford, but reiterate that the proposed housing distribution to Retford will not support these principles. The proposed distribution specifically constrains the growth of Retford, such that it will not support the town's role as a rural hub. There are no principles for Retford which indicate that it is proposed to constrain the levels of growth in this rural hub town, but this would be the effect of the proposed distribution policy.	The approach taken to the spatial strategy is being reviewed in light of comments made during the Local Plan consultation.
DBLP148	ID Planning on behalf of Harron Homes	Acknowledges the Core Strategy apportioned 26% of the total growth to Retford and states that over the Core Strategy period 2011 to 2018, housing delivery has met housing need, and it is stated this indicates demand for housing in Retford is strong. Support this acknowledgement, but to support ongoing need and demand, the Local Plan should retain the housing distribution apportionment adopted in the Core Strategy of 26%.	The approach taken to the spatial strategy is being reviewed in light of comments made during the Local Plan consultation. However, it should be noted that the Core Strategy restricted growth within the villages and as a result Retford accommodated a greater proportion of housing over the plan period than is being proposed by this Local Plan which also proposes a more equitable apportionment of housing across the villages to promote sustainable development.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP148	ID Planning on behalf of Harron Homes	<p>States that Retford is an important rural hub town and will continue to deliver a significant amount of housing development over the plan period and that Retford's housing requirement is 863 dwellings from 2018 - 2035 on sites in and on the edge of Retford. Support the growth of Retford and that sites on the edge of Retford will be needed. Object to the quantum of planned growth for Retford (853 dwellings / 13%), which is too low - Retford is the second largest town where demand for housing is strong. The final sentence of para 10.7 states that the new garden villages to the south of Retford will deliver development to address a percentage of the needs of the local housing market in Retford. Object to this approach. The two garden villages are new settlements in their own right. When delivered, they will form part of Rural Bassetlaw where 27% of the District's housing requirement is proposed, with the villages accounting for an additional 15% of the distribution. It is inappropriate for the proposed distribution to Retford to be reduced in the context of delivery proposed in the new garden villages, as they are distinct settlements and in different tiers of the hierarchy. The Plan sets out the role and function of Retford as a Rural Hub which supports surrounding villages. The level of proposed growth in/adjacent to Retford should support its role and function as the second largest settlement in the hierarchy to accord with sustainable development principles. Should retain the 26% distribution in the Core Strategy. The Council's evidence at the Core Strategy examination (Council's Matter 5 Statement – May 2011) q10, "Why should not more/less of the split go to Retford", states:- "The proportion of allocated growth proposed for Retford is 26%. This percentage share reflects Retford's role as the second key growth settlement for growth, which should accommodate the second highest proportion of planned growth in line with the aims of the RSS (RD01) and the Core</p>	<p>The Local Plan is proposing to deliver the same level of growth on an annual basis in Retford as the adopted Core Strategy. The Bassetlaw Core Strategy (2010 to 2028) identifies a requirement of 1574 dwellings for Retford. This equates to 87.4 dwellings per annum. The RSS found this was an appropriate amount for Retford. Projecting this forward to 2037 gives a housing requirement of 2360 dwellings from 2010 to 2037. Since 2010, 1057 dwellings have been delivered in Retford. There is currently land with permission for 571 dwellings in Retford and resolution to grant permission for a further 316 dwellings. The Council is proposing to allocate enough land to continue to meet the needs of Retford at 87.4 dwellings per annum (enough land to accommodate 420 dwellings). In addition to this, it is expected that there will continue to be a good supply of windfall sites.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>Strategy's Spatial Strategy. The Council does not believe that higher levels of growth over and above this proportion are required to sustain Retford's role or are desirable in light of the levels of development delivered in recent years. Lower levels would not be appropriate in relation to Retford's role and would be unlikely to accord with the RSS." The proposed approach seeks to allow part of Retford's growth to be delivered in two villages. Yet delivering part of Retford's need outside of Retford will not support the services and facilities in Retford in the same way as housing delivered in Retford would. It is clear that the new villages will be sustainable communities (policy 1) and independent settlements (para 12.2), which will provide opportunities for economic growth (para 12.8). Policy 12 identifies that the villages will have a village hub (convenience retail / services), employment and community facilities. The new villages will function no differently to established villages will be independently functioning settlements, functioning no differently from existing villages with Retford acting as a rural hub. The 're-direction' of growth from Retford to these villages is unjustified. A higher proportion of growth should be for Retford to directly support this settlement and meet its needs. If propose to 're-direct growth' to enable the delivery of the garden villages, it is the growth of existing rural villages that should be reduced, as this is the tier of the hierarchy the garden villages will sit within. The distribution proposes to focus the majority of growth in the rural settlements by virtue of the growth of existing villages and the delivery of two new villages contrary to sustainable development principles. The majority of housing growth should be delivered in the largest two existing towns and distribution to Retford should be increased to 26%, which is the minimum proportion the Council states was required to support the role of Retford when the Core Strategy was prepared.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP148	ID Planning on behalf of Harron Homes	<p>Object to Policy 10 which seeks to deliver only 13% (853 dwellings) to Retford. The proposed distribution will not meet the needs of Retford and will not support its role and function. The level of growth proposed (13%) is half of the proportion adopted in the Core Strategy (26%) on the basis that the new garden villages will meet part of Retford's need. It is inappropriate to deliver such a low proportion of the requirement in the second largest settlement in the context of this being a settlement where there is high demand for housing. The Council's evidence to the Core Strategy was also clear that apportioning less than 26% of the housing requirement to Retford would not support its role. For the plan to be sound, Retford should accommodate 26% (1,706 dwellings) with the delivery of the garden villages forming part of the proposed distribution to the rural villages (where 27% of the housing is to be distributed). The distribution to the new garden villages should not be in addition to the distribution to rural villages. These amendments, would support the settlement hierarchy and the spatial strategy for the District.</p>	<p>The Local Plan is proposing to deliver the same level of growth on an annual basis in Retford as the adopted Core Strategy. The Bassetlaw Core Strategy (2010 to 2028) identifies a requirement of 1574 dwellings for Retford. This equates to 87.4 dwellings per annum. The RSS found this was an appropriate amount for Retford. Projecting this forward to 2037 gives a housing requirement of 2360 dwellings from 2010 to 2037. Since 2010, 1057 dwellings have been delivered in Retford. There is currently land with permission for 571 dwellings in Retford and resolution to grant permission for a further 316 dwellings. The Council is proposing to allocate enough land to continue to meet the needs of Retford at 87.4 dwellings per annum (enough land to accommodate 420 dwellings). In addition to this, it is expected that there will continue to be a good supply of windfall sites.</p>
DBLP150	Individual	<p>Would like to see no more new Out of Boundary developments on land currently used for agriculture. Would also like to see improvement to the Infrastructure in Retford. In particular the traffic flow around the town. Moved here in 1990 whilst there has been a reasonable growth in housing, the volume of traffic has at least doubled and there has been no improvements to alleviate congestion, trying to get around the town morning, night or school times it is grid locked with queues at all traffic lights with queues along London Rd. to the Whitehouse's and from North Rd roundabout to Babworth. West St should be extended from Asda to join up with Hospital Rd following a route close to the Chesterfield Canal to minimise the loss to Kings Park. This would eliminate the need for traffic from London Rd going to Worksop or the A1 north or visa-versa</p>	<p>Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers such as the Highways Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required. An area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land. The proposed development boundary for Retford will only be available as part of the next version of the Local Plan.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>having to go all the way around town Arlington Way and Amcott Way through 6 sets of traffic lights and would take pressure off North Rd roundabout. It would require a new bridge over the river Idle. There is an alternative route down Albert Rd, Queen St but it is unusable for any volume of traffic or larger vehicles because residents have to park on the road. Replace the traffic lights at London Rd Arlington Way with a roundabout. Currently trying to get from Arlington Way to the train station is a nightmare. Would like the traffic lights at Amcott Way, Moorgate and Arlington Way replaced with a roundabout - queues stretch as far as Longholme Rd. The Morrison traffic lights should be removed and that junction should be made no right turns, only left in and left out making use of the new roundabout it would only add about 200 meters to most journeys but would make things flow much better.</p>	
DBLP158	Fisher German on behalf of T Strawson and D Horrocks	<p>States that the Council will support the delivery of sustainable development to meet the needs of Retford over the plan period. Where applicable, a number of criteria (a. to g.) must be satisfied by proposed development. Consider these criteria to be typical of development policies across the country, as well as being consistent with national policy. Note that the policy states that the requirement for 853 dwellings in Retford is a minimum. This is supported. Retford should be allocated significantly more development than outlined by the Draft Plan. Retford in the Core Strategy was designated to receive almost a quarter of the District's housing requirement. This has been artificially restricted within the emerging Local Plan, without merit or proper justification. Retford is demonstrably one of the most sustainable settlements in the District. It has a strong housing market which is likely to be representative of high housing need and should receive a level of growth commensurate with this sustainability. Do not consider there is sufficient justification or merit to warrant this step-change,</p>	<p>The approach taken to the spatial strategy is being reviewed in light of comments made during the Local Plan consultation. However, it should be noted that the Core Strategy restricted growth within the villages and as a result Retford accommodated a greater proportion of housing over the plan period than is being proposed by this Local Plan which also proposes a more equitable apportionment of housing across the villages to promote sustainable development. Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Further consideration will be given to the assessment of non allocated sites adjacent to settlement boundaries.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>which seems to be informed more by local politics than sound planning rationale. Support the housing requirement for Retford will be delivered through existing planning permissions and new site allocations in the Plan. The land north of Bracken Lane is an available and deliverable site which is suitable for allocation in the Plan. Policy 10 also states that the Council will support new housing on non-allocated sites within the development boundary of Retford. Support this, but consider that the plan should also contain policies that ensure flexibility should the housing requirement not be met and which facilitate development on unallocated sites adjoining the development boundary, subject to meeting a number of criteria. This would enable the Council to refuse inappropriate development, whilst meeting its housing needs should any of the allocations not deliver.</p>	
DBLP169	Avant Homes (Central) and Wyndthorpe Developments Ltd	<p>As acknowledged in the preamble to ‘Policy 10’ and at para 10.6, the demand for housing in Retford has been strong since the start of the Core Strategy period, with the existing plan target of 26% proportionate growth having been met. The explanatory text adds that as the District’s second largest town, Retford benefits from a wide range of community infrastructure, facilities and services, forming a sustainable area for growth. The ‘excellent public transport links’ from Retford Bus Station, and Retford Train Station are further highlighted. From Paras 10.6 to 10.7, the previous apportionment of 26% residual growth in the Core Strategy is noted, there is little explanation as to why the revised spatial distribution has radically diverted growth away from the town. Para 10.7 makes reference to the identified ‘garden villages’ south of Retford, noting that these are considered to address a percentage of local housing market needs. The identified garden villages represent new isolated settlements which are substantially detached from the centre of Retford. The</p>	<p>The Local Plan is proposing to deliver the same level of growth on an annual basis in Retford as the adopted Core Strategy. The Bassetlaw Core Strategy (2010 to 2028) identifies a requirement of 1574 dwellings for Retford. This equates to 87.4 dwellings per annum. The RSS found this was an appropriate amount for Retford. Projecting this forward to 2037 gives a housing requirement of 2360 dwellings from 2010 to 2037. Since 2010, 1057 dwellings have been delivered in Retford. There is currently land with permission for 571 dwellings in Retford and resolution to grant permission for a further 316 dwellings. The Council is proposing to allocate enough land to continue to meet the needs of Retford at 87.4 dwellings per annum (enough land to accommodate 420 dwellings). In addition to this, it is expected that there will continue to be a good supply of windfall sites.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>'Gamston Airport' site is located over 2km from the south of Ordsall and around 5km from the centre of Retford, falling well outside of MfS preferred walking distances from existing amenities. This site will be heavily dependant on short term private vehicle use and will require significant sustainable transport infrastructure to connect with existing local amenities. Bevercotes Colliery is located over 8km from the centre of Retford and arguably bears little influence over meeting housing need within Retford, given it is equally located within similar distance Ollerton (Newark & Sherwood District). The NPPF is clear that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. The Council recognise that Retford is a sustainable location, opportunities for sustainable growth should be maximised accordingly, particularly given the NPPF's objective of significantly boosting the supply of housing. There is a danger that failure to do so in this regard would render the plan unsound failing to meet the relevant tests, notably that it has not been positively prepared and that it is not effective or consistent with national policy.</p>	
DBLP186	Natural England	Support the inclusion of increasing climate change resilience through good quality design and protecting, conserving or enhancing Green Infrastructure in developments in Retford.	Support for criterion a and g welcome.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP195	Fisher German on behalf of The Hospital of The Holy and Undivided Trinity	<p>Consider the criteria in Policy 10 to be typical of development policies across the country, as well as being consistent with national policy. Note that the requirement for 853 dwellings in Retford is a minimum. The use of the term minimum is supported. Clearly, it is the intention of the NPPF to assist in boosting the supply of housing significantly, as outlined at Paragraph 59 (2018). Paragraph 60 continues that Local Planning authorities should determine the minimum number of homes needed. Consider the minimum threshold for Retford should be significantly greater than that proposed by the Plan. The Core Strategy sought to deliver a quarter of the District's housing requirement in Retford. This was considered a sound approach and reflected Retford's role in the District. The housing requirement for Retford, set out in the emerging Plan appears to have been artificially restricted, without merit or proper justification. Retford is demonstrably one of the most sustainable settlements in the District, a fact recognised by the District's Spatial Strands. It has a recent record of being strong housing market area, which is likely to be representative of high housing need. Retford should receive a level of growth commensurate its sustainability and likely housing need. Do not consider there is sufficient justification or merit to warrant the Plans proposed step-change in the future growth of Retford. This decision seems to be informed more by local politics than sound planning rationale. It is noted that the local MP has differing views to those prescribed by National policy, however it is the Framework which should form the basis of plan making. Consider that the Land at North Road should be included in the development boundary, due to its forthcoming permission, consider that the Plan should also include a policy which allows for non-allocated land adjacent to the development boundary to come forward, if allocations have failed to deliver or can be shown demonstrably to be non-</p>	<p>The Local Plan is proposing to deliver the same level of growth on an annual basis in Retford as the adopted Core Strategy. The Bassetlaw Core Strategy (2010 to 2028) identifies a requirement of 1574 dwellings for Retford. This equates to 87.4 dwellings per annum. The RSS found this was an appropriate amount for Retford. Projecting this forward to 2037 gives a housing requirement of 2360 dwellings from 2010 to 2037. Since 2010, 1057 dwellings have been delivered in Retford. There is currently land with permission for 571 dwellings in Retford and resolution to grant permission for a further 316 dwellings. The Council is proposing to allocate enough land to continue to meet the needs of Retford at 87.4 dwellings per annum (enough land to accommodate 420 dwellings). In addition to this, it is expected that there will continue to be a good supply of windfall sites.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		deliverable. This policy position ensures delivery and flexibility are built into the plan, without the need for review. This could be tied into the Council's proposed trajectory to ensure developers adhere to the timescales set, ensuring housing delivery.	
DBLP226	Retford Civic Society	Support efforts to attract new industry and sources of employment into Retford and welcomes the proposal to develop land on North Road for employment uses.	Support for Part 2 welcome.
DBLP251	Individual	When future sites allocation proposals come forward for Retford the Bassetlaw Plan should include planning policies that explicitly state that there will be no expansion of Retford beyond the current boundaries of the town. Specific reference should be made to the agricultural land adjoining Ordsall, Bracken lane and Tiln lane areas of the town.	Housing land availability is currently being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. An area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land. The proposed development boundary for Retford has been reviewed as part of the development of the Local Plan. Some amendments are being proposed to enable new development to be accommodated.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP238	Individual	When future site allocations proposals take place, that the Bassetlaw Plan should include policy that clearly states that no future housing will be constructed which would increase the current boundary of Retford. In particular reference any agricultural land within or on the boundary of Retford town.	Housing land availability is currently being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. An area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land. The proposed development boundary for Retford has been reviewed as part of the development of the Local Plan. Some amendments are being proposed to enable new development to be accommodated.
DBLP245	Individual	Most concerned about the way in which the policies will be applied to applications in Retford. Major developments for industrial or commercial development should address the availability of appropriate housing for potential employees and vice versa where substantial housing applications are made the applicants should address the questions of appropriate employment opportunities and the availability of necessary local facilities to meet the needs of new residents. Applications on agricultural land or greenfield sites to the east and north of the Retford boundary on the local Plan map 1995 will be rejected unless in exceptional circumstances until such time as essential infrastructure work and further town amenities have been provided. Retford have covered their building quota five years hence based on old boundary plans.	The Economic Development Needs Assessment identifies the links between the number of new homes and the expected amount of employment land required as a result in particular broad locations. Housing land availability is currently being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. An area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land. The proposed development boundary for Retford has been reviewed as part of the development of the Local Plan. Some amendments are being proposed to enable new development to be accommodated.
DBLP267	Sustrans Bassetlaw Rangers	3 Town Centre, i. accessibility to the wider area is rightly a high priority, but equally is provision of a north-south cycle link (Bridgegate – Chancery Lane) across the town centre away from the principal highway corridor (ring road), the absence of which is a major obstacle to cycle use within Retford. A route west from the town centre via West Street, the Carrs, Pelham Road, West Carr Road and into Ordsall, potentially across the Sandhills, should be considered as an element of this project since, not only would it form a link to the town centre from the	The Bassetlaw Transport Study will be updated to inform the next version of the Local Plan. This will include cycle routes. The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure transport infrastructure can remain operational and can accommodate changes in use over the plan period. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to transport will provide a clear approach for all types of transport provision including for sustainable transport. The list of evidence on p81

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		Ordsall area but also one route to Retford from the Garden Villages via Ollerton Road. The table on page 81 quotes an evidence source (5) as the Harworth & Bircotes Neighbourhood Plan; is this correct or merely a 'cut & paste' oversight?	should not include reference to the Harworth and Bircotes Neighbourhood Plan.
DBLP289	968479	Support for all policies. Traffic queues in Retford are unsustainable. Consider a bypass as part of the plans. Can't make use of leisure facilities in the evening.	Housing land availability is currently being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers such as the Highways Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required.
DBLP300	Individual	No support for any policy. Retford and the rural areas are not the place for new housing. The focus should be on deprived areas. Shops are shutting down and people do not have the disposable income in this area. People move to an area for various reasons. This changes the landscape and communities.	New housing should be focussed in the more sustainable locations which includes Retford, as well as Worksop and Harworth. To ensure that these main towns are not required to accommodate an unsustainable amount of housing the Local Plan proposes to equitably distribute housing amongst the villages. The closure of shops is a national trend. Housing land availability is currently being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford and in a mix of income areas) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP352	988350	Strongly object to further housing developments which will spoil a great part of Retford's history as well as destroy and increase unemployment in the area by eliminating the aerodrome businesses. Retford already has a large number of housing developments with an infrastructure which is already struggling to cope.	New housing should be focussed in the more sustainable locations which includes Retford. The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
			to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP398	989658	No support. It would be better to spend the money on improving current local provision, education, medical, transport, housing, employment, rather than trying to entice more people into the area without sufficient employment and services to support the current growing population never mind thousands more. Centre of Retford is already clogged with traffic during busy times.	The Economic Development Needs Assessment identifies that the amount of employment land proposed is consistent with the amount of housing proposed. New major development will be expected to ensure provision of infrastructure to meet the needs of their development, this could include education, health and transport. Housing land availability is currently being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers such as the Highways Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required.
Policy 11: Harworth & Bircotes			
DBLP19	Harworth and Bircotes Town Council	Note that the Plan identifies Harworth and Bircotes as the Local Regeneration Town - the growth in new housing and employment opportunities in recent years supports this. It is recognised that the development of the brownfield site that was Haworth Colliery is ongoing; agree that the appearance of new houses needs to be accompanied by further employment opportunities to ensure viability and to this end look to the future development of Harworth South.	The Council welcomes support for this policy.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP19	Harworth and Bircotes Town Council	<p>Social housing has recently been developed in Harworth and Bircotes with the appearance of Housing Association homes and new Council houses that replaced older Council dwellings. There are also properties available for rent from private landlords. However there is always a demand for accommodation from our growing number of older residents; the Town Council hopes for assistance with the issue if a potential opportunity is proven viable. The Town Council hopes to see a future focus on homes suitable for the elderly within all housing developments. Private housing is attracting immigration to the Town but a common complaint is that there are no bungalows to purchase. Unfortunately as they are to developers there is an obvious need and market for bungalows; residents who own their own houses wish to downsize in preparation for their retirement. It would be interesting to discover what could be done in the future to persuade developers to address this obvious need.</p>	<p>The Housing Mix Policy seeks to ensure that the housing needs of the elderly population are addressed. The Council will also continue to work with partner agencies and the community to take advantage of opportunities to address the housing needs of the elderly community.</p>
DBLP19	Harworth and Bircotes Town Council	<p>The Plan identifies that the regeneration of the town centre requires attention to both retail and infrastructure. Policy 11 states that there is no requirement for expansion of the Primary Shopping Area including new retail floorspace. The Town Council strongly disagrees with this. Expert market analysis of the Town Centre identifies the need for further retail development; the current retail layout resembles a 'seaside town' design with retail outlets along the northern side of Scrooby Road. The recommendation is to create further retail units on the southern side of the main shopping area thus creating a more balanced High Street (Report from Aspinall Verdi, Harworth and Bircotes Town Centre: Growth plan). The comments in the Plan should be corrected to reflect the need for a better balance of retail availability in the main shopping area.</p>	<p>The Plan does not restrict the expansion of the town centre, it supports retail development on the edge of the centre. The Plan is simply seeking to ensure the existing centre continues to function as a retail and service hub for the community.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP19	Harworth and Bircotes Town Council	<p>Ongoing planned growth of Harworth and Bircotes supporting the regeneration of the Town demands changes and improvements to the current infrastructure - para 11.13 states the normal route to achieve infrastructure improvements is 'via direct onsite provision and developer contributions.' In terms of regeneration of the Town Centre there is a need to mitigate the impact of large scale housing growth in Harworth on the current infrastructure and implement: - improvements to Harworth Crossroads - this is a main junction for five roads facilitated by two mini roundabouts, it is a key point of access to the Town, the Town Centre and Bircotes and the A1M. It has been under discussion with NCC for the last decade: the evident and growing pressure from traffic and the need for a better system of traffic control is paramount to the delivery of further growth of the Town. - A new design for improvement traffic management and pedestrian safety in the main shopping area: a Traffic Management Plan (Via). Implementation would control vehicular traffic, increase pedestrian safety, establish connectivity with Simpson Park for vehicles and pedestrians - a must do and support retail and local economy and enhance the retail experience. Town Council recognise that these improvements are necessary for successful regeneration and is aware that local opinion which has been supportive of housing growth and particularly Simpson Park is now questioning further growth without infrastructure improvements. Also recognise that the costs will not be met by developer contributions alone. These two major infrastructure schemes are integral to future regeneration, are key to underpinning the desired balance between housing, employment and retail and should be highlighted in the Plan.</p>	<p>The Bassetlaw Transport Study will be updated to inform the next version of the Local Plan. This will include proposed mitigation to infrastructure where necessary. The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure transport infrastructure can remain operational and can accommodate future development in Bassetlaw.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP90	Lichfields on behalf of db symmetry Ltd	<p>Assume that Symmetry Park is considered as part of the employment land supply for Harworth & Bircotes. This is how it is in the EDNA. Should this be incorrect happy to advise on how the strategy should be amended. Notwithstanding the approach taken within the EDNA, Policy 11 is vague and it is not clear whether or not Symmetry Park is included. Policy 11 states that at least 38 Ha of employment land and associated infrastructure will be delivered in Harworth & Bircotes and "on land extending towards the A1 to the south". This lacks any firm definition. It could include Symmetry Park, there is no clarity as to whether this is the case. 'Towards' might be construed as not meaning 'up to' which would be clearer. At the very minimum, the supporting text should be amended to define the area that is referred to. Suggest wording of: "...on land to the south of Harworth & Bircotes extending down into the parish of Blyth up to Junction 34 of the A1(M)." Para 11.10 should be updated to make it clear that land in and around Harworth & Bircotes also refers to land falling within the parish of Blyth. The EDNA considers Symmetry Park as to be one of the district's most important employment sites and a key contributor to the District's employment land supply throughout the plan period. When considering the 22 sites assessed in the EDNA, paragraph 9.8 states: "Of these 22 sites, 6 sites are considered to be Key Employment Sites – Claylands Avenue, Manton Colliery, Manton Wood East and West, Sandy Lane Estate and Symmetry Park. These are the most important sites for employment uses in the district and should be retained as such. Employment uses at these sites should be protected and development for alternative uses should be resisted." Table 17 of the EDNA identifies Symmetry Park as the only 'key strategic employment site' in Harworth & Bircotes. It is not possible to discern from the DBLP if Symmetry Park has been accounted for in the 38 ha of employment land for</p>	<p>The policy recognises that Symmetry park is an important employment site and will be allocated as such in the emerging Local Plan. The employment land contributes towards the district employment need and not for any specific settlement.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		Harworth & Bircotes - welcome clarity on this. If Symmetry Park is considered to be a commitment and has not been considered as part of the future land requirement set out within the policy then the supporting text should make this clear.	
DBLP91	Highways England	Highways England has previously engaged with NCC and the Council regarding the impact of growth in the Harworth & Bircotes area, particularly on A1 J34. Concluded that the planned NCC junction improvement scheme would mitigate the impact of growth proposed in this location. However, should further development be proposed in the area, over and above current allocations, Highways England considers that it will be necessary to review the impact of this further growth on this junction.	The Bassetlaw Transport Study will be updated to inform the next version of the Local Plan. This will include proposed mitigation to infrastructure where necessary. The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure transport infrastructure can remain operational and can accommodate future development in Bassetlaw. HE will be a consultee in this process.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	<p>Support the more positive approach taken towards planning for growth at Harworth and Bircotes. Welcome the acknowledgement of the Core Strategy Vision in para 11.6 which sought a step change at the town. Note this a step change in housing growth and linked employment development, taking advantage of ready access to the A1 (to the south) and close proximity to neighbouring Doncaster.</p> <p>Support a continuation of a positive strategy but consider that the Local Plan needs to further consider how economic growth can be the driving force for the above stepchange which will in turn require an uplift in the number of homes both at Harworth and Bircotes but also across the wider District.</p> <p>Accept that the proposed levels of growth of 1400 homes (circa 40% growth from the towns current size) is a reasonable expectation for growth at Harworth with a modest level of economic growth as predicted by the EDNA. Should encourage the delivery of employment land Harworth significantly in excess of the 38ha of employment land proposed as the minimum target within Policy 11. The level of housing growth promoted at Harworth and the other main settlements within the District should be significantly increased within the Local Plan to encourage that delivery. In the event that the economic growth of the District does not make a step-change, levels of housing growth required to support such economic growth will not be delivered. Policy 11 (criteria a-g) should be re-drafted to remove ambiguity. Support Part 1 of Policy 11 the delivery of housing in an appropriate mix for the local area. However, the Council point to the SHMA 2017 to provide that guidance which does not form the basis for the Local Plan's housing requirement. The Local Plan seek to provide an evidenced base approach to housing mix needs that is reflective of the housing requirement to be provided; and a mechanism for review of that evidence. At Part 2 support the identification of land to</p>	<p>Agreed. Housing and employment growth will be broadly balanced to support the needs of the district. Snape Lane will be identified as a strategic employment site in the emerging Local Plan to address the step change in growth of the local economy.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		the south of Harworth (towards the A1) for the delivery of employment land. This land, including land to the south of Snape Lane, should form a strategic employment allocation within the Part 1 Local Plan. Support Part 2 of Policy 11 which seeks to encourage employment development to meet unexpected demand. Unexpected demand must be matched by housing growth. At the very least, the Council's housing policies should contain a similar mechanism to support an increase in housing land in the event of unexpected growth occurring.	
DBLP147	ID Planning on behalf of The Haworth Group	The policy establishes the Council will support the delivery of sustainable development to meet the needs of Harworth and Bircotes over the plan period. It emphasises prioritisation will be given to opportunities for the regeneration and enhancement of the former Harworth Colliery site and we clearly support this stem of the policy. In respect of housing, the policy goes onto advise Harworth and Bircotes will grow to accommodate a minimum of 1,400 new dwellings and deliver the associated infrastructure from 2018 to 2035. This stem of the policy is supported and the current planning application for land off Scrooby Road and North of Snape Lane, Harworth will deliver development in accordance with the aims and aspirations of this policy.	Support for policy welcomed.
DBLP186	Natural England	Support the inclusion of increasing climate change resilience through good quality design and protecting, conserving or enhancing Green Infrastructure in developments in Harworth & Bircotes.	Support for policy welcomed.
DBLP192	Johnson Mowat on behalf of Barratt Homes	Appropriate to maintain Harworth & Bircotes as a Local Regeneration Centre. Should take a proactive approach to development within the settlement to ensure that appropriate delivery is supported to facilitate the economic and social aspirations for the area. Acknowledge that Harworth & Bircotes benefits from a made Neighbourhood Plan and is	Agreed. Housing and employment growth will be broadly balanced to support the needs of the district. Appropriate employment land will be identified in the emerging Local Plan to address the step change in growth of the local economy.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>appropriate that this should be referenced in the policy. Haworth scores poorly in the Index of Deprivation. In almost all indicators including (but not limited to) employment, income, health, housing and living environment, Haworth ward results in higher levels of deprivation than the District average and the national average. Of the five data areas comprising Harworth ward three are ranked within the most deprived 30% areas in the country and one is identified as within the most deprived 20%. Direct investment in the settlement will assist in improving the overall housing stock, assist in the drive to raise health and education standards, facilitate the improvement of existing services and facilities and aid in the provision of services where gaps are identified. The ward of Harworth has the second highest percentage of working age population claiming out of work benefits in the District. The commitment of at least 25% of the District's employment land needs to be delivered in this area is welcomed. This should be seen as a minimum. Given the conclusions of the EDNA, which prioritises meeting needs and providing an uplift along the A1 corridor Harworth's strategic location on the A1 places it well to deliver such aspirations. In contrast, the distribution of dwellings (1400 dwellings or 21%) is reflective of the regeneration aspiration and the settlement should be apportioned a higher level of residential distribution to boost investment within the area and compliment the proposed economic growth. The table at 11.8 sets out a total of 1,081 dwellings planning consents in Harworth & Bircotes (as at 1st April 2018). It is noted the same is set out for other settlements. There is no evidence base setting out these known consents. A list of the sites contributing to the known planning consents should included as an appendix. These comments apply to tables in Sections 2 and 8 – 11. Should the requested evidence corroborate the figures in the table, this is clear evidence of developer interest</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>in Harworth and its ability to deliver the District's housing needs. Unless additional homes are distributed to the Town, could see a position where one of the District's key housing supply lines could be "cut off" within the early stages of the Local Plan period.</p>	
DBLP235	Individual	<p>Much attention has been given to the proposed housing allocation within Harworth and Bircotes, but there is scant detail or provision for road improvements which are necessary to facilitate this. The mini roundabouts in Old Harworth cannot cope with the predicted traffic, supported by a number of recently submitted traffic surveys. Scrooby Road, which is the main route to the supermarkets and Bircotes suffers severe congestion at peak times of the day, coinciding with school drop offs/pick ups. The proposed new route along the former pit road, South of Jones Homes Woodland Grange must be upgraded to a main road/bus route between Asda and Blyth Road to alleviate traffic congestion on both Scrooby Road and the twin Harworth roundabouts. Subsequent residential development of land to the West of Blyth Road could compliment this by allowing the creation of a new strategic transport link to Styrrup Road, South of the new cemetery. This is NCC Highway's preferred option, which would see a pedestrian controlled crossing at Blyth Road and footpath/cycle route to Styrrup Road/New Cemetery. This would eliminate a large proportion of traffic using Main Street and allow traffic traveling South along Tickhill Road to flow more freely at the roundabouts. The added benefit would be a safe pedestrian/wheelchair access route to the new cemetery. Footpath access along Main Street is restricted to able bodied pedestrians due to narrow footpaths and cars parked on the footpath by the Blacksmiths Arms pub/shops.</p>	<p>The Bassetlaw Transport Study will be updated to inform the next version of the Local Plan. This will include proposed mitigation to infrastructure where necessary. The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure transport infrastructure can remain operational and can accommodate future development in Bassetlaw.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP235	Individual	<p>The row of shops on Scrooby Road are in need of improvement. The poor layout/design and lack of maintenance by absentee landlords does not help. Deliveries to the shops have to be made from Scrooby Road, due to the poor state of the access Road to the rear of the shops, which does not appear to be improved or maintained. Harworth/Bircotes is not a Market Town like Tickhill or Bawtry and the massive increase in housing will do nothing to provide a much needed boost to the current retail outlets in the short term, as parking is inadequate and the range of shops is considered poor and repetitive. Accept retail outlets will adapt to supply and demand, this process will take years. The colliery site should have had an allocation of retail outlets to the rear of the Town Hall/Asda to compliment the Town Centre. The decision to allocate planning permission for sole residential use to the colliery site was poor and there is now a distinct lack of vacant land for new retail outlets within walking distance of the Town Centre. Any new out of town retail opportunities should not face planning refusals due to the envisaged competition with Harworth Town Centre. Appreciate efforts have to be made to revitalise the existing Harworth shops, do not and cannot offer the same facilities an out of town centre can. There are a large number of families relocating from around the country and they will expect more amenities, feeling disappointed and relatively short changed if these are not forthcoming.</p>	<p>Policies are in place to enable the town centre to expand if there is demand from the retail sector. The town centre continues to function as a key service centre for Harworth and Bircotes. The Retail Study does not identify a need to expand the centre. As such, there is no evidence to support this approach.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP235	Individual	<p>The current and proposed housing developments are predominately large scale and located in two specific areas of the town. Future developments ought to be smaller scale and more evenly distributed around the settlement borders. Not everyone desires to live on a large sprawling estate. There are too many 3/4 bedroom detached properties planned or under construction. These properties sell at over £200,000 and whilst providing significant profit for the builders, are out of reach to the majority of the local population. A greater emphasis should be placed on affordable by nature of build homes. Two bedroom semi detached properties and 2 bedroom quarter houses would be more suitable to first time buyers and local people. The latter offering 4 smaller scale and more affordable homes on a similar footprint to a traditional 2/3 bedroom semi detached property. The 2 bedroom properties have always been the first to sell in all the recent developments. Bungalows have been consistently requested by the local population, to little or no avail. Understand they are less profitable for builders and land hungry. Where there is a specific demand should be fulfilled. The lack of bungalows for sale and the effortless nature of which they sell, often exceeding the asking price confirms this. Development proposals that offer an increased ratio of bungalows to houses should be prioritised when considering site allocations and planning consents, as is the case with government approved affordable homes.</p>	<p>The Housing Mix Policy seeks to ensure that the housing needs of the local community are addressed. Neighbourhood Planning provides an opportunity for communities to undertake an assessment of local housing need and implement policies to deliver the type of properties needed to some extent. However, policies must be deliverable and developers are likely to want to deliver a good mix of housing types.</p>
DBLP235	Individual	<p>The Green Wheel is an ambitious proposal and well received by local people, relies on strategically placed housing developments to allow the route to be designed, funded and constructed. Without said developments in place around the boundary of Harworth/Bircotes, it is likely to face opposition from land owners, who will more than likely be unhappy with the proposals. This is the case with the South West section of</p>	<p>The Green Wheel is supported by the Council, but this is an issue for the Harworth and Bircotes Town Council and the Neighbourhood Plan and not the Local Plan.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		the green wheel, without which it will be more of a horse shoe or a crescent.	
DBLP235	Individual	Development is planned to replace the ex council airey houses on Common Lane, no further developments have yet been proposed for Low Common Lane, further West. This area has become increasingly popular over the years for dog walking/recreation. It is a section of un-adopted road without a footpath. It is heavily used by agricultural vehicles and is becoming increasingly dangerous for the public, particularly children. Trespassing across agricultural fields is common, with scant regard for any damage caused and no thought of the health risks of pesticide applications which may have been made to growing crops. Fly tipping is at epidemic proportions in this area as is the problem of illegal motorbikes. A smaller scale development, sympathetic to the surroundings, with a sufficient buffer from the A1 would benefit this area and provide a degree of ownership to this part of the village. It would allow the green wheel to circumnavigate a large part of the missing link.	The Council is not proposing to allocate land for housing in Harworth & Bircotes. There is a significant amount of development with planning permission which should meet the needs of the local community. The Neighbourhood Planning process will enable the local community to allocate new sites in Harworth and Bircotes.
DBLP251	Individual	Support the proposals for housing in Haworth.	Support for the policy is welcomed.
DBLP290	969442	Support for all policies. Query about Harworth (are the homes currently being built included in the 1400 home requirement?). Query regarding GP services - are they able to accommodate people moving into the new homes? Concern that no homes will be built if the incinerator gets the go ahead.	Yes, the homes currently being built and with planning permission will address the housing requirement in Harworth & Bircotes. The Council will continue to work with our CCG/NHS partners to ensure there is sufficient capacity for the new developments.
Policy 12: North Nottinghamshire hire Villages			

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP3	Individual	Support the creation of two new villages as identified on the sites proposed with the potential of further increasing the proposed numbers at a future date. This would reduce the need for as many additional houses in Worksop and Retford.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP4	Individual	Support the creation of two new villages as identified on the sites proposed with the potential of further increasing the proposed numbers at a future date. This would reduce the need for as many additional houses in Worksop and Retford.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP5	Individual	Support the creation of two new villages as identified on the sites proposed with the potential of further increasing the proposed numbers at a future date. This would reduce the need for as many additional houses in Worksop and Retford.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP6	Individual	Support the creation of two new villages as identified on the sites proposed and support a larger number of houses being built on these sites as opposed to the numbers being put forward for Worksop and Retford.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP8	Individual	Agree that the creation of two new villages which are identified on the Plan should be on the proposed sites and again these would be ideal for larger numbers of houses to be built.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBPL9	Individual	Support the creation of two new villages as identified on the sites proposed, indeed support a larger number of houses being built on these sites as opposed to the numbers being put forward for Worksop and Retford.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP10	Individual	Support the creation of two new villages as identified on the sites proposed, indeed support a larger number of houses being built on these sites as opposed to the numbers being put forward for Worksop and Retford.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP11	Individual	Support the creation of two new 'dormitory villages' as identified on the sites proposed. Any extra houses required should be built on these two sites rather than in Worksop and Retford.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP13	Individual	Read with horror at the proposed notion of redeveloping the current Retford Gamston Airport in favour of a new village. This is an ill thought through and ineffective solution despite understanding the need for new housing. The document often uses the word 'sustainable' but very rarely with evidence or reasoning. In this project the word has lost its effect and that the incentives behind it are ill and flaw ridden. No reason to suggest a success of the proposal.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP13	Individual	States that the airport is an inefficient use of land. This is misinformed. Would like to assume that you are aware of the pilot shortage crisis, with a 2018 estimate telling us that we need as many as 617,000 new pilots by 2035. This is a very real and very serious threat to our modern lives and we cannot afford to make the problem worse. To do so would be a catastrophe. The current site at Gamston is home to several flying schools, each playing a part in the vital role of fundamental training for new pilots. Many of these pilots go onto airlines such as Jet2 and to 'kill off' potential opportunities for new pilots would be a calamitous mistake. There can be no doubt concerning the airport's benefits both locally and to the wider region. Fail to see any actual figures regarding the economic contribution of the airport this suggesting a severe lack of research into the proposal. The Plan states that the closure of the airport will not have a profound effect on jobs,	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		as new ones wil be created at the new village. Fail to see figures quoted as to the level or even sector of employment that would supposedly be created. Assume that the majority of jobs created would be from the construction of the new village. This is more evidence of the Council's inability to thnk about what is best for the long term, as these jobs would only be temporary contracts and after project completion there would actually be a larger level of unemployment. What the Council fails to see is the current contribution of the airport, its ability to create jobs and its ability to exert a positive multiplier effect on the surrounding area.	
DBLP13	Individual	Question the actual purpose, use and credibility of the project. The Plan sets out that we need more homes and housing, alongwith the rest of the country. Heavily dispute this, as the need at the moment is for affordable housing, enabling new young families the chance to get onto the increasingly, impossible to reach property ladder. Found that the neighbouring village of Elkesley has an average property value of £201,000 in some parts estimates even being as high as £343,000. When the average house price for Nottinghamshire stands at £178,000 and £155,000 in Yorkshire the Elkesley prices are clearly out of the range of 'affordable' and there is no reason to believe that the propsoed village would be different.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP15	Individual	Developers should also look at the acres of land Gamston aerodrome occupies - an ideal opportunity for new roads, shops etc to accommodate the houses.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP16	Individual	Support the proposal for the two new villages so long as not too much farmland is taken over cutting down food crops and livestock requirements.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP18	Individual	Examined the plans and know the site well. Wish to object strongly to the development of these houses in this location. Very concerned that para 12.8 states that the site 'provides good connectivity with Retford' when the roads are connected between Retford and Gamston Airport are London Road which is already well known to be heavily congested, and Ordsall Road which passes Ordsall Primary School. This cannot be acceptable for the use of up to 10000 cars. How can the roads to the south of Retford sustain traffic from allocation of 30% of the whole of Bassetlaw new housing development requirement? The traffic through Gamston village would also be too heavy for the village to tolerate.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP20	Individual	Support the creation of two new villages as identified on the sites proposed. Support a large number of houses being built on these sites as opposed to the numbers being put forward for Worksop and Retford.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP21	Individual	Support the creation of two new villages as identified on the sites proposed. Support a larger number of houses being built on these sites as opposed to the numbers being put forward for Worksop and Retford.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
			to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP22	Individual	No objection to the new garden village at Bevercotes which is a good use of land and is currently disused.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP22	Individual	Completely object to the garden village at Retford Gamston Airport. Its absolutely disgusting that airfields are being destroyed to make room for new housing and industrial estates and oppose the development at my local aerodrome. Airfields should not be closed, they are fantastic places which should be protected. Once the airfield is gone its gone forever as there is no plan to replace it. Retford Gamston Airport is one of the best general aviation airfields in the country, and the local skies are always abundant with aircraft which fly from there. The airfield has hangarage for up to 100 aircraft and is home to many successful aviation businesses such as Gamston Flying School, Radiola Aerospace and Diamond Executive Aviation. If the airfield closes where will these aircraft and businesses go? Many airfields are closing across the country to become housing estates so there will not be room at those which remain to base the displaced aircraft. No doubt the plan is to move the aircraft to nearby Doncaster Sheffield Airport - this is unviable. The international airport wants to expand drastically between now and 2037 with enhancement of the terminal and cargo facilities. This will make little room for general aviation	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>aircraft - it is unlikely that the Gamston residents could move there. Moreover Gamston has a 5500ft asphalt runway which is long enough for large business jets to land and take-off. Few general aviation airfields have a runway of this length and it is vital that it is protected. Other airfields in close proximity to Gamston have grass runways which are unacceptable for these types of aircraft. How long are these airfields going to remain before these too are earmarked for housing? General aviation will soon be extinct in the UK if airfields are allowed to be developed. This is a travesty which is why the garden village should be abolished.</p>	
DBLP22	Individual	<p>The plan involves 4000 new homes, 1000 before 2035 and 3000 beyond. This is a huge number of houses - there will be up to 10000 people living in close proximity. This is approx half the population of Retford so the use of local facilities will increase by 50%.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP22	Individual	<p>Disagree with using land which is currently used as an airport as a new standalone development. Losing airport related employment is bad for the aviation industry. New employment will not be created in the aviation industry which needs fresh talent, instead this is being removed from the locality.</p> <p>Describing Gamston as being 'free from significant constraints' is hardly true when a large number of businesses and airfield uses depend on its provision. Airfields should not be considered brownfield sites they are too important to be easily built on. Gamston is not 'an inefficient use of land' it should be developed further as an airfield to give greater social and economic benefits. Describing the airfield as having 'former</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		aviation significance' is wrong when it is a popular airfield, home to many aircraft and businesses.	
DBLP22	Individual	Due to the size of the development the new village (2500 homes, convenience retail and community facilities, business park, new nursery, primary and secondary schools, health care facilities and recreational space) would not be contained within the current airfield site. It is likely to expand into 'lush green farmland' includng huge amounts of farmland surrounding the airfield. Building 2500 dwellings isn't viable and will result in the village speadning into farmland encroaching into fields surrounding Ordsall. Once building starts it will not stop until it coalesces onto South Ordsall, Eaton, Gamston and Elkelsey creating one unseparated development. The plan mentions new bridges over the river which sounds like the plan is to expand into neighbouring farmland which is totally barbaric. This will disrupt local wildlife, such as bats and owls. It will also result in houses being built in areas which are likely to flood due to the close proximity of the River Idle.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP22	Individual	Infrastructure around the airport cannot cope with the current level of traffic - without 5000 more cars, & the vast number of new residents - roads around the site will be unable to cope with the volume of traffic. The B6387 is dangerous with sharp bends and the bend on Rectory Lane junction in Gamston is perilous. This road is incapable of dealing with traffic from 2500 homes and is likely to result in increased accidents. Brick	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>Yard Road and Jockey Lane will be incapable of dealing with the large volume of traffic from the new village. This road is also very bendy especially the sharp one by Gamston runway and is unfit for thousands of cars using it daily. This will be one of the main roads leading to the A1 and the runoff junction leading to Elkesley Bridge is too small. Brick Yard Road will be a major road leading into Retford, the town centre and railway station. Ollerton Road is perilous with people speeding up the hill and out of Ordsall. Pulling out of Lansdown Drive and Gleneagles Way is extremely dangerous and the increased traffic will make this worse. The mini roundabouts in Ordsall and at Whitehouses are unable to deal with traffic and these will be heavily used. Another main road used will be London Road, Retford. This is already too busy due to too many houses being built on the road and it will be unable to deal with the immense number of cars using it. The new village will have easy access to the A1 but this will add to congestion when an accident occurs - the A1 traffic plus that from the village will make Retford roads unmovable. Retford is getting gridlocked especially on Babworth Road and London Road in rush hour. The plan has not been thought through and there has been no consideration to the impact on Retford and surrounding areas.</p>	<p>Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP22	Individual	<p>Gamston is far from the East Coast Main Line and Sheffield to Lincoln railway lines. Retford station is in an unsuitable area with Queen Street and Victoria Road far too congested. It will be impossible to get even more cars down to get to the station. There is not enough parking and the train station facilities cannot deal with the increased number of travellers from new development. Bus services are limited and the new village will increase traffic on the A1 which will soon be unable to cope. Retford just cannot deal with the size of the proposed new villages.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP22	Individual	<p>What about the provision of schools, doctors, hospitals etc? There is a plan for a new secondary school on the site. Where are teachers going to be found and how is the school to be funded? Educational establishments are having their budgets squeezed as there is no money for what they require.</p> <p>Bassetlaw Hospital cannot cope with the number of patients, services are no longer offered and people have to go to Doncaster. These two hospitals will be unable to cope with the vast number of patients. With further housing planned around Doncaster Sheffield Airport the strain on healthcare will increase. Waiting times for doctors are obscene this will get worse with increased residents. The constituency cannot cope with the size of the new village.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP22	Individual	<p>Gamston Airport have 11 recently built hangars capable of housing up to 100 aircraft. In 2015 Gamston was voted best general aviation airport of the year, and the airport has 15,000 aircraft movements a year. The airport is centrally located in Bassetlaw and is easily accessible to Nottinghamshire, South Yorkshire and Lincolnshire. If the airport is removed there will no longer be an airport in close proximity. The Apron Cafe gets fantastic reviews and the airport can deal with aircraft up to a gross weight of 25,000kg. This is something smaller, grass runways are unable to provide.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP22	Individual	<p>There are multiple aviation businesses on site which will be affected by the closure of the airport. Gamston Flying School is a brilliant flight training school and without this being based locally people will no longer be able to learn to fly. Gaining a PPL is often the first step to gain a commercial pilots licence and as there is a need for new pilots losing a flight school will add to the problem. Having a local airport encourages people like me to go into aviation related careers - without the airfield young people will not be able to find out about the various aviation careers available. There is a massive STEM skills gap</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>and the airport is vital to keeping local people interested in aviation. Radiola Aerospace is a hugely successful company and according to their website are leaders in flight inspection, navigation and communication systems. Their regional office is at Gamston and they work with Diamond Executive Aviation at Gamston. Closing Gamston will have a decremental impact on them and finding a new airfield to operate from will be difficult. Visit Gamston Airport, witness the airfield in operation and see why this fantastic place needs preserving for generations.</p>	
DBLP23	Individual	<p>The proposal for 2 new garden villages is an excellent idea, provided they are affordable and all amenities are supplied, therefore saving travelling and global warming.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP24	Individual	<p>Does not support the proposal for the two new villages</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP25	Individual	The proposed village on the current Gamston Airport site will increase the amount of traffic coming into Retford to shop. With the close proximity of the new development with Retford, residents will use facilities like large supermarkets for greater choice rather than use the convenience store on site as mentioned in the plans. The roads are already extremely busy, especially when a crash occurs on the A1 which happens more frequently. Don't think the road network will cope with the large increase in traffic from the number of houses destined to be built.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP25	Individual	Gamston Airport is required in the area as many airfields have closed in recent years to become housing estates and this should not happen to an award winning airfield. Where will aircraft be housed when the airport is closed and what about the many successful aviation businesses that are based on site, what happens to them?	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP25	Individual	Where are all the occupants of the new villages going to find work in the area? If they are going to travel by car to their place of work, the road network will not be able to cope with the sudden increase in traffic during rush hour, which during these times are already struggling with the volume of vehicles using them. If travelling by train the roads surrounding the station are inadequate at busy times of the day to access and park even just to drop off at the station to catch a train is difficult.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP25	Individual	Only assume it will be a matter of time that the new village will coalesce onto the edge of town to make one unseparated settlement. Unsure how all that is mentioned will fit into the boundary of the site when it includes new schools, parks, allotments, healthcare facilities, sports pitches and employment land.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP27	Individual	Support the creation of two new villages at Gamston and Bevercotes are a very good idea, they will both have easy access to the A1, therefore taking a little of the traffic away from the roads in Ordsall and Retford. Both Ordsall and Retford could not take many more houses and the traffic is already built up on nearly all the roads at certain times of the day.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP28	Individual	Really like the idea of creating two new villages at Gamston and Bevercotes, they will both have easy access to the A1, which in turn will take traffic away from Ordsall and Retford.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP29	Individual	Not averse to the idea of the Garden Villages but there needs to be a major upgrade in the road systems to accommodate the increase in traffic. It was suggested there might be a new road linking the Gamston site with the A638. Traffic should be discouraged from going through Eaton which is a small hamlet with a narrow road that is not suitable for large increases in traffic.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP29	Individual	Be happy to see the site developed because there is nuisance caused by low flying aircraft that make no effort to avoid overflying the houses at the lower end of the village even though they are not in a direct line into the runway.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP30	Individual	As a resident of Ordsall living just a mile from the proposed developments at Gamston Airfield oppose the plans in the Draft Plan. Should the plans come to fruition it would mean a further 4000 new homes within approximately four miles of my address. This is a significant number of new homes and will impose a significant pressure on the local infrastructure which from experience is already struggling with the level of demand placed upon it.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP30	Individual	The traffic this scheme will generate is a concern as the estate I live on requires me to pull out onto the busy Ollerton Road at its junction with Lansdown Drive. This junction is dangerous at times owing to drivers entering and leaving Ordsall showing no regard for the 30mph speed limit. The visibility from the junction towards Ordsall is less than ideal and is worsened by the fact that the road into Ordsall is on a hill. Combined with the excessive speed at which some motorists drive, this junction is already dangerous. Many of the new residents will use Ollerton Road as a way of getting into Retford - there is currently a crash gate on the sharp bend at Brick Yard Road which could be an access point for the development. With 2500 homes planned at Gamston, it is feasible that in excess of 5000 cars could be parked there, and each of these could pass the junction which I pass to commute, increasing the risks to myself, other drivers on my estate and pedestrians in the area.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>Retford is becoming increasingly congested. I queue in traffic more than previously as I commute along North Road. Fortunate that can start work at 8am so I avoid the worst traffic during the school run which sees traffic queueing from Hallcroft roundabout up to Retford Oaks. Similarly at 5pm the queue can sometimes stretch to the mini roundabout on Babworth Road. A large number of potential commuters into Retford has the potential to cause greater congestion. Some will commute to Newark/Doncaster but the accidents on the A1 resulting in road closures and traffic diverting through Retford cause more congestion making this undesirable to many. Many residents would prefer to work in Retford because of its close proximity to the new developments which would reduce the journey time to work but result in an intolerable level of congestion in the area.</p>	
DBLP30	Individual	<p>Concerns for other services. Often have to wait a month or more for a doctor's appointment unless it is an emergency. Will the new residents have their own doctors or will they attend the existing ones in Retford, resulting in longer waiting times than the already unacceptably long waiting times that exist? Will new supermarkets be built or will new residents shop at those in Retford despite parking can be challenging at busy times, similarly parking in the town centre on a Saturday. Aware that new schools are planned but has the effect on the existing schools been studied. Some of the local schools are not in the best position with staff being made redundant owing to schools having lower numbers than they were designed for and the Post 16 Centre has closed owing to under performance. New schools could hinder the schools in Retford if they provide better facilities than those that exist. This could leave schools such as Retford Oaks (built only 12 years ago) struggling for staff/students, rendered unviable and at a risk of closure.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP30	Individual	<p>Concerned by the potential closure of Gamston Airport. It is home to a number of businesses providing services to the aviation industry and to the local community. For those learning to fly, Gamston Flying School allows someone to take control of an aircraft and gain a pilots licence. Many commercial pilots would have started their careers by gaining a licence at schools like this. Kuki Helicopters provides a similar service for those who wish to fly helicopters. DEA aviation are a full service provider of bespoke airborne sensing solutions including intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance, aerial survey and flight calibration. Radiola Aerospace specialise in aeronautical navigation aids, flight inspection and flight navigation and provide services to military and civil aviation customers. In addition to the business the airport has 11 hangars and is home to 100 aircraft ranging from a small 2 seat Cessna training aircraft to private jets. Excluding military and commercial airfields such as RAF Waddington and Doncaster Sheffield all nearby airfields such as Netherthorpe have short runways and these are mostly grass. While this is acceptable for small aircraft it precludes using such airports for larger private jets. The weather is likely to cause operational issues for grass runways. Gamston has 5522feet long asphalt runway with lighting, larger and heavier jets are able to operate in wet weather and at night. The Children's Air Ambulance is also based there showing the airfield's capabilities and usefulness to the industry.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP30	Individual	The Apron Café at the airfield is regarded highly by visitors and is a destination for those who have no connection to aviation due to its high quality food. Many people from Retford and the surrounding villages would be disappointed if it was to close to allow more houses to be built, particularly given the number of houses that have already been built in the area and the disruption construction has caused such as the former Retford Leisure Centre car park and the present development at Norman's Garden Centre, London Road.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP30	Individual	Aviation can have an impact on young people. My sister has been inspired by Vulcan XH558 and the Red Arrows which are based locally and has had a trial flying lesson at Gamston. This has resulted in her wanting to learn to fly and gain a PPL in future. Aviation is now her passion and she is studying Aerospace Engineering at University with a dream to design aircraft. The closure of many airfields across the country and turned into housing will have a detrimental impact on the aviation industry as a result of reduction in flight training capacity and a lack of inspiration. There is a STEM skills shortage and airfields should be allowed to flourish and inspire the next generation.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP31	Individual	This proposal could increase the population in my divisional area from 10000 to 20000+ more than doubling the population of a scenic and pleasant rural area. The proposal could increase the population of East Markham ward from over 2000 to 12000+ over a number of years more than a six fold increase. The populations also face the 20% increase in the draft plan. Object strongly to the draft plan. Jobs and employment should be a priority in this document. Safety on the roads for the rural population should be prioritised over the residential expansion proposed. Public transport, in this case rail should be made more use of, and increased residential in West Bassetlaw for access to Sheffield and the North by existing rail links.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		Commercial and industrial situated next to the A1 (garden village sites) to avoid residential.	
DBLP31	BDC Councillor	The concerns of constituents are not nimbismn. A non transparent process of selecting the Garden Villages intends to dump extra houses in ths area only. Need to know what sites were considered and why these were selected, when the public transport for job opportunities is better for instance at Shireoaks with a short rail journey to the northern towns and cities.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP31	BDC Councillor	Bassetlaw reduced it's investment in rural areas with the drastic reduction in the concurrent grant. This grant was designed to compensate the parishes for services provided by BDC to the towns of Retford and Worksop. The New Town proposal on Bevercotes and the Gamston Airfield is not rural investment , but a stand alone new Town which will do nothing for rural investment or the existing rural communities around and about the area.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP31	BDC Councillor	Compact residential planning is desirable, coalescence may be acceptable or even desirable where fragmentation of the rural area and existing country would be the result. The proposal is a modern form of ribbon development which planning was designed to prevent after the second world war. Residential sprawl was considered undesirable as opposed to extension of compact communities with nearby accessible services.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP31	BDC Councillor	<p>What are the other sites ? The draft gives the impression of a fait a comply even though it is supposed to be a consultation. Why are we not allowed to see the other areas considered and the reasons they were rejected? BDC has not taken forward these sites either efficiently or with sufficient consultation with other public bodies. When I enquired at NCC, I was told that BDC had not put forward sufficient information for NCC to comment on so they could not support this draft proposal. This proposal is not supportable as part of a long term growth plan. Commercial and industrial, putting jobs as the priority on these sites, with the direct access onto the A1, without having to pass any residential is the correct use of these sites, putting residential in the towns where the present services can provide without isolation.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP31	BDC Councillor	<p>Connectivity to the East Coast Main line and the Lincoln Worksop Sheffield line will be poor. There is insufficient parking to support increased commuting from outside Retford. There is little opportunity to expand parking capacity. Walking and Cycling to the train station by residents in the town is necessary. A new commercial pay car park was installed West of the main line to allow increased access that side of town to the station from the under rail tunnel. The requirements were increased lighting and improvement of approaching footpaths to make this attractive. Despite support from Retford Councillors none of the required improvements were forthcoming , and the commercial car park was closed. This was an opportunity lost. The connectivity to the A1 is better exploited by the industrial and commercial traffic which will not have to pass through residential areas to access the rest of the country. That heavy traffic is the most damaging and polluting.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP31	BDC Councillor	There are currently over a hundred jobs at Gamston airport. The area must not lose these if possible as the Cottam Power station closes now with the loss of 300 jobs. West Burton Power station to close shortly.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP31	BDC Councillor	The settlement is not sustainable in the community sense. Residential sprawl has its own character but not necessarily a community especially in commuting ghost towns. There are no guarantees how this will turn out despite high ambitions. Talk of health facilities, schools, playing fields and benefits are much exaggerated, and BDC have never made efforts for the existing garden villages. Most of the sports clubs for instance are completely funded with private money, although grants are obtained for all sources where possible. The build benefit is likely to benefit a developer and staff from out of the area anyway. This real sense of community is aspirational. BDC will have no control over the sense of community which is likely to be isolated from the existing country communities.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP31	BDC Councillor	Garden villages is a term of presentation of an unpalatable proposal. Employment opportunities are limited. This is not an environmentally friendly proposal as most of the residents are going to have to commute miles and to the cities to obtain the most sustainable jobs. It would be better to build houses at and in Retford on Retford's economic development land and move Retfords economic development to Bevercotes and the airfield. This will allow the increased Retford residential population to cycle or walk into Retford or use the regular bus services. This will give them easier access to the train station. The movement of the commercial industrial to the garden villages will mean the Retford commercial/industrial light industrial traffic will not	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>have to pass through Retford residential areas or through any residential areas to access the main road network. Workers from away will also not pass through Retford residential.</p> <p>Agricultural Value: Gamston Airfield is a valuable agricultural resource. The plan proposes to convert this land into leisure use and tree planting. The quality of the land is suitable for a wide range of crops. The National Potato demonstration was held on this site for many years. Harvesting, planting, working demonstrations, because of the suitability of the soil which is highly productive and versatile. Only half the temperate food needs are grown in this country. BDC has not mentioned this land as an important resource to grow food.</p>	
DBLP31	BDC Councillor	<p>It is not possible to retain a rural nature with 4000 houses. A New town urban extension is a better description.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP31	BDC Councillor	<p>ALTERNATIVE SUGGESTION: The Sheffield City Region is better accessed by increased development at Shireoaks. The existing station provides major opportunities to access jobs further West of Worksop by rail in the enlarged urban extensions of Anston, Dinnington, Sheffield and the northern cities including Doncaster. The New road planned towards Sandy Lane roundabout from Todwick will provide unrivalled opportunities, with superb access to the M1 motorway and corridor.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP31	BDC Councillor	<p>Attempting to provide new and enhanced services and facilities for surrounding areas and new communities. -BDC has been very limited in what services it has provided to the surrounding rural areas. Waste collection yes. What else? Are these new town settlers something special that they are going to receive enhanced services when the residents of East Bassetlaw have been paying high council tax for little for years? *Connectivity and accessibility to Retford and Tuxford is likely to be overwhelmed. Access to Retford is already difficult, especially from the South. *Tuxford centre is congested and difficult to access at busy times. The proposed new town sites are not convenient fro Retford station and frankly too far away. *</p> <p>Economic prosperity will be promoted by retaining these sites as commercial and industrial providing jobs for Bassetlaw. *It is not within BDC remit to provide schools provision. Schools are authorised when existing demand proves the need for investment and this is assessed at NCC. This is a non political process which only becomes an obligation with certain criteria. In the meantime the pressure would be on existing stretched facilities.*Its impossible to deliver a Net diversity gain with ecological enhancement by building houses. Mitigation cannot replace the Net negatives of urbanisation.* The highway improvements that could be delivered would benefit commercial and industrial development more than residential development.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP31	BDC Councillor	EAST BASSETLAW Under the present proposals Retford is favoured by not getting it's appropriate share of residential development. Development in Retford is sustainable with existing health facilities and it makes sense to locate older people to Retford where they can get appropriate and timely healthcare support. Development should still be focussed on Retford as the centre and NOT the rural villages.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP31	BDC Councillor	This is sensible, but most of the population of these settlements will commute elsewhere to work. These developments are likely to be ghost towns during the day with people enjoying their leisure elsewhere as well, so may become dormitories for the cities. Evidence is easily obtained as the new estates in Worksop are mostly deserted during the day.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP31	BDC Councillor	BDC has no power over these services and infrastructure, on present form they are unlikely to influence NCC or other services. The A1 is dual and already over congested. When I travel North from Newark in the evening a 50 mph speed is dictated by the density of the traffic. This proposal with the high number of residential car journeys will increase the congestion on this part of the road.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP31	BDC Councillor	<p>On the figures provided in the 2018-2035 period there is unlikely to be a legitimate requirement for even 1 primary school. This makes me suspicious that once the proposed land is incorporated into the Draft Plan there is a plot to proceed faster than that laid out. The number of houses estimated in the short term for the New Town is identical to the village of East Markham, which has a small school. This school has been at capacity for some time but it has been difficult to obtain a new school Hall which was desperately needed. Funding has only recently been obtained from the government facilitated by NCC. Delivery is years behind requirement. CONCLUSION Schools provision is likely not to be delivered until after 2035 on provision criteria, depending how the town would grow.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP31	BDC Councillor	<p>This is likely to be a similar community unfulfilled requirement as most other rural villages, as in the short term it is no bigger than East Markham, which does not even have a village shop. This urban extension area is likely to be a dormitory commuter area derelict of community. The development is likely to resemble a graveyard with lights.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP31	BDC Councillor	<p>5a Nursery and Primary education are unlikely before 2035 and nurseries are privately provided. b Only if private. c Health Centres - These are not going to be provided here in the short term, and health provision is going to be accessed at existing facilities in Tuxford and Retford. 5c This comes as supplying too little information. Health facilities in Retford are already short of staff. Radiology in Retford only operates 2 days a week because of shortage of staff. Patients have to travel to Worksop. Staff prefer to work in the larger hospitals. Bassetlaw hospital in Worksop has difficulty in recruiting staff. It is one of the smallest hospitals in the country. Modern health workers like to be where the specialisation is, in the larger hospitals.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		The proposed garden villages and village growth is likely to be older people according to this paper. It is not a good idea to put these people in Eastern and Northern Bassetlaw , a long way from main health provision and hospitals. Any additional residential development requiring car journeys outside Retford and parking as a result is going to increase the difficult access to Retford and its station. New Roads will not help with this and are unlikely to be provided as they would be ineffective.	
DBLP31	BDC Councillor	All the provisions suggested are supplied privately in the Parishes and rural areas. Private clubs , charities and the parishes fund these. BDC does not financially support this provision in the rural areas, so this is presumed to be a wish list. Infrastructure planning gain will not pay for this wish list. The residents would wish to see all these benefits and services but are used to receiving little apart form refuse collection and Council Tax bills from BDC. The rural residents are going to be resentful that BDC considers that the New Town Johnny come latelies, should be treated like VIPs and have a superior status in the services that Bassetlaw wishes to provide for these incomers when BDC does little for them.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP31	BDC Councillor	High quality communications technology is required. Many telephone lines exchanges and local boxes are in poor condition and poorly maintained. Aluminium not copper makes up a good part of the network. The rural resident will settle for fibre to the premise at the moment but they do not have access to the luxury fibre optic service which the towns receive. It may be aspirational for the luxury infrastructure to these new Towns, but BDC cannot influence the telecom companies. Need adequate infrastructure to the rural areas, which many rural subscribers have not been getting.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP31	BDC Councillor	Residential urban Extension (garden villages) results in a net loss in biodiversity. For instance the open land surrounding the	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		airfield runways is favoured by hares, skylarks, corn buntings and grey partridges, Buzzards and hawks. The airfield prevents a lot of human disturbance. People are apt to wander which creates disturbance to the species, which can be as damaging as killing them outright in the first instance. The urban edge of the urban extensions will increase disturbance round it. The River Maun runs alongside the Colliery site. This is an important habitat for otters and waterfowl which is under threat. The River Idle lakes at Gamston are ecologically and environmentally important. These are likely to be increasingly disturbed rendering these habitats as "sink areas" where the mortality of species is likely to exceed their breeding success. This is why wild species suffer reduced numbers from human disturbance and their pets, and people find this difficult to understand. Some species can accept disturbance such as wood pigeons and rats, but most cannot.	have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP31	BDC Councillor	Does not support 2 new villages	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP34	The River Idle Benefice	Our reply is made from the perspective of spirituality but is not limited to that of a particular or indeed any religion. Concern the wellbeing of the new communities and the continuing wellbeing of the existing communities. Only commenting on the needs of all residents, were these villages to be built, and not on whether this is the best site for the villages.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP34	The River Idle Benefice	<p>There is much to affirm for these two villages and would want to support the Council in their aspirations to make these developments high quality examples of new communities.</p> <p>Welcome the provision of health facilities - these are lacking in the present villages and residents need to make long journeys to access health care.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP34	The River Idle Benefice	<p>You correctly identify the importance of transport links and the need to substantially improve the existing road network - particularly a new bridge over the A1. Whilst the aspiration is for the villages to be self contained without radical change many people will still travel to work probably by car and travel also to shop.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP34	The River Idle Benefice	<p>Your propose two new primary schools and a secondary school. Ask that an integrated approach is adopted considering also the existing schools in Elkesley and Gamston, which are part of the character of the villages. Is expansion of both or either a possibility? The aim should be that these new villages also enhance the life of the existing residents.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP34	The River Idle Benefice	<p>The plan mentions a village hub for each community but does not mention the provision of a community hall. Our experience of a number of villages is that a community hall significantly enhances the wellbeing of all residents offering a space for many clubs and activities. Such halls once built, can be self sustaining.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP34	The River Idle Benefice	Ask that you consider spirituality. Suggest good provision for physical wellbeing, some provision for mental wellbeing but nothing about spiritual well-being. Our desire is that people should have the opportunity to be refreshed spiritually to celebrate life events and acknowledge that there is more to life than the purely physical. To provide the possibility of this suggest that a new primary school be a Church of England academy. This should also be designed to allow a space for worship and community use out of school hours. Alternatively some of the community provision could be offered to the church.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP36	Individual	There is a lot of industry established at or around the airfield which could not easily be relocated, the airport for one would struggle to get a new licence and would ultimately end in job losses.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP36	Individual	The impact so many houses would have on Gamston village would be devastating to go from 100 houses to over 1000 with the dangerous link road between them as an accident blackspot waiting to happen. This year there has been three road traffic accidents on the B6387 as it travels through Gamston with cars being pulled out of the river. This section of the road would be impossible to change without massive impact on the river and the village and would inevitably be the main route to Retford as it is the most direct route. Without a clear highways plan the idea should be rejected. The development of Retford's businesses was highlighted as a goal and for choosing these locations. If this many houses feed Retford then the whole infrastructure needs to be changed as each road that goes to Retford is dangerous and overused - all have been reduced to	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		50mph to reduce accidents. Retford is gridlocked at rush hour and school run time adding to this load would make Retford less attractive to commute and if the main line train allows people to commute further afield parking and access to the station is an issue. Retford does not have the parking or amenities to deal with an increase of this level.	
DBLP36	Individual	The sites in principle do have a lot to offer and do not object to the development in a sympathetic manner but to make financial sense to the developer and the Council the scale is such that the impact would be catastrophic for the Icoals and the environment - it is that impact I object to.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP38	Parallax	Concerned about any kind of development that threatens to close Gamston Airport. There's a lot of land nearby that while not brownfield is perfectly suitable for the building of homes that won't close one of the UK's most celebrated general aviation airports. Yes, building homes on the site will create some jobs for a year or two while they are under construction but it will destroy the livelihoods of those who work on the airfield and bury businesses such as DEA and The Apron under a pile of rubble. This plan needs a rethink.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP39	Individual	Object to the aspect of the plan which shows a garden village planned for Gamston / Retford Airfield. The loss of the airfield would be greatly missed in the flying community of the whole country. It would also result in the loss of two navigation aids, - the NDB and the VOR, both of which I use and would like to continue to use. Also the runway is of a very good length and width, making it idea for larger GA aircraft to use. The flight training facilities provided are also first class with both fixed wing and rotary wing schools established on site. As most of Europe is suffering from a lack of commercial pilots, these	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		flying schools are vital to increase the number. The landing charges to use the airport are quite reasonable considering the facilities in place. To destroy this airport would also be contrary to the Governments policy of encouraging General Aviation. Please reconsider this plan, and find a different site for the village.	
DBLP40	Individual	Gamston Airport is considered to be a thriving example of general aviation in this country. Need GA for a multitude of things; employment; engineers, airfield ops, pilots, operations, stores, accounts, sales etc. The airport is a diverse employer and as this country looks to inspire future generations of air and space minded individuals it plays an important part. People travel from all over the UK to the airport. GA is also an important part of the leisure industry in this country. Gamston airport also makes a sizeable contribution to the GDP through its higher cost services and the higher wage employment is very much welcome in the local area. Whilst there may well be short term jobs created by the construction of a new village there will be few long term jobs and some of the demand for housing would have come from those people now out of work because of the closure of Gamston Airport. The few jobs in the new village will be limited to low paid unspecialised ones such as those working in the village shop or perhaps, at best, a childcare nursery. Concerned the council is more focused on council tax receipts than diversity in the community. Propose an alternative and interesting venture; invest in Gamston as an 'air and space' hub. Look at constructing houses for aviation minded individuals on the western side of the airfield with their own taxi ways and aircraft hangars/parking; you could even just sell off the plots for self builds; in any event these houses will likely generate you good revenue; they'd all likely be bands D-H. Basically, create a fly-in air park for people to live at. They won't complain about the aviation noise and probably won't fly	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		that often anyhow. The good road links that Gamston has will attract people from further afield. In any event, please do not turn another one of this country's valued airfields into another housing estate.	
DBLP41	Individual	Deeply concerned over plans for Gamston Airport. Am a Bassetlaw Resident, a private pilot and also an aviation employee (based at Heathrow). Closing a commercial entity such as Gamston means people such as myself have to continue to travel great distances to seek employment in this sector rather than be encouraged to be employed locally with local businesses. Closing this airfield discourages aerospace investment in the north of England and with so many alternatives available for development such as the Bevercotes site, development of Thoresby Pit and Harworth Pit where no gainful employment is now made means the removal of an asset unnecessarily in our area. There are numerous now dormant industrial facilities locally (including many near Retford town centre) that should be focused on before seeking the removal of functioning organisations from our area.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP42	Individual	Appalled at the proposals to develop Gamston airfield as garden village. This airfield is an important part of the UK airfield network and has many successful businesses running on its site. It is an important airfield for flying training and a place for visiting aircraft to land. Have landed there several times in order to visit local attractions. There are also many	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		privately owned aircraft based there and these would have difficulty in re-locating. Do not go ahead with these ill considered plans.	Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP43	Individual	Strongly object to the proposed redevelopment of Retford Gamston Airport as it is a vital part of aviation infrastructure. The site provides outstanding facilities to businesses and private individuals involved in both Commercial and General Aviation which bring a great deal of visitors, business and tourism to the local area. Although not from the area, have visited the airport many times for aviation training, investing into local businesses. Understand that from a certain view point the site may not be the most efficient use of land when compared to housing, it is not a fair comparison. Airports and airfields by virtue require a big area for runways and facilities to operate safely. Airfields and airports have been unfairly targeted since the reclassification of them as brownfield sites as easy targets for quick profit generation. This will continue to challenge the aviation community and industry.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP44	Individual	Yet another land snatch promulgated by a council whose plan is specious, poorly drafted and once again attempts to sneak a 'garden village's onto an airfield. Airfields may technically be brownfield sites, but that was an oversight in poorly drafted legislation. Gamston should be regarded as a key part of the green belt, and any attempt to develop it is once again developing land to build houses at the cost of the livelihood of the people who work there. Who gains? Builders and property developers. Who loses? Anyone who is employed there currently and/or supplies goods and services to and from the local community. Once it's gone, it's gone. General and commercial aviation loses once again, and the national stock of	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		training airfields is destroyed by a thousand cuts. Where do the businesses that are currently there go to? It's an 'inefficient use of land' is it? Property developers love airfields, as they are cheap to develop unlike brownfield sites, which cut into their profits. They also like lickspittle district councils; you're seen as easy meat. Shame on you Bassetlaw.	
DBLP45	Individual	How did you come to the conclusion that Gamston Airport is an 'inefficient' use of space? As someone who uses the airfield regularly - I would disagree. As would, all the businesses and other frequent flyers that use it. It is a unique airfield, one which the county should be proud to be the home of. It shouldn't be a bargaining tool to get a quick 'buck' from a developer. Considering it has been functioning for at least 75 years, it is a bit of a success story.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP46	Individual	Object to the Basset Law Plan and specifically to the closure of Gamston Airport in order to build a new village. Airfields provide a valuable amenity to the community and to local businesses. Gamston Airport is thriving with a significant number of aircraft movements each year and many businesses and associated jobs being based there, most of them dependent on there being an airfield there so impossible to move elsewhere. The success of Gamston is evidenced by the recent completion of the new hangars. This is a major investment and shows the ongoing success and growth of the businesses based there. Airfields should never have been categorised as Brownfield sites - do not believe this was the original intention of the legislation - it crept in almost by accident and is now being exploited by councils and developers with no consideration for the impact on the community and to local wildlife. An airfield also encourages visitors from	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>elsewhere (used it myself several times), thereby bringing in additional business and is also a clear foundation for the aviation industry throughout the country. It is increasingly being recognised that airfields need to be protected and many councils are taking steps to reflect this in their local plans. Hopefully Basinglaw will follow suit and reject this proposal for the new village on the site. Once an airfield has been removed it is almost impossible to establish a replacement so deciding to close Gamston would be a huge mistake to make. Strongly object to the suggestion that Gamston Airport be closed and hope that you will reject this plan at an early stage.</p>	
DBLP47	Individual	<p>Raise my objection to your plans for housing being built on Gamston Airfield. The land is not 'redundant' brownfield first and foremost, therefore not suitable for a housing project. Additionally, Gamston is an important field for strategically connected airfields (they will be able to advise further during consultations). There is plenty of land, airfields do not need to be targeted.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP48	Webb Aviation	<p>Object to the planning proposal to build houses Retford (Gamston) Airport. The airport is essential infrastructure and this scheme will destroy jobs not just locally but all the intertwined jobs nationwide. Am an aerial photographer and although do not live near Gamston, depend on it and other similar small airfields in order to charter and refuel aircraft. If all the small airfields are built on will be out of a job. Mine is one of a vast number of jobs which are dependent to various degrees on Gamston airport. Similarly there are tens of thousands of people who work in General Aviation including service agents, parts suppliers, engineers etc. If Gamston closes, many local pilots will give up flying and this will have a knock on effect on incomes for businesses the length and breadth of the land.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP49	Individual	Further to your plan regarding a green village on this site I am as a GA pilot who flies regularly into Gamston lodging an objection. The area is not brownfield as you state as it is not redundant. This is a working airfield. Your plans and statement contradicts para 104f of the NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework). There are numerous businesses that operate from this airfield including the recent addition of the Children's Air Ambulance. Your planning proposals for the airfield are totally unwarranted and do not reflect existing policy as stated above.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP50	Twismo Financial Planning Ltd	Express dismay that you are considering Retford/ Gamston Airfield as a site for housing and wish to object these plans based on the value this airfield has in view of its location, licences and capacity. Hope you change your mind and do not pursue these housing plans.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP35	Dunham, Ragnall, Fledborough and Darlton Parish Council	The development of the Bevercotes Colliery is welcomed and believed with tasteful planning could create a particularly attractive development. Unsure why there would be any need to remove the option of an airfield used by local businesses; it could only be seen as a negative impact upon the economy. It was felt in this world of the global economy to remove a service that meets the needs of the wider business community would be a retrograde step and is not supported by the parishes.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP52	Individual	<p>Object strongly to Gamston: am a retired airline captain who, over the last fourteen years, have done a considerable business at this airport as a private aircraft owner as could get specialist technical support no further south than Gamston; ease of communication via the East Coast Main Line to Retford and a short taxi trip from the station very important. (It's important for a non-flying person to understand that when an aircraft operator delivers an aircraft for servicing or for flyable defect rectification, that the aircraft is left at the maintenance organisation's premises for days or weeks, and the pilot invariably leaves by taxi to the station unless live locally; with a balancing trip in reverse). Over the last fourteen years, have used the airport many times - have supported Diamond Aircraft UK Ltd., and then DEA Aviation at Gamston (and no other UK company) to well over £75,000. Much of this has been filtering into your local economy, from being charged a high hourly labour charge (the staff have highly-trained skills) in the continued employment of engineers, mechanics, administration and record-keeping staff; their subsequent local spending, council taxes and business rates of a high-value company based on the airport. Am a single customer; there are many others. Gamston brings more money into your local economy than you have given it credit for. During trips to Gamston used Retford Station many times, as well as taxi rides, hotel, restaurants and other businesses in Retford. Not unique in bringing this "Spend" into your local economy, as DEA has other customers like myself. Airports need land space, and that extends to the approach and climb-out paths for safety reasons; close an airport for houses means that businesses with international or South-of-England bases won't look at your District for a potential relocation. If you take away the means of visiting, a business will not give your area a second glance. In France towns keep their airfields open with the active support</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>and financial backing of their Chamber of Commerce, as an enabling tool. Whilst a couple of hundred houses will bring income from Planning Application fees, and domestic rates, it also incurs the costs of supporting that increase in population: new roads, increased wear, tear and congestion; street lighting, traffic lights and their running costs; refuse collection; policing, education (you'd need at least one primary school), doctor's surgery (perhaps), so the net gain to the Council would be marginal. Build housing on an active airport's site and close it will not gain great financial improvement; the real profiteers will be developers, who'll keep their profits secret, and slink away with their prize like a marauding fox, and move on to their next meal elsewhere. When a local authority is thinking about closing an airport and building housing on the land, this is a FAILURE to make the best opportunities of their best asset to attract investment - should consider industrial or commercial units on the north side of the airport. Building houses is not the best use; it is the easy way out. Sherburn-in-Elmet, Yorkshire - an enormous distribution centre for Sainsbury's alongside the northwest airfield boundary; - Cumbernauld between Edinburgh and Glasgow, and commercial development is very close. Have the advantage of an airport close to the A1, within 15 minutes of the East Coast Main Line; this is very favourable and appeals to business and commerce, it would be wrong to fail to promote your area to attract business (and then jobs, and thus income for the District), using your airport at its prime appeal for the business owner to relocate.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP53	Individual	<p>Strongly object to the proposal for a new village for construction up to 2500 dwellings on the site of Retford (Gamston) Airfield. Whilst the requirement for new housing across the district is acknowledged, the appropriate location of suitable sites is paramount and must take into account all local circumstances, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) para 10 refers. Gamston airfield is definitely not an appropriate site for a new village. Furthermore, it beggars belief that the council states ‘the present use of the site is considered to be an inefficient use of land’. Indeed, Gamston is undoubtedly one of the best and most efficiently operated GA airfields in the UK.</p> <p>The proposal for the new village encompasses two quite separate areas of land which are under different ownership. It is much regretted both owners are clearly complicit to sell the land and thus close the airfield. The current developed part of the site, comprising the main runway, hangars, operations centre, cafe and associated business premises, cannot possibly be consider ‘brown field land’. All the buildings are modern, well designed and built to a high specification. Subsequent demolition and the loss of all the jobs on the airfield would be an act of economic suicide if this proposal was to be adopted by the Council, contrary to NPPF para 28. Some 9700 jobs are supported by GA flying activity in the UK measured at aerodrome level, including those at Gamston, Department of Transport – GA Strategy refers. Moreover, GA business in the UK supports 38,000 jobs overall and represents some 0.12% of GDP. Furthermore, the northern part of old RAF airfield is currently in productive agricultural use. Recommend the deletion of Gamston Airfield as a site for a new village from the Strategic Plan. The closure of Gamston Airfield, if the proposal for a ‘Garden Village’ is carried through to the next stage of the Draft Local Plan, is contrary the recently revised NPPF Section 9, sub para 104f. Indeed, the importance ‘of maintaining a</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		national network of General Aviation airfields' is recognised in this paragraph and further justifies my strong objections to the current proposal.	
DBLP54	POM Flight Training, Humberside International Airport	<p>Object to the proposal for a new village for construction up to 2500 dwellings on the site of Retford (Gamston) Airfield. Whilst the requirement for new housing across the district is acknowledged, the appropriate location of suitable sites is paramount and must take into account all local circumstances, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) para 10 refers. Gamston airfield is definitely not an appropriate site for a new village. Cannot accept that that, as the council states, 'the present use of the site is considered to be an inefficient use of land'. Indeed, Gamston is undoubtedly one of the best and most efficiently operated General Aviation airfields in the UK. Object for the following reasons: 1. The current developed part of the site, comprising the main runway, hangars, operations centre, cafe and associated business premises, cannot possibly be considered to be 'inefficient'. All the buildings are modern, well designed and built to a high specification. Gamston airfield employs some 250 to 300 people in a variety of roles. Must also take into account that the airfield is used not only by aircraft based at Gamston, but</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>those from other parts of the country who use the facilities for pilot training There are also executive and business flights which arrive from all over Europe. 2. Pilot shortages have been recognised and recently highlighted as a current and growing issue in the UK. Gamston is a nationally important provider of commercial pilot fixed wing and helicopter training. It is also used by UK and European based flying schools for navigation and procedural training, which would be irreplaceable. The major airports are not designed or equipped to deal with the large amounts of training traffic that Gamston currently deals with, and proposes to develop in the future. For further information on the recent elevation of the importance of General Aviation please refer to the Department of Transport – GA Strategy. Suggest that you have not fully considered the impact on local jobs and the effect on pilot training, both private AND commercial, not to mention the loss of a facility for business aviation. Have to realise that the closure of an airfield is not just affecting your Bassetlaw, it affects the whole nation AND furthermore, when an airfield is gone, it is gone forever and will never be replaced.</p>	
DBLP58	Individual	<p>Totally opposed to your destruction of the airport. Flown in there regularly for some 35 years and its one of the best GA airfields in existence and if the Council had any proper knowledge or understanding of aviation it would be blindly obvious what a most wonderful asset they have in their locality. A crass idea beyond belief.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP59	Styrrup with Oldcotes Parish Council	<p>The concept of garden villages at Gamston Airport and Bevercotes former Colliery is not supported due to lack of infrastructure and poor amenity and facilities. Both these locations were developed for their previous use BECAUSE they</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		were rural and out of the way, exactly the reason that they are not supported for housing.	to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP60	Nottinghamshire Fire & Rescue Service	Will the new villages have alternative energy supplies?	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP60	Nottinghamshire Fire & Rescue Service	Although in the hierarchy of transport users throughout the plan refers to emergency services, are you aware of the size of modern fire appliances to be considered when planning?	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP60	Nottinghamshire Fire & Rescue Service	Will there be any development to rural roads to cope with increased traffic?	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP61	Parliamentary Candidate for Bassetlaw	Support the creation of two new villages as identified on the sites proposed and support a larger number of houses being built on these sites as opposed to the numbers being put forward for Worksop and Retford.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
			to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP62	Individual	<p>A good solution to reduce impacts on Retford would be the planned build of two new villages identified for Gamston Airport and Bevercotes Colliery. These villages would mean the direct pressure on Retford could be elevated whilst still being able to support the growth of Retford and surrounding areas which we fully support, however we feel that this should be done in a way which gives Retford residents piece of mind that our current lifestyles and properties will not be affected by large border expansions. Feel this would be suitable for the council to expand in the future whilst being able to leave the borders as they currently lie. Consideration should be given to ensuring houses built are affordable.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP63	Netjets	<p>Object to the proposal for a new village for construction up to 2500 dwellings on the site of Retford (Gamston) Airfield. Whilst the requirement for new housing across the district is acknowledged, the appropriate location of suitable sites is paramount and must take into account all local circumstances, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) para 10 refers. Gamston is definitely not an appropriate site for a new village. Furthermore, I cannot accept that that, as the council states, 'the present use of the site is considered to be an inefficient use of land'. Indeed, Gamston is undoubtedly one of the best and most efficiently operated General Aviation airfields in the UK. Object for the following reasons: 1) The current developed part of the site, comprising the main runway, hangars, operations centre, cafe and associated business premises, cannot possibly be considered to be 'inefficient'. All the buildings are modern, well designed and built to a high</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan– Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>specification. Gamston airfield employs some 250 to 300 people in a variety of roles. The airfield is used not only by aircraft based at Gamston, but those from other parts of the country who use the facilities for pilot training There are also executive and business flights which arrive from all over Europe. 2) Pilot shortages have been recognised and recently highlighted as a current and growing issue in the UK. Gamston is a nationally important provider of commercial pilot fixed wing and helicopter training. It is also used by UK and European based flying schools for navigation and procedural training, which would be irreplaceable. The major airports are not designed or equipped to deal with the large amounts of training traffic that Gamston currently deals with, and proposes to develop in the future. For further information on the recent elevation of the importance of General Aviation please refer to the Department of Transport – GA Strategy. You have not fully considered the impact on local jobs and the effect on pilot training, both private AND commercial, and the loss of a facility for business aviation. The closure of an airfield is not just affecting Bassetlaw, it affects the whole nation AND furthermore, when an airfield is gone, it is gone forever and will never be replaced.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP64	POM Flight Training, Humberside International Airport	<p>Object to the proposal for a new village on the site of Retford (Gamston) Airfield. Whilst the requirement for new housing across the district is acknowledged, the appropriate location of suitable sites is paramount and must take into account all local circumstances, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) para 10 refers. Gamston is definitely not an appropriate site for a new village. Cannot accept that that, as the council states, 'the present use of the site is considered to be an inefficient use of land'. Indeed, Gamston is undoubtedly one of the best and most efficiently operated General Aviation airfields in the UK. Object for the following reasons: 1) The current developed part of the site, comprising the main runway, hangars, operations centre, cafe and associated business premises, cannot possibly be considered to be 'inefficient'. All the buildings are modern, well designed and built to a high specification. Gamston airfield employs some 250 to 300 people in a variety of roles. The airfield is used not only by aircraft based at Gamston, but those from other parts of the country who use the facilities for pilot training. There are also executive and business flights which arrive from all over Europe. 2) Pilot shortages have been recognised and recently highlighted as a current and growing issue in the UK. Gamston is a nationally important provider of commercial pilot fixed wing and helicopter training. It is also used by UK and European based flying schools for navigation and procedural training, which would be irreplaceable. The major airports are not designed or equipped to deal with the large amounts of training traffic that Gamston currently deals with, and proposes to develop in the future. For further information on the recent elevation of the importance of General Aviation please refer to the Department of Transport – GA Strategy. You have not fully considered the impact on local jobs and the effect on pilot training, both private AND commercial or the</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		loss of a facility for business aviation. The closure of an airfield is not just affecting Bassetlaw, it affects the whole nation AND furthermore, when an airfield is gone, it is gone forever and will never be replaced.	
DBLP65	POM Flight Club	Object to the new village on the site of Retford (Gamston) Airfield. Whilst the requirement for new housing across the district is acknowledged, the appropriate location of suitable sites is paramount and must take into account all local circumstances, the NPPF para 10 refers. Gamston is not an appropriate site for a new village. Cannot accept that, as the council states, ‘the present use of the site is considered to be an inefficient use of land’. Indeed, Gamston is undoubtedly one of the best and most efficiently operated General Aviation airfields in the UK. Object for the following reasons: 1) The current developed part of the site, comprising the main runway, hangars, operations centre, cafe and associated business premises, cannot possibly be considered to be ‘inefficient’. All the buildings are modern, well designed and built to a high specification. Gamston airfield employs some 250 to 300 people in a variety of roles. Must take into account that the airfield is used not only by aircraft based at Gamston, but those from other parts of the country who use the facilities	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>for pilot training. There are also executive and business flights from all over Europe. 2) Pilot shortages have been recognised and recently highlighted as a current and growing issue in the UK. Gamston is a nationally important provider of commercial pilot fixed wing and helicopter training. It is also used by UK and European based flying schools for navigation and procedural training, which would be irreplaceable. The major airports are not designed or equipped to deal with the large amounts of training traffic that Gamston currently deals with, and proposes to develop in the future. For further information on the recent elevation of the importance of General Aviation please refer to the Department of Transport – GA Strategy. Suggest you have not fully considered the impact on local jobs and the effect on pilot training, both private AND commercial, or the loss of a facility for business aviation. The closure of an airfield is not just affecting Bassetlaw, it affects the whole nation AND furthermore, when an airfield is gone, it is gone forever and will never be replaced.</p>	
DBLP66	POM Flight Club	<p>Object to the new village on Retford (Gamston) Airfield. Whilst the requirement for new housing across the district is acknowledged, the appropriate location of suitable sites is paramount and must take into account all local circumstances, the NPPF para 10 refers. Gamston is not an appropriate site for a new village. Cannot accept that, as the council states, ‘the present use of the site is considered to be an inefficient use of land’. Indeed, Gamston is undoubtedly one of the best and most efficiently operated General Aviation airfields in the UK. Object for the following reasons: 1) The current developed part of the site, comprising the main runway, hangars , operations centre, cafe and associated business premises, cannot possibly be considered to be ‘inefficient’. All the buildings are modern, well designed and built to a high specification. Gamston airfield</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>employs some 250 to 300 people in a variety of roles. Must take into account that the airfield is used not only by aircraft based at Gamston, but those from other parts of the country who use the facilities for pilot training. There are also executive and business flights which arrive from all over Europe. 2) Pilot shortages have been recognised and recently highlighted as a current and growing issue in the UK. Gamston is a nationally important provider of commercial pilot fixed wing and helicopter training. It is also used by UK and European based flying schools for navigation and procedural training, which would be irreplaceable. The major airports are not designed or equipped to deal with the large amounts of training traffic that Gamston currently deals with, and proposes to develop in the future. For further information on the recent elevation of the importance of General Aviation please refer to the Department of Transport – GA Strategy. Suggest that you have not fully considered the impact on local jobs and the effect on pilot training, both private AND commercial or the loss of a facility for business aviation. The closure of an airfield is not just affecting Bassetlaw, it affects the whole nation AND furthermore, when an airfield is gone, it is gone forever and will never be replaced.</p>	
DBLP67	Individual	Support the creation of two new villages at Gamston airfield and Bevercotes former colliery site.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP68	Individual	Object to the proposal for a new village for up to 2500 dwellings on the site of Retford (Gamston) Airfield. Whilst the requirement for new housing across the district is	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>acknowledged, the appropriate location of suitable sites is paramount and must take into account all local circumstances, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) para 10 refers. Gamston is not an appropriate site for a new village. Cannot accept that, as the council states, ‘the present use of the site is considered to be an inefficient use of land’. Indeed, Gamston is undoubtedly one of the best and most efficiently operated General Aviation airfields in the UK. Object for the following reasons: 1) The current developed part of the site, comprising the main runway, hangars, operations centre, cafe and associated business premises, cannot possibly be considered to be ‘inefficient’. All the buildings are modern, well designed and built to a high specification. Gamston airfield employs some 250 to 300 people in a variety of roles. Must take into account that the airfield is used not only by aircraft based at Gamston, but those from other parts of the country who use the facilities for pilot training. There are also executive and business flights which arrive from all over Europe. 2) Pilot shortages have been recognised and recently highlighted as a current and growing issue in the UK. Gamston is a nationally important provider of commercial pilot fixed wing and helicopter training. It is also used by UK and European based flying schools for navigation and procedural training, which would be irreplaceable. The major airports are not designed or equipped to deal with the large amounts of training traffic that Gamston currently deals with, and proposes to develop in the future. For further information on the recent elevation of the importance of General Aviation please refer to the Department of Transport – GA Strategy. Suggest that you have not fully considered the impact on local jobs and the effect on pilot training, both private AND commercial or the loss of a facility for business aviation. The closure of an airfield is not just affecting</p>	<p>process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		Bassetlaw, it affects the whole nation AND furthermore, when an airfield is gone, it is gone forever and will never be replaced.	
DBLP69	Individual	The creation of the two new urban areas to satisfy the local housing needs seems a very sensible and logical solution and one which we fully support. In fact we believe these areas could indeed accommodate a greater number of dwellings than those being proposed and that doing so would in turn negate the need for the housing being proposed in Retford.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP70	Individual	The creation of the new villages looks very sensible - would suggest that these could be bigger to remove the need for further housing in Retford.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP73	Individual	Support the creation of two new villages as identified on the sites proposed, as this would revive what currently is a wasted and misused space in some cases, with restored life and job opportunities. Not only will it provide housing but it will also reassure local residents of Retford that their concerns regarding the expansion of Retford beyond its current boundaries of the town are being heard but more importantly listened to.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP72	Individual	The idea of new villages being built is an excellent idea.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
			Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP74	Sport England	Active Design will be particularly important in the delivery of two Garden Villages in Bassetlaw. A reference to active design could be added specifically to policy 12.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP75	Individual	As an aviator and frequent visitor to Gamston airport and their superb restaurant it is incredulous that it is stated that the present use of the land is inefficient! What a lot of nonsense! It is about time we stopped covering our land with concrete and minimised population growth and this uncontrolled migration instead. Now that would be a better use for councils to try and stem the tide of increased population. We do not need more houses, we need control over the population on this small island. Stop this ridiculous development idea now. Appalled that all the airport staff, clubs, visitors and restaurant staff are dismissed without thought. They don't want to find other jobs they are happy with the ones they have.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP76	Individual	<p>Object strongly to the planning application that is being put forward to yourself regarding Gamston Retford Airport to be closed and for a garden village to replace it , as the local villagers are already just coping with the traffic and as the airport brings in many needed jobs and gives locals as well as many people a place to use for pleasure as well as professionals a place to fly in and do business. The surrounding area has many places better suited to village life than on the side of the A1 and would not cause the loss of the only airport in the local area and many jobs</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP77	Individual	<p>Developing a garden village on an active, growing and vibrant GA Aerodrome does not appear to be aligned with government policy or where that policy is heading. NPPF Paragraph 104 f) states that Planning Policy should “recognise the importance of maintaining a national network of general aviation airfields, and their need to adapt and change over time – taking into account their economic value in serving business, leisure, training and emergency service needs, and the government’s General Aviation Strategy.” Bassetlaw has failed to recognise this in the preparation of the Local Plan with the proposal to allocate Gamston Airport as a Garden Village. The first General Aviation (GA) Strategy, outlines its vision for UK GA and recognises its potential as a wealth generating and job producing sector of the economy. In December 2017, the Secretary of State for Transport Chris Grayling MP appointed Byron Davies as the Government’s General Aviation Champion to produce “Aviation 2050, The future of UK aviation, A Consultation”. Chapter 7 refers to General Aviation and to accompanying documents: General Aviation Strategic Network Recommendations. Aviation 2050 recognises the UK strategic importance of General Aviation. Government data indicates that the sector is responsible for contributing £1.1bn directly and £0.9bn indirectly to the UK economy and is responsible for</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>employing approximately 10,000 people, directly and a further 30,000 indirectly. It confirms that the core of the 2015 GA Strategy (which resulted in the incorporation of NPPF paragraph 104 f), remains as current government policy. It recognises that “Continuing population growth and demand for housing development means there are strong economic incentives for aerodrome owners to sell part or all of their land and more aerodromes may be lost to development”. To address this, it aims “to recommend a methodology to identify the contribution of GA aerodromes to inform the development of a General Aviation Strategic Network (GASN) of aerodromes. The intention of the GASN is to ensure an appropriate balance between transport and housing development priorities, protecting the GA sector’s contribution to the UK economy.” The green paper consultation closes on 11 April 2019 and the Final Aviation 2050 Strategy is expected to be published in 2019. If adopted, Gamston would be included in the GASN based on the proposed criteria: Gamston is strategically geographically located, attracting aircraft owners and operators from a 35 mile radius. Registered owners are from Nottingham, Sheffield, Derby, Lincoln and Grantham. The Airport has a high quality, Civil Aviation Authority licensed hard runway of a length that accommodates business turbine and jet operations. It supports several fixed wing and helicopter training schools as well as a licensed maintenance facility. It provides flight support for business and private aircraft, with extensive, quality hangarage. ATC, fuel and customs are also all provided. Gamston won the National Airport Operators Association GA Airfield award, 2015. Recently there has been significant private investment in Gamston; providing a new control tower, extended hangarage, a helicopter training school, a growing maintenance facility and café. It is unfortunate and staggering that the Local Plan fails to</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		recognise the significant District, Regional and National benefits that private investment has contributed.	
DBLP77	Individual	<p>Gamston Airport and the Aviation related companies based there support the direct employment of between 40 and 50 full-time equivalent jobs. Para 12.10 is clearly ill-informed when compared with UK government policy. Para 12.10 presumably applies employment figures to the whole of what is referred to as the Gamston Airport site. Most of the land identified within this area is agricultural land. Only the land to the south east of the main runway and the runway itself is owned by the Airport and only this area is essential for the airport to operate. The land around the Runways is all farmed. Employment per hectare is therefore much higher than assumed by the above statement. The green paper, paragraph 7.21 comments that “in the longer term, serious consideration should be given to developing mixed use airfields, where GA, industry and housing can co-exist”. Gamston could be a perfect model for this. Well over 1500 homes could be provided on a reduced site area lying within the currently identified site (map enclosed). Even taking account of the appropriate airport safeguarding requirements of the NPPF, the Garden Village and the airport could potentially co-exist.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP77	Individual	<p>The All-Party Parliamentary Group on General Aviation (APPG-GA) advocates that airfields should be given the same protections under planning law as other places of business, such as factories or music venues, allowing airfields to operate without challenges to their right to exist. It is understood that members of the APPG-GA, recently met with the Government's Director of Planning, Simon Gallagher, to discuss new planning guidelines aimed at further protecting airfields. It seems that the protection of GA airfields from housing will be forthcoming. The Local Plan could be overturned by legislation before reaching Final status. It would be logical to exclude Gamston Airport from the Local Plan and to only include this in subsequent versions of the Local Plan, if the anticipated legislation fails to materialise.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP77	Individual	<p>The Plan estimates that demand for housing within the two Garden Villages by 2035 will be 1000 homes. It identifies that each site will ultimately accommodate 1500 and 2500 homes respectively. It identifies that these sites are to both include nursery and primary education, appropriate health care facilities and recreational space. Additionally the Gamston Airport site is to include a secondary education facility. The Local Plan does not need to identify sites for development beyond 2035 and it is not understood why Bassetlaw has sought to do this. 1000 homes are required by 2035 and the need for the associated amenities is understood and accepted. However, the logical way to ensure that this is achieved and funded is to commence the development of a single site and not to endeavour to develop two concurrent sites. Bevercotes Colliery is the obvious first development and this in isolation would satisfy demand up to 2035. There would be no requirement for any development at Gamston until post 2035. If the Authority still wishes to identify the potential second site for development beyond 2035, then to comply with the NPPF,</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		this should be limited to the area to the north west of the Airport main runway and should take account of the airport safeguarding requirements.	
DBLP77	Individual	The Draft Plan identifies that the Community Infrastructure Levy, (CIL) “charges are more marginal for brownfield development”. It is highly unlikely that the development of two brownfield sites (without the incorporation of any greenfield) could support the CIL charges in addition to the Section 106 Agreement works proposed and required to provide the new self contained communities. The fundability of the Draft Plan is questioned.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP78	Individual	Am concerned how the proposal might impact on any future upgrades to the A1 which, in my opinion, will need to be addressed soon. Construction of the stretch of the A1 past Elkesley as a dual carriageway commenced in 1936 and completed after WW2. It runs East-West between Markham Moor and Five Lane Ends and between these junctions incorporates the A57 Lincoln to Liverpool trunk road. Except for the provision of bridges at Elkesley and Twyford Bridge, the road itself remains much as it was when first constructed. Both the Northbound and Southbound carriageways are subject to 50-mph speed limits at the point that the road passes Elkesley and Gamston Airfield; the northbound because of inadequate points of access to properties along the stretch and the southbound because of the sharp bend in the road adjacent to the airfield and Twyford Bridge. Highways Agency state that they wish to remove the 50-mph speed limit eventually, but	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>major realignment of the road would be necessary. The volume of traffic using this stretch of road has increased exponentially in recent years (by 50% in 15-years / 40% in the last 5-years) resulting in daily hold-ups. Clearly the road is reaching the point of being inadequate and ideally should be three lanes rather than two. To underline the traffic increase even further; in the 1980's when I was Secretary to the 'Elkesley Bridge Action Group' there were 14,000 vehicles per day using the road. In 2016 the day count was 100,535, an increase of 618% but the road is essentially the same! There are currently very few buildings on the northern side of the A1 between West Drayton and Ranby thereby making its realignment more feasible than it would be if there were a new housing development on the proposed site. No objection to the residential development of the site but ask that due consideration is given to this issue. Undoubtedly the road will need to be upgraded and the only way for that is for it to be widened or re-routed using land on the northern side. Would hate public money to be wasted, because there was insufficient thought or meaningful consultation with local people with local knowledge.</p>	
DBLP79	General Aviation Awareness Council	<p>To be considered available for development a Brownfield site has to be Redundant, which as your para 12.10 clearly states is not the case. The proposal is therefore contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2018. The loss of such an important airfield would fundamentally disrupt the existing network of General Aviation airfields in the Midlands and would severely impact on general aviation in the region. It would also be a significant deviation from the policy set out in the Government's General Aviation Strategy. The NPPF contains additional provisions relevant to the General Aviation community as they serve to reinforce the protection given to General Aviation airfields by the planning system. Appreciate</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>that this is a draft Local Plan, there is no indication so far of any intention for it to include a specific policy recognising and protecting Gamston Aerodrome. The new provisions require local authorities not only recognise the intrinsic status of an airfield but also as part of a national transport network. NPPF Paragraph 104 states: 'Planning policies should....(f) recognise the importance of maintaining a national network of general aviation airfields, and their need to adapt and change over time – taking into account their economic value in serving business, leisure, training and emergency service needs, and the Government's General Aviation Strategy.' This new wording places a requirement on planning authorities to consider any General Aviation airfields in their plan making activities. Local planning authorities must now consider if an airfield should have its own planning policy, which would have to provide for change to occur. The closure of Tollerton Airport emphasises Gamston's intrinsic importance to the County and its contribution to the General Aviation network of airfields should be recognised in the Local Plan. It should also recognise its contribution to the local economy, and the provision of specialist employment with a bias towards the important STEM based activities focussed at an Airfield. The Local Authority has not identified its residential land allocations correctly and should re-evaluate the situation in relation to Gamston Airfield ensuring that all the measures currently in place to protect current and future aviation activities on and around the Aerodrome are understood, respected and protected into the future. This should be reinforced by an appropriate and robust Local Plan policy.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP82	Individual	House should not be built over Gamston Airport. Madness!	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP83	Individual	To treat the whole of an airfield as brownfield is simply wrong, it misinterprets planning guidance which is to consider the curtilage of the current developed areas as brownfield not the whole airfield. Airfields such as Gamston should be considered part of the UK's critical infrastructure for transport both national and international as is common practice elsewhere in Europe, in the US and farther afield. Because of the way they are managed they are havens for wildlife including, insects, birds (which comes as a surprise to many), plants and provides a contribution to the area's "green lung". To replace all this by a euphemistically described "garden village" is not planning it's vandalism. I know this because I live in an area of outstanding natural beauty which contains a number of airfields all of which are valued and thriving. Indeed next time you fly in a Boeing or an Airbus reflect on the fact that the undercarriage and a good few other components were manufactured at an airfield in Gloucestershire! Would like to continue to visit relatives by flying into Gamston rather than driving for hours on end. Could develop the industrial capacity of the airfield and improve the population of high skilled jobs and benefit the economy.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP84	Individual	Object to the garden Village housing plan at Retford Airport. So many airfields are at risk of being lost this way. Soon there will be no airfields left for general aviation. We already have a shortage of trainee pilots with aviation set to expand over the	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		next 10 years. Also this airfield is the ideal home of the Children's Air ambulance.	to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP86	Individual	Who are you people, stop messing with things that work for the community and come up with something that actually helps the community without any detrimental effects.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP87	Individual	Do not support the plans for creating a garden village on Retford airport. This is land that is used for lots of employment and provides good infrastructure for the local area and brings employment to the area. The airport employs a large number of people already and with the growing need for general aviation the sector is only growing.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP88	Individual	Object to the proposals to create a new village at Gamston airport. This will have a detrimental effect on both the local and wider community. The airport has excellent facilities and is used frequently. For a local airport it has a long runway and can accommodate private jets & vintage aircraft, it has facilities to refuel all aircraft and is used frequently by the medical helicopters. The airport has a very good restaurant and employs many staff as well as the fire brigade, control tower, auxiliary facilities and flight school. The airport acts as a focal point for the surrounding villages and has in the past also hosted charity events, and private vintage car rallies. The proposal will remove a large area of open space and have detrimental effect on the landscape	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP89	Individual	<p>Object to the proposed plan at Gamston - UNLESS at least 600m length of the existing runway(s) and reasonable ground handling space including hangarage for aircraft parking, is retained – and that those facilities are enabled to continue in perpetuity for General Aviation flying operations. Suggest that the Council takes the lead from Stratford County Council who showing leadership in this area regarding Wellesbourne. Such mixed use arrangements would enable the accommodation of new house building AS WELL AS retaining the nations' airfield flying amenities – the latter of which is supported by the largest All Party Parliamentary Group, the APPG [the APPG has 207 MP members - see http://www.generalaviationappg.uk/airfields/]</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP91	Highways England	<p>Highways England is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). Role is to maintain the safe and efficient operation of the SRN whilst acting as a delivery partner to national economic growth. In Bassetlaw principal interest is safeguarding the operation of the A1 which bisects the Local Plan area, and the M1 which is approximately 8km to the west of the district's western boundary. Gamston Airfield and Bevercotes Colliery sites at Elkesley, are north and south of the A1. It is anticipated that these two sites shall deliver around 4,000 new homes, 1,000 of which would come forward within the Plan period. From review of Figure 9 access onto the A1 would be served by the existing junction with the B6387. Welcome the statement that the Council will encourage sustainable transport links between these two sites crossing the A1 to help to ensure that any adverse impacts of additional traffic are minimised.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP94	Individual	<p>Horrified and dismayed about wanting to remove this fantastic airfield and all the facilities there, oppose this plan. Gamston Airfield is something you should be proud to have. It has a reputation in General Aviation of being Friendly Professional and Safe with the latest aid in Navigation suitable for all aircraft. Seen what work they do and the excitement in both young and old people of having a gateway into aviation so close by, I'm typical of the majority of people who use the airfield, However what everyone on the airfield has is a passion for aviation and a passion to share that with others. It's frustrating that a minority of enthusiastic people with such a specialised interest has to suffer for a housing estate with a nice name (gardens) property development has a place but surely not with such an awful price. Gamston, is a provider of full service airborne sensing solutions that operates a fleet of 10 'special mission' equipped aircraft fulfilling UK government and European agency contracts for airborne intelligence, surveillance & reconnaissance and aerial survey work. Also the European headquarters of a multinational company who have a reputation as world leaders in providing flight inspection, navigation, communication and calibration services for air transportation. They work with navigational aids, airfield lighting and communications equipment for civilian and military use and provide real time passenger information for public transport operators. Aircraft continuing airworthiness management, sales & contract maintenance, ground handling services for visiting business aircraft, passengers and pilots. The UK & Eire distributor for aircraft manufactured by Diamond Aircraft Industries of Austria. Five businesses are engaged in pilot training to European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) and Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) standards, aircraft rental and trial flying lessons for local people. An excellent café and restaurant often visited as much by local residents as aircraft operators. A</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>number of other local businesses, including providers of engineering and aviation services rely on the airport and visiting aircraft as a source of work. Nottinghamshire Police use the site (between 12 and 15 times per annum) to deliver advanced driver training in tactical pursuit and containment. Aircraft owners and the Retford-Gamston based flying schools demonstrate a socially responsible approach to engaging with the wider community to improve knowledge of STEM subjects. For example, a recent children's charity day involving educational activities and a flying experience for local children.</p>	
DBLP95	Individual	<p>As a user of Retford/Gamston airport, object to the Bassetlaw plan on the grounds that it involves closing the airport. In general I am in favour of new developments, but not at the expense of closing down such a unique local facility.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP96	Individual	<p>Concerned regarding the possible closure of Gamston airport in connection with a proposed new development. Have visited the airport on a number of occasions and am aware that it provides employment for a significant number of skilled people. It is also a centre for leisure, for those learning to fly, for those such as myself with aviation interests, and also for others, such as cyclists, who regularly stop there to use the splendid cafe facilities. Live near Blackpool whose airport is</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		also being developed. However in our case the development is being built around the airport and the money raised is being used to protect the runway and infrastructure. A plan, allowing some development, but which allows the airport to remain open and thrive is preferable to one under which the airport would close. The convenience of smaller airports such as Gamston which are able to handle European business flights provide a significant incentive for inward investment, which might otherwise be located elsewhere.	
DBLP98	Individual	The plan to demolish Gamston Airport for housing is in my opinion unsound as it does not adequately give weight to the benefits the general area gains from the Airport, in terms of business and jobs, and its loss would be in grave detriment to the locality.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP100	Individual	Why is it that local politicians fail to see the benefits of a local airport. Once it is gone it is gone and all will be the poorer for that. Yes you need homes but we also need employment, if you end up sending everything to Heathrow, London will have and keep all business. Wake up and protect the north.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP102	Individual	<p>As an ex flying school student and a customer of the Gamston Flying School and other services at the airport, cannot believe that would consider using the site for housing when it employs so many people in many varied businesses. The airfield opened in December 1942 as part of the Royal Air Force Training Command, was withdrawn from military service in 1957 and modernised as a general and business aviation airport from 1993. Many historical features remain, including a World War Two era firing range and other buildings that have been adapted for industrial, commercial and residential use. Two of the original three runways remain available, one of which is still used. Five thriving flying schools based at the site, continue a tradition of flying training, each school provides training to standards required by the UK Civil Aviation Authority and the European Aviation Safety Agency. The airfield is equipped with a range of modern facilities that are not routinely available at similar sized airports including pilot controlled lighting and a co-located navigation aids. The runways at Gamston are long enough to accommodate light jet aircraft for business, charter operations and medical evacuation flights and private flying and helicopter operations. General and Business aviation contributes between £2 and 3 billion to the UK economy and relies upon a strategic network of airfields, this has recently been recognised in UK planning policy (but not referenced in the Plan). Hundreds of aircraft from around the UK and the rest of Europe regularly visit the airport because it provides vital transport links for businesses in Retford, Nottingham, Lincoln and Sheffield City Region. Military aircraft primarily helicopters, occasionally use the airport and royal helicopter flights refuel at the airport. Gamston is able to accommodate traffic that would not be able to gain access to larger facilities, e.g. Doncaster-Sheffield Airport. Following the closure of Sheffield City Airport, Gamston is one of the only airports of its size in</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>the region, serving the needs of the business aviation and flying training sectors. Proposals will destroy nationally important aviation infrastructure, risk the loss of approx 100 highly skilled jobs and close or relocate businesses providing Science, Technology, Engineering and Pilot Training services.</p>	
DBLP102	Individual	<p>The plan: - does not take into account the requirement to maintain a strategic network of airfields as outlined in NPPF para 104f. Have not considered ‘the importance of maintaining business, leisure, training and emergency service needs’. - Para 10.3 disregards the locally and nationally significant transport infrastructure provided by the airport. Contradicts para 10.5 which seeks to support opportunities to retain and create. - Other suitable brownfield land is available for housing development in the local area. Partial-development of the site would be possible to capitalise on existing aviation and technology sector strengths whilst retaining an active airport that will provide more skilled jobs for local residents. The plan references the airport site as ‘brownfield’ - planning legislation requires this to be suitable or redundant brownfield land, which the active airport is clearly not. - Other airports across the region are unable to accommodate the business and aviation activity that would be displaced including 10 independent businesses and over 50 based aircraft including</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>business jets, helicopters and light aircraft. The airport also homes a Children's Air Ambulance. - The direct loss of highly skilled technical and STEM jobs at the airport and in the region, including flight training, engineering, support services contradicts strategic objectives 4 and 6 (economic development). - The plan makes a case for local housing need in Worksop (9.7) but does not provide the same level of evidence for Retford. The plan states that Retford has already experienced significant housing growth in recent years since 2011, this being without the need to destroy existing infrastructure. The plan drastically underestimates the scale of potential job losses and the value of the airport in providing highly specialised services to the local and national economy. Section 3.2 of the plan states that "The single significant negative effect relates to the loss of employment land through cessation of airport operations. However, the scale of employment opportunities is likely to be relatively limited" and goes on to say that new jobs will be created in the 'garden village' that would replace the airport. Any jobs are likely to be low skilled, small in number and far lower paid at the Airport. The following publically available data describe some of the businesses based at Retford airport, including: - provider of full service airborne sensing solutions that operates a fleet of 10 'special mission' equipped aircraft fulfilling UK government and European agency contracts for airborne intelligence, surveillance & reconnaissance and aerial survey work. - European HQ of a multinational company with a reputation as world leaders in providing flight inspection, navigation, communication and calibration services for air transportation. Work with navigational aids, airfield lighting and communications equipment for civilian and military use and provide real time passenger information for public transport operators. -Aircraft continuing airworthiness management,</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>sales & contract maintenance. -Ground handling services for visiting business aircraft, passengers and pilots. - The UK & Eire distributor for Diamond Aircraft Industries of Austria.- Five businesses train pilots to EASA and CAA standards, rent aircraft and offer flying lessons.- An excellent café and restaurant.-A number of other local businesses, including providers of engineering and aviation services rely on the airport and aircraft for work. Nottinghamshire Police use the site (12 - 15 times pa) for advanced driver training in tactical pursuit and containment.-Aircraft owners and the flying schools demonstrate a socially responsible approach to engaging with the wider community to improve knowledge of STEM subjects e.g., a recent children's charity day.</p>	
DBLP103	Individual	<p>Find the fact that you are even considering this totally deplorable. The airport and what it has to offer is of great importance to a lot of people, and has been for many years. Use the airfield quite regularly to use my private pilots licence. Urge you to reconsider your proposal, and try to find a way of leaving the airfield operational.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP104	Individual	<p>Object to the plan to build houses on Gamston Airfield, this would be big mistake. Use Gamston Airport with my aircraft so this development would prevent me using Gamston any more. Fly to France quite often and France seem to have an airport at most towns and cities and this helps the local businesses to be reached by air thus helping the local economy and you need to keep Gamston Airport open to serve local businesses. Gamston with being next to the A1 puts the airport in a very strong position to serve other towns in the area as it does at the moment. Places like the old Bevercotes mine site would be a far better use of derelict land and maintain the airport for the local economy and would be still next to the A1. Cannot</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		understand where the local jobs will come from for the people living in these houses so they will have to travel to find work so the A1 will keep the traffic off the local roads.	
DBLP105	Individual	Complain about the proposed plans to close Gamston airfield. Use this airfield literally hundreds of times during my flying career and have found it to be friendly and well run. This airfield has and does provide a vital and valuable aviation asset to the whole community in general. For years innumerable pilots have taken advantage of the facilities provided by this small but fantastic place. To destroy the work of years along with dozens of jobs and the facilities provided would indeed be a criminal act. Gamston Airfield is in a position perfectly placed for aircraft transiting north to south and vice versa, providing fuel, food and a safe haven when the weather deteriorates. Strongly urge the council to think again and look to more plausible brown field sited for their planned developments.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP106	Individual	<p>Have an aircraft based at Gamston Airport since November 1999. Object in the strongest possible terms to the proposal to redevelop the airfield. - does not take into account the requirement to maintain a strategic network of airfields outlined in NPPF paragraph 104f and have not considered 'the importance of maintaining business, leisure, training and emergency service needs'. - Para 10.3 disregards the locally and nationally significant transport infrastructure provided by the airport. The aims for development at the airport contradict para 10.5 which seeks to support opportunities to retain and create - Other suitable brownfield land is available for housing development in the local area. Partial-development of the site would be possible to capitalise on existing aviation and technology sector strengths whilst retaining an active airport that will provide more skilled jobs for local residents. The plan references the airport site as 'brownfield' - planning legislation requires this to be suitable or redundant brownfield land, which the active airport is clearly not.- Other airports across the region are unable to accommodate the business and aviation activity that would be displaced including 10 independent businesses and over 50 based aircraft including business jets, helicopters and light aircraft and the Children's Air Ambulance.- The direct loss of highly skilled technical and STEM jobs at the airport site and in the region, including flight training, engineering, support services contradicts strategic objectives 4 and 6 (economic development) elsewhere in the plan. - makes a case for local housing need in Worksop (9.7) but does not provide the same level of evidence for Retford. States that Retford has experienced significant housing growth since 2011, without the need to destroy existing infrastructure. Drastically underestimates the scale of potential job losses and the value of the airport in providing highly specialised services to the local and national economy. Section 3.2 states that "The</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>single significant negative effect relates to the loss of employment land through cessation of airport operations. However, the scale of employment opportunities is likely to be relatively limited” and adds that new jobs will be created in the ‘garden village’ that would replace the airport. Any jobs created likely to be low skilled, smaller in number and far lower paid than those provided by existing airport.</p>	
DBLP106	Individual	<p>The following from publically available data describes some of the services at the airport:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A provider of full service airborne sensing solutions that operates a fleet of 10 ‘special mission’ equipped aircraft fulfilling UK government and European agency contracts for airborne intelligence, surveillance & reconnaissance and aerial survey work. - The European hq of a multinational company who have a reputation as world leaders in providing flight inspection, navigation, communication and calibration services for air transportation. They work with navigational aids, airfield lighting and communications equipment for civilian and military use and provide real time passenger information for public transport operators. - Aircraft continuing airworthiness management, sales & contract maintenance. - Ground handling services for visiting business aircraft, passengers and pilots. - The UK & Eire distributor for aircraft manufactured by Diamond Aircraft Industries of Austria. - Five businesses provide pilot training to EASA and 	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>CAA standards, aircraft rental and trial flying lessons for local people.-An excellent café and restaurant.- other local businesses, including providers of engineering and aviation services rely on the airport and visiting aircraft as a source of work.-Nottinghamshire Police use the site (12 - 15 times pa) for advanced driver training in tactical pursuit and containment.- Aircraft owners and the flying schools demonstrate a socially responsible approach to engaging with the wider community to improve knowledge of STEM subjects e.g., a recent children's charity day. From personal experience this resource is incorrectly characterised - the plan seeks to minimise the value of the airfield over its alternative potential use. Gamston is a valuable local airport and the redevelopment should not be allowed.</p>	
DBLP107	Individual	<p>The proposal to build a garden village on the airport dismay me. There is now clear nationally acknowledged guidance in the NPPF asked to be importance of general aviation on this country's economy and infrastructure. The plan underestimates the job losses involved, the impact upon the areas prosperity generally and the cultural significance of the site which has been an airfield since the 1940's. Understand that there are other suitable site to find destruction of an airfield with such a long history and food shop particular longer be available for future generations is a disaster. Strongly urge you to reconsider.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP108	Individual	<p>Do not live in your area, but in Leicestershire, where I have been for approximately 30 years. Am a keen and active private pilot, and have flown into Gamston often over that period, my wife; who also trained as a pilot has also flown into the airfield on a number of occasions. Gamston is a well equipped and efficiently run airfield, yet very welcoming to visitors. Apart from being a pleasant field to fly into, with an excellent restaurant, it has a very well respected training establishment. Need to do some refresher training on instrument flying, and will come to Gamston to undertake that because the facilities on offer, and the location beat anywhere else that is readily available. Know that airfields are currently classed as brownfield sites, following an oversight in legislation introduced by John Prescott. As a result, a number are under threat of redevelopment. Feel strongly that this is very shortsighted. Quite apart from a leisure activity, light aviation is an important part of our country's infrastructure, and shortsighted pillaging of that infrastructure is not, in my opinion, in the national interest.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP109	Individual	<p>This must STOP. Stop destroying UK aviation by closing valuable airfields for the sake of a cheap housing development option. Soon there will be no airfields to land/operate from, ruining the future of a huge aviation business infrastructure and economy not to mention the future supply of airline pilots. Airfields provide a myriad of benefits to local communities not least assisting the maintenance of green fields assisting nature and 'Green and pleasant land'! Insist on the wealthy developers ONLY being granted planning permission on previously used 'Brown Field' sites, not Green Field areas. Know they are only interested in profits and green is a lot cheaper to develop. Not our problem! Less profit and more common sense is essential to maintain the environment we know, need and live so much.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP111	Individual	<p>Appreciate that there is a need for extra housing in Bassetlaw, as there is in most of the country. The two sites proposed have very different criteria. The airfield is in active use and has several businesses active on site. It is a general aviation facility for the region, which is an asset. Land must be redundant (i.e. unused) for inclusion in Local Authority lists of 'Land suitable for development', by definition active airfields are, therefore, not subject to the presumption that development should be allowed. Also understand that airfields are 'described' as brownfield sites, and not 'designated'. The plan uses the word 'classified'. The old pit site has been unused for many years, apart from illegal activities, and is an ideal site for development. In favour of development of the pit site, but not the airfield.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP112	Individual	<p>Cannot stress what a pleasure it has been to learn to fly at Gamston, the layout of the facility, the members of staff in all aspects of the airport instructors or otherwise, have kept and held Gamston airport in highest level of efficiency and standards, to that of larger airports. Writing as a student pilot wish for Gamston to be saved as, from a location point of view it is most convenient as I do not have to travel far to continue training or hour building for further advancement in a hopeful aviation career. Gamston airfield is a great place to fly and meet people, in my time at Gamston have not met anyone that I would not like to meet again, even if it was for a coffee. From the instructors to the café, ground team/fire and rescue to those who work in the offices and the tower, Gamston is a wholesome community who work together very well and very hard, who would also help you with whatever problem you had, in the air or on the ground. As an individual without a mind for business, unable to address what the financial advantages would be for or against this possible development. The only appeal I can make is on an empathetic level and hope</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>that is enough to help stir the decision to leave Gamston in its current state and location, allowing all its staff to keep their employment in turn letting the students continue their aspirations towards a career in aviation, or simply to obtain a PPL/LAPL license which is an extraordinary achievement. Gamston means a great deal, not only to those who work there, but also those who train there, the airport itself is located in a great position for flying as well as the occasional host for other smaller jet aircraft, National Grid etc.</p>	
DBLP113	Individual	<p>Gamston is one of the few airfields in our area that is professionally managed, well equipped with a long solid runway maintained to a high level. It can not only deal with light aircraft but business jets, helicopter e.g. police and children's air ambulance. On site schools for pilot training have a wide remit, from pleasure flights to first steps on the pathway towards commercial flying, encompassing all the educational milestones and examinations necessary. This facility provides badly needed technically highly skilled jobs for local people. New housing can be built elsewhere in the area but Gamston cannot and would not be able to be replicated at a cost to make it viable. Bassetlaw would be losing a unique resource whose reputation is second to none in its field.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP114	Contrail Flight Service Ltd	<p>Dismayed and disappointed to see the plans to build on the airfield at Gamston, thus destroying the Airport. Surely developing the derelict Bevercotes colliery site would provide adequate housing for the foreseeable future and would not have any negative effects on employment or facilities. Worked at Gamston Airport for over 35 years and have seen the Airport develop from a barely used landing strip to the excellent professional facility it is today. This company provides pilots and management services for business aircraft as well as handling services for visiting aircraft. Handle aircraft from most of UK and Europe visiting the area, mainly for business purposes. This involves more business for local firms by way of taxi and hotel bookings etc. The airport provides employment for around 100 people and hangarage for 80-100 aircraft valued at several million pounds. The fact that the Bassetlaw has an airport, at no cost to the public purse, is a great way to encourage businesses to establish themselves in the area. This proposal is not in compliance with government policy towards General Aviation (i.e. non airline flying) and should, therefore, be rejected – it's not a planning policy, its vandalism. PLEASE DO NOT DESTROY 35 YEARS OF HARDWORK – OR ALL OUR JOBS</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP116		<p>As a part-owner of a thriving limited company based at Gamston) object to the Plan. Section 3.2, Results of the Bassetlaw New Settlement Study Methodology relative to Gamston Airport states: "The single significant negative effect relates to the loss of employment land through cessation of airport operations. However, the scale of employment opportunities is likely to be relatively limited" There are roughly 100 often highly skilled jobs provided at the airport, either directly by the airport or on-site cafe (Gamston Aviation), 5 Approved Training Organisations (ATOs) and Declared Training Organisations (DTOs) which provide training</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>towards European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) standards and other specialised aviation related businesses including the children's air ambulance. Many of these businesses provide employment in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) roles directly. Para 12.9 of the Plan states: "Whilst development of the site would result in a loss of airport related employment the new village would provide opportunities for new employment" All businesses at the airport are specialised and require an airport site to operate from. Other airports across the region are unable to accommodate the business and aviation activity that would be displaced by the 'garden village'. Many other airfields would also be effected as multiple local airfields provide maintenance facilities that Gamston-based aircraft use. The Plan underestimates the scale of potential job losses and the value of the airport in providing highly specialised services to the local and national economy. There is also a contradiction as the Visions and Objectives chapter in Section 4 of the Draft Plan states: "Facilitating development opportunities that will enhance Bassetlaw's economy through the delivery of new and the expansion of existing enterprises, providing jobs across urban and rural Bassetlaw." Section 3.2 makes clear: "In order for the Bassetlaw Plan to be successfully developed and adopted, it will need to be in conformity with the NPPF" However, the NPPF Section 9, 104(f) requires planning policies should: "recognise the importance of maintaining a national network of general aviation airfields, and their need to adapt and change over time – taking into account their economic value in serving business, leisure, training and emergency service needs, and the Government's General Aviation Strategy." It is clear that the Draft Plan is not taking the above point into account and is not in conformity with the NPPF and is wrong to consider the airport as "inefficient use of land"</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		(12.10). Reconsider replacing a valuable local asset with houses and instead look elsewhere at poorly-utilised land (such as the Bevercotes site) redevelopment of which will not effect existing business and operations.	
DBLP117	Individual	What a disgrace by the Council to seek to build on the Gamston Airfield. Gamston airport is probably the best General Aviation airfield in the Country. Also it has been there for years and a satellite airfield during the Second World War. Not all the businesses that work out of the airport can relocate. Also the 100 or so aircraft that are located there would find it difficult to relocate as the majority require a hard runway. If it is Council policy to shut business down it should be prepared to set aside a fund for compensation to the people who have business interest there and also to the people who have aircraft there. It could cost millions. If compulsory purchase of the airfield goes ahead alternative accommodation should be offered by the Council and of course a hard runway.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP118	Individual	Express our worries with regards to traffic management. Live in Gamston on the B6387. This road already has very heavy traffic at certain times of the day, and the acute bend in the road at the river and junction with Rectory Lane (which has seen a recent car accident resulting in the car land in the river) causes us to worry about it being unable to cope with the additional numbers of vehicles that the new village would create. Consider the possibility of providing another route into Retford from the new village (such as via Jockey Lane). Have concerns re any possible effect on the wild and bird life in the area. Currently there is a line of trees to the east side of the airport which provides for a great range of bird habitat including buzzards. It would be very sad to see this habitat lost. Do not oppose the plans to build a new village but do feel that great care is needed to be able to maintain the rural beauty that makes this area so attractive.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP119	The Coal Authority	Note that it is proposed to take forward a strategic growth allocation at the former Bevercotes Colliery site. As you will be aware there are mine entries on the site and would expect the risks that these pose to the development to be considered and identified. This should ensure that the implications that these features may pose to the quantum and layout of any development on the site are properly considered in order to ensure its safety and stability.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP120	Individual	In principle, not against the idea of building more affordable homes in the area. Do not think the roads in the vicinity are capable of accepting any more traffic than at present. If the development in Gamston does proceed, then there should be a link road built from the present southern end of airfield onto the A1. The current road through Gamston village (past where Bramcote school used to be) is busy enough as it is – and there are many accidents involving cars failing to take the very tight bend over the river bridge – in fact, 3 in the past few days. Even the first stage of the development would result in very many more vehicles using this road, as presumably Retford will be the initial destination for shopping, using the railway station etc. The main London Road into Retford is also extremely busy for much of the day, and even worse during the morning and evening rush, plus school turning out time. Any more traffic would cause much more congestion.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP121	Individual	Object to the Garden Village on the site of Gamston Airport. The planning department have been grossly misinformed in relation to the long term deleterious economic impact to the Bassetlaw Area, which would result from the closure of Gamston Airport. The plan states: "It is currently a small scale, commercial enterprise which serves the needs of local businesses. Whilst development of the site would result in a loss of airport related employment, the new village would provide opportunities for new employment." This is in error.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>My brief research has revealed the following. The site is a highly active airfield providing valuable services and skilled employment to the local and wider community. Specifically, there are a number of specialist technical companies based on the site, providing 80 -100 skilled jobs. These include support for the national aerospace infrastructure and the military. A number of non based companies rely on the presence of the site to maintain further local skilled employment. 5 flight training organisations, providing professional and private pilot training, rely on the site for their continued existence. The airport is employed as a training facility by the military and by the police for training drivers and search dogs. The National Children's Air Ambulance is based at Gamston and the airfield is used for the movement of transplanted organs and seriously ill patients. The airport has some 18,000 aircraft movements per annum, is home to 50 - 100 aircraft and is used by well over 1,000 pilots. In 2015 the airport received The UK Airport Operators Association award as "The Best General Aviation Airport". Were the plan to be adopted, employment would be temporally provided during the construction of housing and some limited employment would persist to service the new housing. On balance, the long term loss of skilled employment would be devastating to the local and wider community. The loss of the site would have a significant effect on the national aerospace infrastructure.</p>	
DBLP122	Individual	<p>Quickly scanning the full document there appears to be a number of inconsistencies in the housing requirements that appear to be driving the plan and a clearly a misunderstanding of the challenges of rural communities. The airfield is described as an inefficient use of land. It is not as the infield are all farmed and in productive arable use. It's described as brownfield. It is not. The runways may be but the infield is in agricultural use. The airfield and land within the runways</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>provide a habitat for brown hare, skylarks and deer. The perimeter dispersal bays are in use as industrial storage and the cross runway is in use as mineral reclaims business. The edge nearest the A1 is in industrial use but clearly not attractive to distribution as the business on there as just ceased. The airfield is a valuable amenity. It handles small jets and light aircraft enabling air travel from Bassetlaw to Europe and the rest of the UK for business. It is something that could be usefully used to sell the economic benefits of the area.</p> <p>Removing the airfield will mean the closure of the airfield and the loss of jobs for those employed there. Furthermore it will be a loss of economic activity for Bassetlaw as the businesses and plane owners will have to take their business elsewhere.</p> <p>Any house built on the Gamston site will be subject to perpetual noise from the A1. The Bevercotes site is protected by the land topography. That noise will increase when the Twyford bridge improvements are done as the Highways authority have stated the 50 limit will be increased back to 70 mph. Transport proposals are not clear in the plan and will mean anyone living there will need a car. Those at Bevercotes are more likely to travel west to Ollerton than Retford. The report does not understand the challenges of rural living. The provision of viable shops health care and education are not clear and given the various authorities in ability to organise such matters in an urban setting not convinced they can do so in a rural one.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP123	Individual	<p>Where are you going to build new access roads to these large 'villages'? The current roads in these areas are small, narrow roads that are not designed to take the large increase in traffic (including large lorries etc). There are two small bridges in Gamston, one in Eaton and one in Ordsall none of which are suitable for heavy vehicles and there are already frequent accidents on them. Building a new access route onto the A1 will not solve the traffic problems as traffic will still want to access Retford, which is the nearest small town. Retford town centre is dying – it is full of charity shops and coffee shops but major retailers have left the town or are not interested in moving into the town. How are you going to persuade large shops, ie Marks and Spencer, to move to Retford and then provide the additional parking etc needed? Where and how are you going to provide all the additional hospital facilities that this large increase in numbers will necessitate? Bassetlaw Hospital and A & E already struggle to cope and Doncaster Hospital is no better. Where are you proposing these people are going to work? How are you going to attract new businesses to the area? It is not sufficient to think new businesses will arrive just because a lot more people will be living here.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP124	Individual	<p>It seems really ill thought out as a knee jerk reaction to land becoming available. Could not support these plans, and it seems neither can you... Before deciding on Bevercotes and Gamston Airport seem to discount the areas entirely based on poor roads, amenities and local provisions. See that these pockets of land are ready to be developed but with the current roads and facilities available they simply are unsuitable. Have you ever tried to get through Gamston on any road when the A1 is shut? Have you ever seen cars run off the road at the bend in Gamston 6ft down into a river? Have you attended Gamston Primary School at pick up time? The current car park</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>can't cope for the 100 kids it's already got, and that isn't council land. So siting that there is a local primary school is totally irrelevant. Bevercoates isn't much better, you site that there are two access roads to the A1 - this is in fact incorrect without disturbing traffic through other local villages, this extra road is in fact a private road, so even if the road was bought would need to be widened over two river crossings.</p> <p>Bevercoates, especially, on each map on your plan is outside the 4k marked areas for everything but a school. It seem like other areas have been rejected based on the fact that land isn't available, and whilst that is a valid point, why not just state that. Cannot support either of these developments without a way the council are going to substantially improve conditions in the area first. It's no point suggesting that the development will bring these facilities and jobs, when it's been 14yrs since a similar development in Clipstone (then known as Kings Clipstone) and they are still waiting for any such resources.</p>	
DBLP126	Individual	<p>Been residents of Gamston for nearly 40 yrs. and can see no benefit in the proposed planning for these areas. It seems to us that there is a chicken and egg situation here in that there is nowhere for people to work! In order to attract people to an area you need places of employment, THERE ISN'T ANY. There is NO industry in this area for anything like this amount of people nor can the infrastructure stand every household having TWO plus cars each. Neither are you building houses that people want. Not everyone wants 3/4/5 bedrooms and as many bathrooms. Would like for YOU to sell me a plot of land that I can build my own BUNGALOW to my own design, so that my wife and I can down size and sell my present large house and garden to someone who will enjoy it for 40yrs. or more. Give the people with their own money the opportunity to build</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		what they want and not what some crackpot builder, planner or architect think they should have.	
DBLP127	TwelveTwenty One Planning Services on behalf of Hamlin Estates	Supports the proposal for garden villages. The reliance, albeit limited, on two new villages is debatable and has to be treated with caution. New villages inevitably prove contentious and, if approved, will require substantial infrastructure and other establishment costs. This can prove a deterrent to delivery - an issue that will likely prove to be intractable for two new settlements so close to one another where they will predate upon the same housing market.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP128	Individual	Strongly object to this plan. Live on Hather Close/Rectory Lane and the amount of heavy traffic that uses this road is already on the increase without the building of 4000 extra homes, which will cause more traffic. The junction onto the great north road from Rectory Lane is already congested at peak times and these extra houses will only make it worse. Are pensioners and are already struggling with crossing Rectory Lane to get to the bus stop on North Road owing to the amount of traffic and the blind summit across from where we live. The building of these villages will turn, what once was a lovely peaceful village into a very busy and over populated area. Are there not enough new builds going up in Retford and surrounding areas without adding more. Retford isn't big enough for all these developments, we have not got enough facilities to justify these extra houses. Retford is a small quaint market town and	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		it will end up being near as damn it to a city without the facilities. Strongly dissapprove of these plans.	
DBLP130	Individual	Object to the proposed closure of Gamston Airport for housing development as outlined in the Bassetlaw Plan. The airport is a vital amenity for the surrounding area providing both high quality jobs and flight training opportunities for the local population. It is also an important base for the rescue helicopter which cannot be easily replaced. There are other more suitable sites in the area for the provision of housing that will not entail the loss of an important source of local employment.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP131	ManEdge Ltd	Any development that will reduce the number of operation airfields in the UK is without a doubt short sighted. Aviation plays a key part in the transportation infrastructure off the UK, the airfield is home to many services that support both military and civil services for the UK. This plan does not take into account the requirement to maintain a strategic network of airfields as outlined in NPPF paragraph 104f. The closure of Gamston that is the base to a number of local businesses and provides a home for the Children's Air Ambulance seems a very poor choice when other brown sites are available. Do not appear to have considered the importance of maintaining business, leisure, training and emergency service needs. Will result in a direct loss of highly skilled technical and STEM jobs at the airport site and as there is no other airfield sites that can take all these facilities resulting in a loss to the region. These jobs include flight training, engineering, and the support services. The mentioned of work generation by the 'garden village' is total unsubstantiated and has no basis in fact and cannot remove the fact that this development will create real	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		highly skilled job losses; this plan directly contradicts one of its strategic objectives of economic development. Whereas, a partial development of the site allowing for the continued operation of the airfield could bring valuable additional work to the local economy. Do not support the closure of Gamston and wish objection to be noted. Support a development of the site retaining the active airfield to meet both local and UK needs.	
DBLP132	Individual	<p>Registering my total opposition to the proposal for the building of two garden villages in the Gamston /Bevercotes areas. The village of Gamston does not have the infrastructure to support such massive development as is proposed for the airport site. It is a quiet hamlet of less than 80 houses and such developments will totally destroy the whole ethos of the place along with increasing traffic on the side roads that were never meant to cope with this volume of occupation. Indeed Retford will not be able to cope with an influx of some 4000 new families. Let's not dress up the facts by calling these "Garden Villages" they are quite simply huge housing estates. My understanding is that these homes are affordable housing and not private developments. The reputation of such developments sadly precedes them. Being adjacent to such a project will inevitably have a negative impact on the value of existing properties. People who live in Gamston have made a conscious decision not to live in built up areas and to have this choice taken away from them is totally wrong. Police, fire, medical services and schools in the area are already stretched to the limit as a result of small scale private developments and the whole system simply would not cope with the influx even if school and medical facilities were incorporated into the villages.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP133	Individual	Like to object most strongly to the Gamston development on three basic points. Firstly the proposed removal of the airport facilities, which is a very big employer in this local area. Secondly the amount of traffic it will generate on the local roads particularly in our little village of Eaton. Thirdly the loss of the food producing area that will be lost completely.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP134	Individual	It is about time something was done with the Bevercotes site, since the current owners seem to be unwilling to continue with their planned industrial development and it has been a derelict neglected eyesore for many years since the closure of the pit. The only use that it has had since that time has been for illegal raves every so often, blighting the local villages. However, the Gamston airfield is a different matter entirely. Who in gods name thinks it's a good idea to remove a totally viable business venture which has been in place for many years, to replace it with a new village, when there is equally usable waste land just the other side of Jockey House Lane which could be used for the project and not 100 metres away. It seems to be a case of the owner, wanting to offload the site, and BDC taking the easy option instead of considering alternatives. Jobs will be lost, and opportunities missed if this part of the plan is allowed to see fruition. They have the option to rid the area of unused land that has been derelict for decades, but instead are willing to sacrifice a perfectly good business and attribute to the area. Not near enough to Gamston to be affected by any development there, but am certainly opposed to the plan for the reasons set out above.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Dispute that the proposed new garden villages (to the south of Retford) should be considered to deliver development to address a “percentage of the local housing market in Retford”. Such a policy approach serves only to remove housing needs from where they are needed, increase commuting and harming sustainability. Consider that the garden villages should be removed from the Local Plan and that growth as it relates to the housing market at Retford should be allocated towards Retford.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP137	Individual	Register my concern over the proposed garden villages for Gamston and Bevercotes. Moved to Eaton village 20 yrs ago because of its quiet old village charm and beautiful views. Over the years some of the charm has been eroded particularly by the amount of road traffic speeding through the village. Cyclists, walkers, horse riders and large farm vehicles use the road daily and the amount of speeding traffic has become a great worry, it's only a matter of time before there is a serious accident. For the second time in a few years the bridge has been damaged due to vehicles colliding with it. With the amount of houses proposed, Eaton village will not cope with the increased traffic flow.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP138	Bothamsall Parish Council	Building 2 new villages in close proximity will have an unacceptable impact on our local, rural infrastructure. Support the development of 1 new village at Bevercotes because this site is clearly a brownfield site which requires reuse and redevelopment. It is currently well screened and allows the opportunity of a blank canvass in the style and character of the new village (Screening must be maintained and in areas improved). Do not support the development of a new village at Gamston airport because the site may be technically brownfield, but much of it is undeveloped agricultural land with the remainder in employment use. Not convinced that even upgraded roads and infrastructure could acceptably	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		accommodate both new villages and that the total dwellings proposed in the 2 new villages are too high. Gamston airport currently provides local employment and has the potential to draw in investment by continuing as a local airport servicing local businesses. The loss of Gamston airport may affect the height of aircraft passing over the local area destined to or traveling from neighbouring airports.	
DBLP139	Individual	<p>Live in Eaton Village and understand the need for extra housing for an increasing population and can certainly see some positives about this planned development such as better transport links and facilities for the area. Am worried about the increase in traffic through Eaton village which would be inevitable without a change in the road network. The road is narrow, especially on the bridge in the middle of the village, a large section of the village has no path for pedestrians and the road is regularly used by cyclists, horse riders and agricultural traffic. In the 3 years I have lived here, have had two cars lose control on the bend nearby and end up in our front garden (both drivers admitted to driving too quickly), the street light on the same bend was demolished and the bridge has been severely damaged on two occasions, the most recent only last weekend. Worry that with any increase in traffic would come more of these kind of accidents and also be detriment to the character of the village. Any incident on the nearby A1 often leads to a vast increase of traffic through the village too, including large lorries ignoring the weight limit signs.</p> <p>Appreciate these incidents are sporadic but it does highlight the pressure the road through Eaton is under. Hope that a new garden village at Gamston would include a change to the road infrastructure that would help tackle this, or at the very least, some proper traffic calming system through Eaton. As Ordsall</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		spreads outwards towards Eaton and the new garden village is developed near Gamston, would Eaton lose the green areas between these areas and effectively be swallowed up in the future. Are these green belt areas and would they remain so?	
DBLP140	Individual	It is with great sadness that hear that there may be plans to destroy Gamston Airport. The airport has been an asset to the local community for years and is the home to many successful businesses and employers, providing both jobs and local economy to the area. Strongly object to the potential plan to close the airport and hope that some sense prevails and these houses and built on an area that will not adversely affect so many people.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP141	Individual	<p>Object to proposals to close Gamston Airport because of: the loss of nationally important aviation infrastructure and the consequential loss of approximately 100 highly skilled technical jobs; the loss of a strategically important element of a national airfields infrastructure which collectively contributes between £2 to £3 billion annually to the UK economy; forced closure or relocation of businesses providing Science, Technology and Engineering facilities; the loss of five separate Pilot & flight training businesses, which would be unlikely to be successful in relocating to any alternative 'local' airfield; the loss of runways which are long enough to accommodate light jet aircraft for business, charter operations and medical evacuation flights, otherwise not available within the local area. (Other airports across the region are unable to adequately accommodate the business and aviation activity that would be displaced by the proposals); the cessation and removal of important business trade from the local economy due to the loss of many hundreds of visiting aircraft from around the UK and the rest of Europe regularly utilising the primary transport links for businesses in Retford, Nottingham, Lincoln and the Sheffield City Region; loss of facilities for military aircraft and royal helicopter flights which frequently refuel at the airport; the eviction and forced relocation of the Children's Air Ambulance; the loss of a substantial area of nationally, strategically important agricultural land; significant business impact on peripheral, non site based businesses which rely on trade from the airport; the provider of airborne sensing services that operates a fleet of 10 'special mission' equipped aircraft fulfilling UK government and European agency contracts for airborne intelligence, surveillance & reconnaissance and aerial survey work would probably have to close, due to the lack of suitable alternative accommodation; the European headquarters of a multinational company who</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>have a reputation as world leaders in providing flight inspection, navigation, communication and calibration services for air transportation. Working with navigational aids, airfield lighting and communications equipment for civilian and military use and provision of real time passenger information for public transport operators would probably have to close, due to the lack of alternative suitable accommodation; the loss of business to the local area by the removal of services to Nottinghamshire Police, who use the site (between 12 to 15 times per annum) to deliver advanced driver training in tactical pursuit and containment; the loss of engagement with the wider community and schools to improve knowledge of Science, Technology, Engineering & Mathematics subjects and provision of educational activities such as flying experiences for local children. The implications of the Council's draft proposals for the closure of the airport have been poorly thought through and contradict several of their own long term goals and strategies for economic growth and job creation. There are several unused alternative 'brown field' ex-industrial areas within the near vicinity that are crying out for redevelopment.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP144	Individual	<p>Do not support the proposal for 2 new villages - would have a devastating and unacceptable impact on local and rural infrastructure. Major road improvements would be needed. The development of Bevercotes would be the most accepted as it is a brownfield site which could be redeveloped providing all the toxic waste is removed. The site is well screened, this should be retained, maintained and some area's improved. Major road improvements is a necessity. Gamston should not be developed - it is not all a brownfield site, a large part of it is agricultural and of reasonable quality. The airport provides employment for up to 100 people at 10 companies. Gamston Aviation Ltd have operated the site for over 41 years, the opération includes the airport manager, trained firefighters, aircraft refuelers and air traffic controllers all working on a shift system to support airfield operations 362 days per year, plus back office administration staff as well as other workers. The website shows that GAL has 50 to 250 employees and a turnover of 10 to 50 million. The Apron Cafe provides food and beverages for staff, aircrew and aviation related visitors and is very popular with a large number of non-aviation related local customers. All of the companies based at Gamston are high quality aviation services/ employment; if this was lost fail to see any new set up business being able to attract alternative skillful work. DEA Aviation Ltd operates and maintains a fleet of 10 "Special Mission" aircraft at Gamston Airport ~ http://www.diamond-air.at/en/special-mission-aircraft/ One of their primary roles is to provide Airborne ISR (Intelligence, Surveillance & Reconnaissance) services to the Government and European Agencies, some of which are related to national security. The global market for Airborne ISR was \$20 billion in 2018 but is expected to rise to over \$40 billion by 2020. DEA Aviation Ltd has invested heavily in its Gamston operations to be prepared to keep pace with the future growth potential</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>within the Airborne ISR market. Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd provide flight inspection and validation services, navigational aids and communications equipment as well as airfield lighting systems, all to both civilian and military customers worldwide. Also the Children's Air Ambulance is based at Gamston. They have been provided with 24/7 access to the airport site and hangar security systems, have equipment available for getting the helicopter in and out of the hangar quickly and the provision of pilot controlled runway lights from the helicopter so it can be accessed and utilized very quickly to respond to emergencies. Being a helicopter it can depart and return at any time of day or night avoiding overflying the most built-up areas near to the airfield. The airport is also used by Nottinghamshire Police between 12 - 15 times per annum for driver training in Tactical Pursuit and Containment. The Plan does not properly or fully investigate, quantify or qualify the level of job losses resulting from the closure of the Airport or its negative impact on the local economy. The current figure show there is 2600 people unemployed plus recently Canute Haulage Ltd, with an operating base on the industrial area between Gamston Airport and the A1, and employing over 600 people within the group, which went into administration in December 2018. This will ultimately already leave a large industrial site vacant with the resultant job losses. Also the Plan has failed to quantify, or qualify the number and nature of businesses, and jobs that it intends to attempt to attract in order to support such extensive housing developments. Without which the developments will only serve to increase the large numbers commuting out of Bassetlaw on a daily basis and increase road congestion, traffic and noise pollution and provide little benefit to the local economy. The plan mentions that 17,000 people from Bassetlaw commute daily for work to Sheffield, Doncaster, Newark and the surrounding areas. Would strongly encourage</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>the Council to look at the tangible benefits of preserving the Airport, to retain the existing businesses and employment but also for it to continue to provide a strategic resource to Bassetlaw to help attract new businesses to the area. Without a large influx of new businesses to provide employment for people locally then building thousands of new houses will vastly increase the number of commuters out of Bassetlaw providing a very limited contribution to the local economy. Should be noted that the site has at Land registry a Caution for either Chancery Repair Liability or minerals.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP143	Persimmon Homes & Charles Church	<p>The Plan is in total reliant upon both proposed garden village sites to deliver a total of 4000 homes. A promoter has an interest in the Bevercotes site however no developer interest as yet raising questions of the deliverability of the site. The supply of housing from either site is closely allied to their viability which is also unknown due to an absence of cost detail concerning necessary infrastructure (power/ services / diversion / energy / suitable roads etc). The Gamston Airport & Bevercotes Colliery were assessed along with other prospective garden village sites within the Bassetlaw New Settlement Study 2018. This set a series of tests to shortlist six sites that were subsequently examined further for suitability. One of the early tests identified the sustainability of parishes, drawing sites from the most sustainable for further examination. The test found Bevercotes colliery was unsustainable due to the absence of basic services i.e. retail, GP surgeries, schools or post office facility. Despite the council's own evidence Bevercotes has been brought forwards undermining the methodology behind the settlement study. The final assessment studied 'deliverability and viability' on three shortlisted sites and yet no detailed costing work is given on matters which directly affect the deliverability of these sites i.e. the costs attributable for major highway upgrades, service connections and upgrades, ground remediation cost, foundation strategies. Given the report concludes both Garden Villages are marginally viable without this information worry about the suitability of this particular spatial approach. Delivery of either village is subject to the cessation of an Airport business and the promoter's ability to find a willing developer(s) with the necessary capital to deliver significant frontloaded infrastructure cost, CIL and S106 contributions, build cost. The introduction of Garden Villages is a risky strategy to adopt. Ordinarily a council might consider the</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>prospect of a single village enough risk for a Local Plan period.</p> <p>Two new villages is extremely risky - advise the 1000 completions anticipated be considered windfall completions and the additional 1000 homes re-distributed between the two principal towns of Worksop and Retford.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP146		<p>Why do it? Your report speaks of the "gentle undulations of lush green farmland" then claims it an "inefficient use of land". When forecasts for 2050 state 60% more food will be needed where is the logicality to build over the lushness? Your varying reports repeatedly speak of "green infrastructure" "air quality" "biodiversity" and every buzz word of the moment. It reports the requirement to "avoid inappropriate and unnecessary development in the countryside" so again why do it?</p> <p>Particularly as one of the supporting reports declares "protection & enhancement of open spaces in the District would help conserve & improve the visual amenity & existing character of Bassetlaw. The National Forecast for Bassetlaw is 5,000 extra but you have a figure of 6,630 required within the timeplan. Of course you have to be prepared but how far should that go? Your investigations have shown that Bassetlaw is basically a commuter area with a containment rate of 66.8% resident self-containment and a 69.6% workplace self-containment. This is lower than all surrounding areas which range between 70-85% for both types of self-containment.</p> <p>Comparing the Travel To Work Areas self-containment figures nationally shows that the Worksop and Retford TTWA ranks 225th out of 228 TTWAs nationwide for resident self-containment and 218th out of 228 TTWAs for workplace self-containment. Why should Gamston go to build houses for people who will commute out of the district to work? The Plan waxes lyrical about providing for local employment but it also admits that "the industrial location of the A1 corridor is unproven". The Plan says "promoting economic prosperity through the delivery of high quality employment space and advanced communications technology" but B1, B2 and B8 doesn't say whether it is industrial or commercial which allows for a wide interpretation of what can be placed there. The supporting document commissioned by Bassetlaw, Economic</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>Growth from a Garden Village, declares "It is considered unlikely that a garden village will act as a catalyst for a major inward investment" so again just what is hoped/intended to go there? It would be nice if the area of Retford could benefit from advanced technology first. The Plan states that new schools and health facilities will be provided. Has Nottinghamshire agreed it will provide new schools? If so and in what time scale? The secondary schools already in the area have a problem attracting staff, why will a new school have any more success? Has anybody told the NHS they will be providing brand new facilities when they are closing them? Has this been discussed with the relevant bodies? Refers to 6 Transport.</p> <p>Green infrastructure is a marvellous phrase but real life (and your supporting documents) disagree with the above declaration. "Connecting development to existing transport networks encourages the site to be accessible & may help reduce the need for further infrastructure in the District."</p> <p>Encourages, may help reduce; even your commissioned report isn't sure and why should existing infrastructure, already rocky, not be upgraded if money is available? Every new house will need (at least) two parking spaces per house so that's 625 parking spaces at Gamston and the area is a commuting one, so will mean 212 extra parking spaces somewhere. Being positive, they may all commute via Retford Station, will the parking be multi-storey? Cycle parking facility and links - The provision in the Retford area is a disgrace and downright dangerous in many places. A bit of a let down to discover cyclists in the District will only get decent provision when a couple of mega housing estates are built. "Overall it is considered that the development supported by the plan & resultant pressures associated with this level of development has the potential to result in habitat loss, disturbance & fragmentation. Sites by Gamston Airport (& former Bevercotes</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan– Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>Colliery) would together provide a minimum of 1,000 new homes over the plan period & development at these locations has been identified as having potential to result in adverse impacts in this manner." "...expected to have negative effects on conserving the significance of settings of nearby heritage assets" Howabout "Gamston & Brickyard Road has been identified as containing land which has high tranquility. The provision of new development at these locations is likely to have an adverse impact on tranquility in the district. Maybe not as Green as the final booklet says and as "death and serious injury on the roads of Nottinghamshire is higher than average" should encouragement of so many extra car journeys really happen? Don't believe the extermination of Gamston will bring any benefit to Bassetlaw. The evidence supplied in the extensive documentation is rather flimsy and quite contrary. The infrastructure to support such a mammoth development is not there. Small country roads and B roads does not make for "good links", when they go through villages. Isolating so many families away from Retford and facilities will mean huge increases in car journeys with associated loss of air quality etc. There is no evidence to support that the NHS and associated bodies will fund infrastructure. Where are the shops-also mentioned-going to come from? Business rates are crippling existing shops so who will be setting up there? The nearest retail is the Co-op and Spar at Ordsall and parking, free movement of pedestrians is at bottleneck for hours in the day due to the estates already built around. Gamston is a huge asset to Bassetlaw to use as a tool to sell the area, not something that should become an eyesore from the A1. Garden Villages are currently a fashionable thought but what about the winner of the Wolfson Prize by David Rudlin who argued that existing towns should be expanded? When the brief was "How to create a garden city that would be visionary,</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		economically viable and popular" to win with the totally opposite idea does indicate originality of thought.	
DBLP148	ID Planning on behalf of Harron Homes	Refers to the planned growth for the garden villages. It acknowledges that delivery will continue beyond the plan period with 1,000 dwellings expected to come forward to 2035.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>The final sentence states that it is envisaged the delivery of the garden villages will help to meet a proportion of the needs of the local housing market in Retford, which has resulted in a lower housing target for that town. Object to this approach: the needs of the local housing market in Retford should be met in Retford, not in an outlying village. Support the identification of the garden villages in principle, their delivery as independent settlements with their own services and facilities, should not impact upon the growth of Retford as the second largest town in the District.</p>	<p>process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP148	ID Planning on behalf of Harron Homes	<p>The two new garden villages are proposed to deliver 1,000 dwellings to the end of the plan period. It should be made clear that the delivery of dwellings in these villages will meet part of the housing requirement in Rural Bassetlaw, and not the town of Retford.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP149	Fisher German on behalf of D Thorlby	<p>Largely support the proposed Bassetlaw Spatial Strategy, have serious concerns with the two garden villages as part of the strategy. The sustainability of this option is questioned. Do not consider the delivery of the two villages to be more sustainable than delivery in and adjoining existing settlements in Bassetlaw. The size of the proposed garden communities whilst considerable, would still lack the critical mass to deliver a range of services, facilities and amenities that other settlements such as Worksop benefit from. Concerned that the location of the new villages, straddling either side of the A1, will lead it to becoming a dormitory community with residents heading straight onto the A1 to locations such as Doncaster and Newark daily for work. Such patterns are likely to lead to little benefit to the towns of Bassetlaw. Housing growth in the District's</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>existing towns, such as Worksop and Retford needs to be the focus of the strategy to stimulate growth and regeneration in those towns. The Garden Villages will not deliver these same benefits. A proportion of the 1,000 dwellings should be directed towards Worksop to ensure it is delivering a quantum of development commensurate with housing need in the location and its sustainability credentials. If the Council proceeds, this should be seen as windfall, supporting the government in its aims of boosting significantly the supply of housing and contributing to housing delivery in the next Plan period. Not as a way to support the District's towns in their growth and regeneration.</p>	
DBLP150	Individual	<p>The two new garden villages is the best idea have heard since 1967 when the government created Milton Keynes. Would like to see this extended to three sites, Cottam power station is due to close this year - an ideal 3rd site has existing rail as well as road links. Being a brownfield site, it is suitable for both residential and commercial developments. The rail links to Retford would make it ideal for both residential and commercial making rail links to London in under 2 hours or even Eurostar to Paris etc. By granting it planning permission it would encourage EDF to clear the site as quickly as possible and create jobs that replaced the ones lost with its closure.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP151	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	<p>The Garden Villages are very close together and with the number of houses shown cumulatively it amounts to 4000 dwellings. This size of conurbation will rival the towns of Tuxford and Harworth and even Retford. The garden villages will have a negative effect on our remaining villages. Whether the Council allow our existing villages to continue to grow so that services can be maintained or they put an unduly tight cap on such development, but the dwellings in these new garden villages will be more affordable than those allocated in our existing villages. Land values in the garden villages will be considerably less than smaller sites in existing villages, this is simply a matter of scale. These new garden villages will be highly detrimental to the viability of our existing villages. Over the past 20+ years development in the majority of our villages has been small scale which has resulted in the loss of local services, such as schools, shops, public houses, churches etc. This was a conscious planning policy that has resulted in villages stagnating. Now with the advent of garden villages another more virulent problem will beset our existing villages and that will be unfair competition from these large villages.</p> <p>Question the term village - do not know a single village with house numbers approaching those suggested. These are towns and it remains to be seen if there will be sufficient jobs created within these sites for the residents. Doubt it. Like to know how these garden villages fit with the Council's own landscape assessments and the aims of the policies surrounding these assessments. These villages will have an irreversible negative effect on existing villages and village life. If families are not attracted into our villages, schools will not have the throughput of children required nor will the local facilities listed above last very long. This is based on historic facts of village life, only those villages with acceptable growth survive. This type of massive growth will take away the likelihood of developers</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>looking at our existing villages as competition will be too steep and biased towards the new larger allocations. This will inevitably lead to a further reduction in rural services and possible closure of schools, shops etc. Not desirable in any way, after all there is a finite number of dwellings required to meet the demand identified. Garden villages are not required in Bassetlaw, just a more pragmatic approach to rural development in and around our existing villages. Retain Gamston airfield and Bevercotes colliery site for employment-may get a major employer here being so close to the A1. Encouraging incentives should be offered nationwide and if the local authority do not have the experience to do so there are many in the district who have. These portions of land should not be given up to housing lightly, on the simple “all eggs in one basket” principle. This is idle planning and is not planning for the district as the detrimental effects do not seem to have been considered.</p>	
DBLP152	Individual	<p>Object to the plan to close Retford/Gamston Airport in order to use the site for development of a “Garden Village”. To describe this as a “Brown Field” site is at best inaccurate. Among the several sound reasons this plan should be rejected is the fact that: It does not take into account the requirement to maintain a strategic network of airfields as outlined in NPPF paragraph 104f. The planners also do not appear to have considered ‘the importance of maintaining business, leisure, training and emergency service needs’.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP154	Individual	<p>Para 12.9 of the Bassetlaw Draft Plan dismisses the high quality employment presently provided by Gamston Airport in a single sentence “Whilst development of the site would result in a loss of airport related employment, the new village would provide opportunities for new employment”. Gamston currently provides employment to a significant number of people in specialist, highly skilled and well paid employment. DEA Aviation (https://www.dea.aero/) provide high tech aerial surveillance services to government and other agencies. They employ pilots, aerospace engineers, logistics planners, electronic and avionic engineers and other highly skilled people. Radiola Aerospace (http://www.radaero.com/) are a multi-national high-tech aviation company specialising in niche, but vital airport and air navigation services. Gemstone Aviation (https://gemstoneaviation.co.uk/) are an importer of the worlds most advanced piston engine aircraft. There are other companies operating on the airfield that also provide high quality employment. To dismiss these in one sentence with the argument that ‘there will be other jobs’ seems to be a rather cavalier approach, lacking in rigour and depth. Nothing in the proposals address where these highly skilled residents of Bassetlaw will find further employment should their employers be forced to shut down or re-locate. The NPPF definition of a brownfield site covers any land that has had, or currently has, a building or permanent structure on it, with only some exceptions. This is an extremely broad definition that the Council For The Protection of Rural England is challenging. The publicly accepted view of a brownfield site is one that is disused. Gamston Airport is definitely not disused. It supports a thriving community of businesses, private flyers, aviation enthusiasts and a large number of visitors. The Plan dismisses this in a single sentence in Para 12.10 “The present site is considered to be an inefficient use of land...” There is no</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>quantifiable justification provided to support this. The development of two large new developments will require significant investment in roads and infrastructure. This will inevitably impact upon the surrounding villages. The Plan extols the benefits of the short commute into London by rail from Retford, the routes to Retford station and the parking once there are woefully inadequate. Any increase in numbers using the station to commute will require significant redevelopment within Retford town centre itself which the Plan has disregarded. Commuters using the A1 from the new developments will also increase congestion on an already congested bottleneck on that major traffic artery. Current schools in the area would not be able to accommodate the increased numbers of children. Whilst this is addressed in Para 12.30, it is not clear how these will be funded and maintained. On a wider view, developments of the proposed size would almost inevitably swamp and subsume the surrounding towns and villages of Gamston, Elkesly, East Markham, Tuxford, Bothamsall and others. This has not been addressed. Draw your attention to the Governments Aviation Policy Framework (assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/153776/aviation-policy-framework.pdf). Para. 1.3 states that “there is broad agreement that aviation benefits the UK economy.....the economic benefits are significant.....” and that “In addition, we believe there to be social and cultural benefits from aviation”. This government policy appears to have either been ignored deliberately or dismissed without due process.</p>	
DBLP158	Fisher German on behalf of T Strawson and D Horrocks	<p>Largely support the proposed Spatial Strategy, have serious concerns with the promotion of two garden villages as part of the strategy. The sustainability of this option is questioned. Do not consider the delivery of two villages to be more sustainable than delivery in and adjoining existing settlements in</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>Bassetlaw. The size of the proposed garden community sites whilst considerable, would still lack the critical mass to deliver a range of services, facilities and amenities that other settlements such as Retford benefit from. Concerned that the location of the proposed new villages, straddling either side of the A1, will lead it to becoming a dormitory community with residents heading straight onto the A1 towards locations such as Doncaster and Newark daily for work. Such patterns are likely to lead to little benefit to the towns of Bassetlaw.</p> <p>Housing growth in the District's existing towns, such as Retford and Worksop needs to be the focus of the strategy to stimulate growth and regeneration in those towns. The Garden Villages will not deliver these same benefits. A significant proportion of the 1,000 dwellings should be directed towards Retford to ensure it is delivering a quantum of development commensurate with housing need in the location and its sustainability credentials. If the Council proceeds with the Garden Villages, this should be seen as windfall, supporting the government in its aims of boosting significantly the supply of housing in the next Plan Period. Not as a way to support the District's towns in their growth and regeneration.</p>	<p>to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP159	Individual	<p>Makes many referrals to Plans “that will” etc when the wording should be “they would” etc. This choice of phraseology leads to the opinion that this is a ‘done deal’ and the Consultation is purely a PR Exercise. This is more evident when some of the detail is examined, with conflicting statements and referrals, and dismissal of existing High Level Jobs as being expendable. Distances quoted in the ADAS Report Section 4.6 appear to be inaccurate and seem to be taken as direct routes, or ‘as the crow flies’. Examples are those relating to the Bevercotes: Bevercotes to Tuxford is stated as being 3.9km. Road distance is 8.4km. Has this Report assumed access through Bevercotes ?? The Lane from the former Pit Site towards Tuxford IS A PRIVATE ROAD. Bevercotes to Retford is stated as being 6.82km. Road distance is 11.5km. Bevercotes to Retford Oaks Academy is stated as 7.0km. Road Distance is nearer 11.5km. Bevercotes to Elkesley Primary School is stated as a ‘round trip’ of 4.4km. The road journey is a 9.4km ‘round trip’. The road distance is 4.4km to and 5km back as it is necessary to use the “new” Elkesley Bridge on the return journey. Accessing the A1 Northbound at Twyford Bridge really is a case of ‘taking one’s life in one’s hands’ due to the poor slip road length and speed of A1 Traffic. The need for the Housing is not clear and appears to be based on a ‘directive’ rather than a true requirement. There are a large number of empty properties in Bassetlaw totalling around 1,300 (Report from “Action on Empty Homes” September 2018) the requirement for these new properties seems a little exaggerated. It looks more like development for developments sake. The decisions made to compel Parishes to take housing development do not concur with the requirement through other sources/channels to reduce our ‘Carbon Footprint’ by making less car journeys. This has a similarity to the proposals for two “Garden Villages” (a strange term for small towns) located away from the main Hubs of Shops,</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>Markets, Entertainment and Services requiring travel along existing Roads that, at times, are inadequate for the current traffic levels. Apart from the additions to the 'Carbon Footprint' that this will create. Locating this housing adjacent to existing urban areas. To this needs to be added the traffic created by the new residents 'commuting' to places of work (e.g. Sheffield, Rotherham, Doncaster, Worksop, Retford, Lincoln) and even those who wish to use the Rail Network will find that access to the Station in Retford at peak times is extremely difficult, due to current congestion, and the Station itself has inadequate parking facilities for a much increased usage. A better proposal would be to have these developments in close proximity to Public Transport Links that would allow for a reduction in car travel for Social and Work. It is commendable that there is Industrial/Commercial Land, this needs to be for true employment. Warehousing and Distribution Depots are becoming more automated and jobs created are smaller than in Manufacturing. These jobs are not of 'high-tech.' attracting the higher paid employee that raises the level of the Job Market and the Income Level. It is not acceptable that highly technical jobs are wiped out to be replaced by Automated Warehouses with minimal labour requirements or low-paid job opportunities. The proposal to destroy current businesses on Gamston (around 10 companies with some 100 employees of a Technical nature) by using this land for Housing. These companies cannot just relocate 'to a new Unit' somewhere nearby as the very nature of their work requires an Airfield. Gamston Airport is incorrectly referred to Page 89, 12.10 as a "Brownfield site". The definition of a 'Brownfield Site' is previously developed land that is not currently in use, whether contaminated or not. It is also used to describe land previously used for industrial or commercial purposes with known or suspected pollution including soil contamination due to</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan– Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>hazardous waste.[Gamston Airfield is in use having 10 Companies related to the Aviation Industry with around 100 employees in skilled high-tech. jobs raising the level of the economy in this area.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP159	Individual	<p>The current road network is, at times, beyond its capacity to cope without additional vehicles trying to get from out-of-town locations to local centres for Work, Access to the Rail Network, Social Activities, Shopping etc. Gamston has issues at the river bridge and the A638 to Retford has recently had 'Speed Cameras' fitted following fatal accidents. The A638 is also a 'bottleneck into Retford. The B6387 is a Rural Road currently carrying traffic in excess of what it was designed for, a large amount of which is slow moving agricultural traffic. This then approaches Bothamsall or Walesby both villages will be affected by increases in traffic. Bothamsall have a narrow road with many bends and narrow pavements. The village should also be protected by a "7.5 tonne Weight Restriction" which is flouted. Despite the difficulties of passage there is, on average, a computed vehicle usage of around 3,000 vehicles PER DAY at current levels. This would only increase if developments go ahead. Road improvements would not be implemented in the early stages, and Highways is outwith the remit of the Council. Before Bothamsall could take more housing the Sewage Authority (Severn Trent) would need to take actions with the Pumping Station on Main Street. In times of heavy rainfall it is not unusual to have this Facility overflow to the point where we have experienced sewage flooding over the road</p> <p>Development of these sites is planned over a period of time. As such, the infrastructure of Shops, Schools, Employment Units, etc as proposed is unlikely to occur until well into the development. Apart from the Industrial applications other aspects are Flying Lessons and Pleasure, Pilot Training, a Catering Facility, and support for a Children's Air Ambulance. All essential activities not to be lightly discarded. In the early stages there will not be any provision for Schools, which are, not within the remit of the Council. This will then put additional pressure on local educational facilities. Are these other</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>facilities able to cope, which cannot be determined as the occupants are not known yet and how many places will be required? These facilities will entail travel adding to the congestion and pollution created by these 'school runs'. Again outside the control or remit of the Council is health which will only follow when sufficient occupation of houses is taken up, if it is allowed to happen. Gamston Airport is set amongst good quality farmland. This land is definitely needed for food production. Home grown Food will become a priority to reduce imports. On the Airfield and in close proximity (within the woodlands) the wildlife and natural environment succeeds. It is well known that wildlife moves away from developed areas due to the unnatural disturbance of their habitats and by human disturbances after the development. Bevercotes Pit Site is almost enclosed by woodland which is acting as a screen to the surrounding area and has a 'carbon absorbing' effect. The lane through to Bevercotes Hall and Bevercotes Village is a private road, giving only one 'official' access road. If this part of the Plan is to proceed then the screening is still vital to act as 'carbon-absorbing'. Development at either or both Sites would create more traffic in an easterly direction. The 'direct' route, to Mansfield-Chesterfield-M1 is through Bothamsall. This is evidenced by the recordings that show traffic flows of around 3,000 vehicles PER DAY through this small village with a narrow Main Street, narrow Pavements, and several Bends. Buildings in Bothamsall can be felt to vibrate when traffic passes through now, so additional traffic will only make this worse with building damage a high possibility. Bevercotes Pit Site will be extremely expensive to develop for housing as the former use will have left much contamination. This would result in much lower CIL payments. It appears to not have attracted any interest as a Warehouse Development, but are there any reasons known for this ?? It should be developed for</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>alternative Industrial/Commercial applications. It would create much additional traffic through the villages of Gamston, Walesby and Bothamsall, and Ollerton Town, creating pollution and congestion. If this Site is developed for Housing or Industrial/Commercial strict traffic controls need to be requested from NCC to protect the small villages from the extra traffic involved in Construction and then occupation. Some thought should be given to restoring the Rail Link to this site for 'spoil' removal and materials delivery. It could then be developed to offer a passenger service. The traffic flow needs to be diverted away from Bothamsall, by ensuring that Construction Traffic does not pass through here and that as soon as any development is approved there needs to be a route direct to the A614 avoiding Bothamsall. A large amount of traffic cuts through here to avoid the delays in Ollerton. This can only be expected to get worse.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP159	Individual	<p>Refers to Section 3.2 Results of the Bassetlaw New Settlement Study Methodology relative to Gamston Airport. It is most disturbing that the loss of employment is passed off so flippantly without any corroborating evidence or supporting statement of facts as to how many jobs would be lost or what businesses would be affected. And in a similar tone within Policy Statement 12.9 of the Plan it is stated:-“Whilst development of the site would result in a loss of airport related employment the new village would provide opportunities for new employment” There is no attempt to quantify the job losses, or potential gains, from any redevelopment. How many of the planning department have visited to find out what happens there? How many of the elected members and Planning Committee members have visited? It is not just about a handful of jobs but 10 businesses that could be forced to close because they are all aviation industry related companies. Provides list of the businesses operating on the airport site. The first 2 have direct employees of the current owner, Gamston Aviation Ltd. The rest are independent companies who have invested to start the businesses and grow them but also the funding of investments in both on-site infrastructure and aircraft. Gamston Airport includes the airport manager, trained firefighters, aircraft refuelers and air traffic controllers to support airfield operations 362 days per year, plus administration staff as well as cleaners. The Apron Cafe ~ providing food and beverages not only for staff, aircrew and visitors. DEA Aviation Ltd ~ Operate & maintain a fleet of 10 “special mission” equipped aircraft out of Gamston Airport fulfilling Government and European Agency contracts for Airborne ISR amongst other activities. Gamston Flying School ~ Aircraft pilot training to, and for, EASA standards and qualifications, Trial Flying Lessons and Aircraft Rental.mContrail Flight Services Ltd ~ ground handling services for visiting</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>business aircraft, passengers & pilots. They also operate aircraft for the Pektron Group Ltd who have 3 aircraft based at Gamston. Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd ~ providing Flight Inspection and Calibration services, Navigational Aids and Communications equipment, all for both civilian and military use, as well as airfield lighting systems.mKuki Helicopters ~ Helicopter pilot training to EASA standards & helicopter sales. ALH Skytrain ~ Aircraft pilot training to, and for, EASA standards and qualifications. True Airspeed Flight Training ~ Ground school flight training & Examination to EASA standards. Gamston Flight Training ~ Aircraft pilot training to, and for, EASA standards and qualifications, plus Aircraft Charter Reach Aerospace ~ Aircraft Management, Sales & Contract Maintenance Gemstone Aviation Ltd ~ recently appointed UK & Eire distributor for Diamond Aircraft Industries GmbH of Austria None of these businesses can relocate to a business park that may never be built as they all require to operate from an airfield. DEA Aviation Ltd and Radiola Aerospace two very high-tech companies based on the airport site along with the resultant loss of high-tech jobs within the area and overall loss to the local economy.Dukeries Aviation Ltd based at Netherthorpe near Worksop, provide aircraft maintenance and carry out Civil Aviation Authority licensed annual aircraft safety and integrity inspections on a high proportion of the Gamston based aircraft. They also provide, and support, some of the aircraft used by flight training schools at Gamston Airport. Pektron Group Ltd is industrial electronics design, validation and manufacture and count major corporates on the scale of JCB, Ford and Nissan as customers. One of the Children's Air Ambulance helicopters is based at Gamston Airport. They have been provided with 24/7 access to the airport site and hangar security systems, have equipment available for getting the helicopter in and out of the hangar quickly and the provision of</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>pilot controlled runway lights from the helicopter so it can be accessed and utilised very quickly. There are 100 jobs that will be lost with 10 separate independent businesses potentially having to be wound up in addition to Gamston Aviation Ltd, and Dukeries Aviation Ltd, that will have its business severely adversely affected. The airport is also utilised by Nottinghamshire Police between 12 and 15 times per annum for driver training in TPAC. Canute Haulage Ltd, with an operating base on the industrial area between Gamston Airport and the A1, and employing over 600 people within the group, went into administration in December 2018. That will ultimately already leave a large industrial site vacant and with the resultant job losses. The loss of aviation-dependent businesses and development totally contradicts and ignores the Visions & Objectives 4 and 6 of the draft plan. The draft plan mentions that 17,000 people from Bassetlaw commute daily to Sheffield, Doncaster, Newark and the surrounding areas. Strongly encourage the Council to look at all the tangible benefits of preserving Gamston Airport, not only to retain the existing businesses and employment but also for it to continue to provide a strategic resource to Bassetlaw to help attract new businesses to the area. Without a large influx of new businesses to provide employment for people locally then building new houses will increase the number of commuters providing a very limited contribution to the local economy as well as creating more road traffic and so mitigating any efforts made to reduce carbon emissions and limit the environmental impact.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP159	Individual	<p>Para 3.2 states that:- “In order for the Bassetlaw Plan to be successfully developed and adopted, it will need to be in conformity with the NPPF” but has failed to provide any mention of, and no consideration to, its statutory duty under Section 9, Paragraph 104(f) of the NPPF which requires that Planning Policies should: “recognise the importance of maintaining a national network of general aviation airfields, and their need to adapt and change over time – taking into account their economic value in serving business, leisure, training and emergency service needs, and the Government’s General Aviation Strategy.” Suggest look more closely at the Government’s General Aviation Strategy and also the information that is readily available on the web site of the All Party Parliamentary Group for General Aviation especially the Airfields Working Group. Should you take the time to adequately research what you are proposing with the closure and redevelopment of Gamston Airport then you will discover that two of the fundamental issues that the APPG are working hard to address are those of adequate and cost-effective pilot training within the UK and the fact that aviation is at the heart of high-tech jobs and skills and so is promoting STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering & Mathematics) jobs through General Aviation. Boeing predict, as part of their business modelling, that an additional 800,000 pilots will be required worldwide within the next 20 years. Because of a more advantageous tax regime towards flight training in such as Spain, and a much more proactive approach to General Aviation in the USA, a high proportion of pilot training is already being drawn outside of the UK which needs to be addressed. There is also a national shortage of flying instructors as well as pilots and yet the Plan, will wipe out 5 pilot / flight training schools. These cannot simply be relocated because they require an airfield and other airfields have established flying training schools.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP159	Individual	<p>It is an active airport for business, leisure, flight training and Children's Air Ambulance, home to 10 independent aviation related businesses, providing employment for around 100 people, training facilities for emergency services as well as having a large acreage of productive arable agricultural land then how can it be possibly be deemed to be an "inefficient use of land" (12.10 of draft plan) as Bassetlaw Council is claiming?</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP159	Individual	<p>It is very disappointing that the provisions of what is seen by most to be flawed legislation that allows a wider airfield / airport site, irrespective of its additional use as grazing or arable land, to be considered in its entirety as 'Brownfield'. Brownfield land is a term used in urban planning to describe any previously developed land that is not currently in use, whether contaminated or not. This Site is definitely currently in use !! Natural England are a statutory consultee on plans that are likely to cause the loss of 20 hectares or more of BMV (Best & Most Versatile) land. Have calculated that there is 96 hectares (238 acres) of land in continual use, within the wider Gamston Airport site, for productive arable farming. The NPPF states that:-"Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality." The Agricultural Land Classification maps are of a scale that do not allow for assessment of individual fields, the ALC map for the East Midlands shows that the agricultural land at Gamston Airport site to be a mix of Grade 2 and 3. Having contacted Natural England note with interest and disappointment that the Council has consulted Natural England but not so that their comments were available before the Draft Plan was published.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP159	Individual	Refers to precedents for retaining the airport. Wellesbourne Airfield, Wolverhampton Halfpenny Green Airfield, Redhill Airfield, Reigate & Banstead Borough Council, Welshpool, Powys, Sywell Aerodrome, Northamptonshire. All are thriving local airports used for business and leisure but which also serves the local, and area, community. With the right airport management, and with the right local authority attitude then General Aviation airfields can, and do, thrive and provide numerous advantages to the local existing business community as well as providing a wide range of jobs from catering to high-tech airframe and avionics engineers.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP160	Individual	<p>Based upon the calculations in the 2018 Rural Settlement Study, Clayworth is proposed to have a minimum of 14 houses and a maximum of 28 houses during the plan period. This is based upon an overall projected housing requirement across the District, which has been allocated proportionally across all settlements identified as 'suitable for growth' based upon their current housing numbers. Whilst this would appear a fair and equitable way of allocating the projected housing requirements, there will be a need to consider how this number needs to be flexed as part of the next stage of the plan process to reflect the following key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The ability of other settlements across the District to accommodate greater than their minimum required housing allocation; - The availability of suitable sites in the village; - The specific character of the village; - that Clayworth is not on the main highways route network. <p>As part of the next stage of the plan process, it is expected that the minimum housing requirement will be exceeded in several larger settlements, which will be able to accommodate greater housing growth due to their proximity to services and availability of suitable housing sites. Should consider and explain how they will reflect the need to accept lower than the minimum housing requirements in other, predominantly smaller and less well served, settlements i.e. how they will decide which settlements can accept lower housing unit targets. Would strongly advise that despite the Rural Settlement Study and the Plan not using either a settlement's conservation status nor its availability/proximity to services as an initial filtering criterion (due to the Council recognising such an approach would be unsound at this stage), serious consideration is given to reintroducing them at this more advanced stage, to prioritise which settlements could see their housing numbers reduced. Given Clayworth's 'enhanced' conservation status and its lack of basic services, either in the</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>village or in any reasonable proximity, it should be prioritised for lower housing requirements. Understood why the Council has chosen not to filter settlements suitable for growth at this stage based upon their conservation status, not least given the District has 32 conservation areas. But simply relying on Policy 8 or 21 to protect both the rural and conservation status of Clayworth in respect to the type of development considered, the Council considers prioritising reductions in housing numbers for these type of settlements during the plan making process. This is of relevance to Clayworth as its conservation status is 'enhanced' beyond the normal narrow confines of the built settlement. Clayworth's status also includes the way the village sits within the wider environment. This puts a greater need for consideration to be given to how development affects the way the village appears from a wider perspective, and not just ensuring development is consistent with the built character of the village. This warrants serious and careful consideration when sites are being reviewed as part of the next phase of the plan process. Not least as it appears entirely consistent with Policy 8 Criteria C which states that any development should 'not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside and farmland.' It has been suggested that previous sites identified as part of the 2017 LAA will be considered. This identified 5 sites in Clayworth, all of which were not considered further, as at that time, the previous Local Plan did not identify the village as suitable for growth. The Council should clarify, at an early stage, whether the 2017 LAA is still valid and its status in respect to the next stage of this new plan process. Welcome Policy 8 which seeks to protect a number of features of rural settlements. The proposals for the strategic criteria in this policy are robust which is encouraging. Prior to these policies being used to protect the rural nature of settlements, the next</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>stage of identifying suitable sites should also consider the criteria set out in Policy 8 to avoid unsuitable sites proceeding further. This is of concern to Clayworth. As Policy 8 outlines, that any development should be ‘of a scale and in a location that is in keeping with the core shape and form of the settlement and will not adversely harm its character and appearance’, and also that ‘it would not result in the loss of identified open spaces within the settlement that contributes to the character and form of the settlement’. Three of the five sites previously identified in 2017 contravene this policy. These are: LAA255, LAA265 and LAA266 – Clayworth does not contain any significant housing developments which would be considered homogenous in form and character i.e. housing estates or homes built en-mass at the same time. This site would be large enough to accommodate a significant number of housing units, therefore making it entirely inconsistent with the form and character of the existing settlement. It would appear unlikely that Clayworth would have suitable sites to accommodate even the minimum proposed housing requirement of 14 units, without contravening Policy 8. Would expect the Council applies Policy 8 and 21 rather than relying on them to protect settlements from unsuitable development post-allocation. Welcome in Policy 8 that ‘new housing will also be supported within settlements and/or on nonallocated sites where appropriate to the character of the area, and where amenity or highway safety is not adversely affected.’ Clayworth is served by only a single B road (B1403) which runs from Hayton through the village then up to Gringley on the Hill, alongside an unclassified road from Drakeholes through the village to Wheatley. 14 new dwellings would add significant pressure on the road network, in and surrounding Clayworth, which it is unable to accommodate. This should be considered as part of the site allocation process, but also to prioritise</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan– Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		Clayworth as a settlement whose minimum housing requirement should be reduced subject to other settlements exceeding theirs.	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP161	Individual	<p>Express my strong objection as the Plan will have an irreversibly destructive effect on the diverse community of individuals and organisations that depend upon Gamston Airport. It is clear that the council's intention to build on the site is supported by misinformed and incorrect belief that the services and facilities can be simply dispensed with or easily replaced. The Plan also demonstrates an irresponsible and inconsiderate approach to the employment of those who work at the airport, erroneously assuming that these jobs can be easily replaced by misunderstanding the highly specific and demanding technical nature of the roles. As a medium-sized and very well equipped, internationally-connected General Aviation (GA) airport, capable of handling aircraft ranging from light aircraft to small jets by both night and day, and providing flight instruction in both fixed-wing aircraft and helicopters from an amateur to a professional level through numerous on-site organisations, Gamston Airport is, and will remain to be, an irreplaceable East-Midlands asset. Gamston does, and will continue to provide a valuable transport link connecting the East Midlands to the rest of the UK and Europe in ways that Doncaster-Sheffield and Nottingham-East Midlands Airport do not provide. General Aviation flight usage by business personnel both to-and-from all corners of the UK and Europe, especially to areas served only by smaller airports that are not accommodated for by airlines operating out of larger airports, is commonplace. If Gamston is to be removed, where will these aircraft be based, and how will these links be replaced? The plan does not address this issue at all, choosing instead to focus only upon local bus and train routes. There are three tiers of airport in the UK: Small airfields hosting mainly hobby pilots, medium-sized airports supporting activities ranging from flying training (including professional pilot training), aircraft engineering and charter flights, to large-scale international</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan– Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>airports such as East-Midlands airport. Gamston Airport belongs to the middle tier, and it is in-fact this tier that offers the largest variety of commercial enterprise. The middle tier is the only one capable of hosting small jets at a reasonable price; the majority of business aircraft chose to land at mid-tier airports since their landing, handling and parking fees are vastly reduced in comparison to the larger airports. The loss of Gamston will force these aircraft elsewhere, which drives more business in the direction of larger airports and away from smaller ones, allowing such large aerodromes to raise prices, and contributing to a serious shortage of reasonable, medium-sized useable airports for the UK GA sector. The indispensable value of Gamston Airport is illustrated by my own usage of the airport; as a Cambridge University student, I drive over 120 miles - at significant time and fuel cost to myself - to be able to fly from the airport, passing at least five other airfields, because there is nowhere else able to provide the flexibility and variety of services offered by Gamston. Further, my home address is in Belper, Derbyshire. Despite having at least four airfields and airports closer than Gamston (including East Midlands Airport) still make the drive to Gamston because it offers facilities that cannot be found elsewhere. Intend to begin part of my commercial pilot training at Gamston – more specifically to undertake my EASA competency-based Instrument Rating (IR) – a process which will be more difficult if Gamston is to be removed. This would be devastating for those pilots who rely on Gamston for their commercial aviation careers. Gamston is a hive of STEM activity; observations that cannot be made nor appreciated by those not experienced/involved in the sector. The airport significantly boosts the cultural intellectuality of the area and that its existence proudly stands out in a region not otherwise noted for its technological offerings. It is woefully misinformed and</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>borderline offensive that the Plan states 7. Whilst development of the site would result in a loss of airport related employment, the new village would provide opportunities for new employment. It is abundantly clear that these highly technical roles cannot in any reasonable capacity be replaced with ‘alternative employment’ in the garden village. What possible employment could aircraft engineers, tower operators, flight instructors, flight charterers feasibly seek in the garden village? Is the garden village going to offer aircraft engineering, flight instruction and character flight services? Many of the businesses at Gamston built themselves up from scratch, and depend on the airport to survive, and cannot be operated outside of an airport environment. Moreover, where are the people that require these services expected to go? The GA sector in the UK is an intricate and complex machine, comprising over 96% of the aviation operations in the United Kingdom, and contributes billions of pounds to the UK economy annually. Understanding of the magnitude and ubiquity of the UK’s GA sector is inadequate; the most striking evidence of this being ‘aviation’ is used just once in the Local Plan (page 91). In comparison p 90 describes Gamston as a ‘small scale, commercial enterprise’, despite having five active flying schools, being the British and Irish distributor for the multi-million Euro Diamond Aircraft Industries (Austria), and hosting numerous aircraft engineering and charter flight services. Urge the council to employ a truly competent and informed consultative body that, instead of trying to justify the proposed building on the airport site, approaches from the opposite direction, and determines whether the price of permanently removing an irreplaceable jewel in our country’s aviation sector is really worth the construction of a garden village that can be placed in less harmful locations. It is detailed when it comes to describing should be built, but lacks detail</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>and understanding, when it comes to explaining the void in aviation facilities will be replaced. This is in contrast to the NPPF 2019, which states that planning policies should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5. recognise the importance of maintaining a national network of general aviation airfields, and their need to adapt and change over time – taking into account their economic value in serving business, leisure, training and emergency service needs, and the Government's General Aviation Strategy. <p>No consideration has been given to the economic value in serving business, leisure, training and emergency service needs afforded by the airport. The Plan is in breach of the Policy Framework.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP164	Individual	<p>This is an objection to the Local Plan. Understand and agree with the more housing being built to support the demand in the local area. Do not agree with the proposal to build upon Retford, Gamston Airport. General aviation is a huge sector in the UK that is under-funded, under-appreciated and poorly represented across the country. It has such a large influence on not just free movement in the UK, but the entire airline industry. It's becoming harder and harder to find pilots, and with the demand for more flights, the grassroots process to allow people to train in their relatively 'local' area is getting harder. Come from a low wealth family and have had little support in terms of funding to achieve my lifelong dream of becoming a pilot. As more airports shut down, prices and distances to an airport where I can learn to fly increase. As demand for airline pilots increase, the demand for instructors increases. As the demand for instructors increases, the demand for general aviation airports increases. With the supply of general aviation airports decreasing and the number of instructors decreasing, the price of learning to fly increases. As a result, less people (particularly people from an under-privileged background) can learn to fly - hence the harder it is for people like myself to achieve the job that I dream to do, not because of my competence or skill, but because airports like Retford, Gamston Airport are being forced to close as they are poorly represented and under-recognised for the impact they have on the UK economy and local areas.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP166	Individual	<p>The proposed plan will create more traffic on the B6387 through Gamston on MuttonshireHill / Rectory Lane which includes Hather Close to the A638 Gt North Road. Hather Close occupants are all senior citizens, do they really need to put up with more traffic. If Commercial units are built how will the B6387 through Gamston cope, is not a good road for HGV traffic now so what will it be like. The volume of traffic</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		including HGV's is quite busy during peak times now, so the extra traffic will be worse than ever, traffic from the A1 already cuts through Gamston. By all means build new houses but please give them a new access road to A638, surely a new road round the airfield can be made to access A638	Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP167	Individual	Objections to the draft local plan, specifically in relation to the proposed housing development at Retford (Gamston) Airport. The plan underestimates the loss of highly skilled jobs at the Airport and that jobs in the proposed garden village will be low skilled and consequently lower paid. The area needs highly skilled, diverse jobs, that broaden rather than narrow the skill set of the district. Small general aviation airports help divert concentrations of traffic and environmental issues around larger airports. Retford (Gamston) Airport is part of a nationally important aviation infrastructure.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP168	Individual	Find it hard to believe that closure of an active, vibrant airfield (with recent investment in structure and hangarage) can even be considered. The number of available airfields to feed the very necessary GA structure of UK has reduced considerably in recent years and once they are gone, they will never be replaced. The APPG is working towards defence of this situation – so why would you fly in the face of our elected representatives (the largest cross-party group in Parliament!)? There must be other sites that you could consider without the loss of so many jobs and businesses – which will be lost forever to your area. Suffice to say that you would destroy another facility from which potentially life-saving organisations such as ours are able to operate from. Don't do it!	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP169	Avant Homes (Central) and Wyndthorpe Developments Ltd	<p>The contribution from the two garden villages toward the overall planned housing supply is estimated at 1,000 units in the plan period. The draft evidence base contains a New Settlement Study which explores the feasibility of various options, little evidence is available in the public domain by which to substantiate the Council's assumptions on deliverability. Welcome a review of the Council's Local Plan housing trajectory at the earliest opportunity, together with any evidence to support the deliverability of both sites.</p> <p>Flexibility in the overall plan requirement is essential in order to offset any potential slippage in delivery. In our experience, large scale new settlements or sustainable urban extensions ('SUEs') are commonly susceptible to delays in bringing forward first completions, not least due to the complexities of facilitating initial upfront infrastructure to bring sites to a point by which preferred developers may be appointed to submit detailed planning applications. Due to the significant upfront costs associated, initial planning applications are typically frontloaded with a volume of viability work, often resulting in protracted delays in agreeing Section 106 Agreements and associated trigger points. It is anticipated that in the case of both planned settlements, the affordable housing policy aspirations⁹ will be challenging to meet in full and given the Council's admission as to the achievability of delivering 134 affordable homes per annum, the Authority may wish to give consideration to wider Local Plan objectives. The ADAS Bassetlaw New Settlement Study (April 2018) provides a series of high-level assumptions in order to viability test each site. Whilst useful as a broad exercise, the paper is not clear as to what specific inputs have been assumed, including sales revenues and any S106 requirements inclusive of affordable housing delivery. There is no confirmation that M4(2) and M4(3) standards have been factored into build cost</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>assumptions. In the case of Bevercotes, it is noted that initial viability assumptions already generate a below market return of circa £150k per acre, exclusive of incorporating these points. In the case of both planned settlements, the majority of delivery is envisaged beyond the plan period (i.e. 2035 onward). Whilst both new settlements have potential to contribute toward meeting the District's housing needs in later years, this should not be at the short term expense of providing much needed homes to more sustainable locations. With respect to Gamston Airport, the Bassetlaw New Settlement Study references the land being controlled by 2 separate landowners, however the paper is ambiguous as to whether an alternative residential use would provide an incentive to release the land for development. The report concludes that:- "Whether at this level of residual land value this would encourage the existing landowners to close down the existing use and make the land available for development is unclear without undertaking further direct consultation with them." Further work should be undertaken to ascertain the viability and deliverability of both sites and in the case of Gamston Airport, the Council should be clear as to the landowner's intentions to release the site for mixed use development.</p>	
DBLP170	East Markham Parish Council	<p>Given their proximity to the A1 corridor both of the sites should remain as industrial and not be reclassified as housing. There is a lack of employment opportunities in rural South East Bassetlaw and their connectivity to the A1 and A57 mean these two sites offer the widest possibilities for industrial use. Gamston Airport has the ability to connect the A1 via both the B6397 and the new bridge at Jockey House lane and given careful planning it should be possible to keep the runway open for use. Understand this type of development has taken place at Gloucester Airport. Gamston Airport provides over 100 jobs, most of them highly skilled in aircraft repair and maintenance,</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>these jobs would be lost should the airport close. Jobs of this skill and calibre will be hard to replace in the area. The airport is the only private airport in Nottinghamshire, and provides a range of facilities for small aircraft associated with business use and a useful leisure facility for light aircraft enthusiasts.</p> <p>Understand that the A1 junction at Twyford Bridge is of concern regarding its use by heavy goods vehicles, and would suggest that if both sites were developed for industrial use this would enable the contribution required towards upgrading to be shared. The District Council could contribute to the upgrading from CIL monies. Alternatively, could put the bridge forward with other initiatives in the District seeking a share in the Government's £1.6 bn as seed money to help the economic development. Should the housing plan continue, the implications for the surrounding parishes would be considerable. Construction traffic associated with a development of this magnitude would be considerable, the B6397 is a minor country road and the two curves in Gamston village will require considerable upgrading prior to the commencement of construction. When the new villages begin to be occupied there will be an increased amount of traffic, in the vicinity but on Retford itself, (Retford grinds to a halt every time the A1 closes, regular extra traffic could cause this situation on a regular basis) with extra traffic caused by people leaving for employment, the school run, shopping and leisure. Concerned that this development will put an intolerable strain on all the infrastructure services (transport, education, medical etc) in our area. Will need to ensure that the necessary infrastructure is in place i.e. Retail facilities, Schools, Doctors Surgery, Community/Sports facilities prior to the commencement of house building. By ensuring these facilities are in place prior the housing phase it could alleviate many of traffic problems. An alternative would be to utilise Bevercotes</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		as a garden village and utilise the Airport for airport and employment, like Gloucester Airport, utilising Jockey House Lane and the new bridge for access to the A1, which could still go ahead if the bridge improvement was delayed.	
DBLP174	Individual	Does not take into account the requirement to maintain a strategic network of airfields as outlined in the NPPF paragraph 104f. Do not appear to have considered 'the importance of maintaining business, leisure, training and emergency service needs'. Para 10.3 disregards the locally and nationally significant transport infrastructure provided by the airport. The aims for development at the airport contradict para 10.5 which seeks to support opportunities to retain and create. Other suitable brownfield land is available for housing development in the local area. Partial-development of the site would also be possible to capitalise on existing aviation and technology sector strengths whilst retaining an active airport that will provide more skilled jobs for local residents. The plan references the airport site as 'brownfield' planning legislation requires this to be suitable or redundant brownfield land, which the active airport is clearly not. Other airports across the region are unable to adequately accommodate the business and aviation activity that would be displaced by the proposed 'garden village' including 10 independent businesses and over 50 based aircraft including business jets, helicopters and light aircraft. The airport also currently provides a home for a Children's Air Ambulance. The direct loss of highly skilled technical and STEM jobs at the airport site and throughout the region, including flight training, engineering, support services contradicts strategic objectives 4 and 6. Makes a case for local housing need in Worksop but does not provide the same level of evidence for Retford. States that Retford has experienced significant housing growth in recent years since 2011, without the need to destroy existing infrastructure.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP181	Individual	Please don't close Gamston airport.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP182	Severn Trent Water Ltd	The proposed sites are located remotely from any significant existing sewerage infrastructure, off site works will be required to make a connection. Based on our high level assessments a connection into the current drainage system is likely to result in an increase in flood risk and increase spill volumes at overflow locations. A revised assessment will need to be undertaken once further details of the development are available. It is anticipated that the provision of a new settlement will result in a master plan - would strongly encourage further discussions around the development of these villages with Severn Trent to enable an understanding of the development phasing, and delivery / occupation timelines so that a plan can be developed for what infrastructure will be needed and when it will need to be provided.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP184	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Do not support the allocation of the former Bevercotes Colliery site due to its designation as a Local Wildlife Site (LWS). There are three Local Wildlife Sites in and adjacent to the proposed allocation: Bevercotes Colliery Site (LWS 5/2165); Bevercotes Colliery Site and Lawn Covert (LWS 5/304); Fox Covert West Drayton (LWS 5/3411). Local Wildlife Sites are afforded protection due to their substantive nature conservation value. Their selection takes into consideration the most important, distinctive and threatened species and habitats in a national, regional and local context, making them some of our most valuable urban and rural wildlife areas. Local authorities in	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>England and Wales have a key role to play in the conservation of biodiversity and this is now recognised and formalised in Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006, where: “Every public body must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity”. Section 41 (S41) of the Act requires the Secretary of State to publish a list of habitats and species which are of principal importance for the conservation of biodiversity in England. The list has been drawn up in consultation with Natural England, as required by the Act. The S41 list is used to guide decision-makers such as public bodies, including local and regional authorities, in implementing their duty under The Act. The habitat in the former Bevercotes Colliery site is included on the list as Open mosaic habitats on previously developed land.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP184	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	<p>The statement in Section 8 seems incongruous with Policy 12. Do not see how the mitigation hierarchy can be applied appropriately i.e. avoid damage for example, if a site has already been allocated in principal. If this is to be strictly applied, then another site would need to be chosen. The whole of the site is currently a Local Wildlife Site and has existing nature conservation value of at least a county level. Question whether delivery of a net gain in biodiversity is possible given that the brownfield areas alone qualify as a Local Wildlife Site for their botanical interest. Rather than increasing connectivity (Section 8), development is likely to fragment habitats and increased disturbance on those remaining fragments will further reduce their wildlife value. Whilst it is an obvious role of a local plan to identify sites for development, it would be valuable to identify areas that can be incorporated into large-scale sustainable landscapes. This would help to avoid fragmentation of habitats to ensure they remain as a functional ecosystem and a biodiversity resource. It may seem an unconventional and negative step to preclude areas from development by identifying them for sustainable landscapes and biodiversity. Biodiversity objectives can deliver economic benefits to communities by creating employment through new projects, re-creating cost-effective ecosystem functions such as flood relief, enhancing the local economy through tourism and improving local surroundings. An audit of brownfield sites should be undertaken to consider their ecological importance, especially in view of the over allocation of land for housing and employment use within the District. Core Strategy Policy DM9 provides protection to Local Wildlife Sites. Section B. Biodiversity and Geodiversity states: "Development proposals will be expected to take opportunities to restore or enhance habitats and species' populations and to demonstrate that they will not adversely affect or result in the loss of features of</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>recognised importance, including: Local Wildlife Sites (Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)); vi. Local and UK Biodiversity Action Plan Habitats (including Open Mosaic Habitats on Previously Developed Land); and vii. Protected Species". Draft Policy 19 provides protection to habitats and species of importance and includes Local Wildlife Sites. Protection is also provided through the NPPF Section 174. Would like to see more emphasis placed on avoidance of damage to Local Wildlife Sites rather than measures to mitigate any detrimental impact on environmental features. Sites of regional and local biodiversity and geological interest, which include Regionally Important Geological Sites, Local Nature Reserves and Local Wildlife Sites, have a fundamental role to play in meeting overall national biodiversity targets; contributing to the quality of life and the well-being of the community; and in supporting research and education. The aim should be to protect and enhance the natural environment and biodiversity by ensuring all new development does not have a negative impact, but a positive benefit for biodiversity. Development should reflect and enhance the character and appearance of the local natural environment and be positive for biodiversity through design, use of materials, layout and landscaping. Draw attention to the two Local Wildlife Sites that are adjacent to the other proposed Garden Village location at Gamston Airfield: Gamston Airport Scrub and Grassland (LWS 5/358) and Brick Yard Road Ponds (LWS 5/1239). If a full application were to be submitted, we would expect the submitted documents to demonstrate how the nature conservation value of the LWS would be maintained during and post-construction.</p>	
DBLP185	Individual	<p>Like to express my concern at the increased volume of traffic that would come through Eaton should the housing development at Gamston Airfield take place. When the bridge</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		at Ordsall was being repaired residents of Eaton noticed increased traffic and because have no traffic calming facility in the village it became dangerous. There was an accident on the bridge in Eaton last Saturday night and should the development at Gamston go ahead traffic lights on the bridge as well as speed limit signs are essential. This small and quiet village has become a rat run especially at school times and only become worse with more cars associated with the planned housing. The combination of a narrow road and a single lane bridge are not conducive to safety. Welcoming the idea of a Garden Village and the additional infrastructure that would bring, it should not be at the expense of road safety in Eaton.	process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP186	Natural England	Support part 1c which expects development in the garden villages to have good connections to green infrastructure routes. Supports part 8 which supports development only where significant harm to biodiversity can be avoided, adequately mitigated, or, if either criteria cannot be achieved, compensated for. Support the delivery of net gain, increasing connectivity of habitats and restoring/re-creating priority habitats where possible. Suggest that the potential to strengthen ecological and green infrastructure links between these two sites should be considered, including opportunities to link existing woodland areas and watercourses.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP187	Individual	The two proposed Garden Village sites are too close together and the airport is a well known business hub that adds value to the area, so strongly suggest it is retained as an airport. Why not offer them incentives to develop it further?	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP188	Individual	<p>Gamston Airfield is on a scale not anticipated nor expected. Instead of being an addition to a small village, this concept is more like a small town, linking Gamston and Elkesley. The final outcome would no way be within your guarantees that towns and villages would “grow at a rate and scale commensurate to their defined role” as it would increase the size of a village of approx 80 properties by over 3000%. The airfield is on the edge of a small rural village and the creation of a “Garden Village” on this site does not fit your guidelines of Bassetlaw Villages “respecting their distinctive character”. It is too close to existing settlements to become a new village and will have a detrimental effect in many ways including the price and saleability of existing properties in the village. The proposed site is currently in use and is not dormant as many similar propositions around the country are. Surely dormant brownfield sites would be much more suitable. The road networks around this area are already busy, especially in the mornings and evenings and with the addition of 2500 homes, of which you anticipate the majority of occupants will be commuting to work will mean a large increase in road use. Already increased use of these rural roads cause problems, including the road through Eaton which only recently has had part of the single lane bridge knocked down by a vehicle and the 90 degree bend near the river in Gamston at the bottom of Muttonshire Hill which in the last few months has had at least 2 cars smash into the bridge, with one nearly ending up in the river. Yes, the A1 is close, in view of rail links from Retford, more traffic will be using the rural lanes and roads to get to the station. There is also the issue of parking at the rail</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>station and surrounding streets. Would increasing the number of new homes in walking distance of the station not be more suitable? This would reduce the number of vehicles on the road and reduce emissions. It appears that the link to the A1 is important as the anticipated population growth of Bassetlaw will be from in migration with people moving into Bassetlaw but working outside of the area and commuting. Surely sites could be considered at alternative sites along the A1, that already have access and a “new” village would not have impact on existing villages or settlements, e.g. “Five Lanes End”. There is no close village and commuting to Doncaster, Rotherham and Sheffield would be easier without overloading existing used and busy rural roads with extra traffic. Assuming the new homes will be varied and include family homes, what about the issue with schools and access to them. The new proposals will include new schools, but not until after 2035. What about the issues that will be caused with already oversubscribed schools and travel to them? No longer have a hospital in Retford and with more services being transferred to Doncaster, how long before the hospital at Worksop will be no longer available. Do not have the infrastructure in place for this scale of development. You anticipate the majority of occupants will be working out of the area and commuting. Why would they choose to spend their money locally when the “thriving” market town of Retford is no longer thriving. Just look at the local market, which is now less than half of what it used to be with the number of businesses that have closed. Building more properties in the town would encourage people moving into the area to use the towns facilities</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>without the need to travel. If they have to get into a car to visit the town, why would they not just go to a larger place such as Doncaster or Sheffield. Figures used in the Plan regarding local labour was from a report dated 2014. This is 5 years old and there have been a lot of changes locally and not for the better. In a day of internet and online shopping this will get worse. More people move into the area, but they will not move here if the houses are not available.</p> <p>Although there are plans to extend the industrial site, with the loss of many skilled jobs already at the airport there is unlikely to be a boost to employment. There are plenty of empty business sites in and around Retford, how are you going to entice new businesses? With the increase to sites at the Blyth A1 junction, closer to the M18 and M1, don't see how this will work and the loss of existing jobs will outweigh any new roles created. With the scale of the building projections, this is likely to be taken on by large construction companies who tend to use their own contractors and would not be using local firms and labour. Would smaller developments be more beneficial to local companies using local labour? This appears to be a "quick win" rather than one that takes into consideration local residents and infrastructure.</p> <p>The plan uses scenic photographs of the countryside, and states that Gamston Airfield is "nestled in gentle undulations of lush green farmland". This would show a different picture if there were 2500 houses, and doesn't indicate the loss of wildlife and detrimental effect this would have on the area. Bevercotes Colliery would make use of a site that has been derelict since the colliery closed. Would still have an impact on local</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>roads and traffic, it would create a new village that is not linked to an existing settlement and would have much less impact on the local community. It is a smaller proposition, but would have a large impact on new housing numbers and government targets. It would still have major infrastructure issues, but not on the same level as the Gamston Site.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP189	Individual	Oppose the closing of Gamston Airfield. The loss of over a 100 jobs is a lot of people to find reemployment. Where are the people who live in these homes going to educate their children? Retford doesn't have the capacity to take in loads of children. Drs are struggling now to see patients and if we need all these extra homes there is plenty of land round the area that isn't going to cost someone's livelihood. Where are the residents going to work? There aren't enough jobs in Retford to support all the extra people who may move here.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP190	Individual	Express my outrage at your ill-judged decision to close Gamston airport to allow the building of houses. It is based on an incorrect designation of the land as brownfield by an incompetent environment minister. It's like all the farms around is a green field site. So why not develop any of the farms nearby and save hundreds of jobs? Around the world countries are developing aviation infrastructure as fast as they can, whilst Bassetlaw proposes to destroy a thriving airport with a great future and prospects to grow. Such incompetence is mind-boggling. Urge you to abandon this act of vandalism.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP194	Emery Planning on behalf of J G Pears Property Ltd	The methodology used for site selection of the Garden Villages is clear. Note that para 12.4 the Council advises that the Parish of Bothamsall does not meet the methodology criteria set and that the Former Bevercotes Colliery site was treated as an exception to the methodology. This provides an unreasonable advantage to this site. The justification given for this is: "Given the size of the site and the fact that it is brownfield land and has an extant planning permission for employment, the Council considered it appropriate and necessary to include the site in the study. Section 11 of the NPPF (Making effective use of land) also indicates that Local Plan Strategic Policies should set out a clear strategy for accommodating objectively assessed needs in a way that makes as much use as possible of brownfield land." The same approach should have been applied to all major	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>previously developed sites within the District, including the Former High Marnham Power Station site, in order to ensure that all possible locations for the 'Garden Villages' have been appropriately and equally assessed. Suggest that prior to acceptance of the two 'Garden Village' locations identified in the Plan a further assessment should be made of the other major previously developed sites.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP195	Fisher German on behalf of The Hospital of The Holy and Undivided Trinity	<p>Largely support the Spatial Strategy, have significant concerns with the garden villages. There is a lack of evidence and justification for the need for such an approach. In allocating the Garden Villages, the levels of housing to be delivered in Retford appear to have been reduced without justification. Retford is a clearly sustainable settlement which has a strong demand for housing and has delivered strongly since the Core Strategy was adopted, wherein it was the recipient of nearly a quarter of the growth proposed. This has now been reduced to 13%, with the Plan confirming this reduction in housing numbers was due in part to the delivery of new housing as part of the new garden villages. The reduction in the proportion of dwellings allocated to Retford is justified and could serve to frustrate housing delivery. The delivery of the two villages is not sustainable. The size of the Garden Villages whilst considerable, would still lack the critical mass to deliver a range of services, facilities and amenities that Retford benefits from. Certainly, the Garden Villages will never benefit from a train station (particularly one serving two lines), or the range of and breadth of bus services currently serving Retford, meaning they are fundamentally going to be less sustainable than Retford. Whilst the Council state the sites connectivity to Retford would enable future residents of the Garden Villages to utilise Retford's services and facilities, particularly the train station, this is going to be less sustainable than residents living in or adjacent to Retford where the services would be significantly closer and readily available. This is particularly true for the Bevercoats Colliery site, which is around 7km from the centre of Retford, circa 9km following the current road network. Considering this, again the proposal to pursue housing growth at the Garden Villages ahead of the delivery of additional sites within the sustainable settlements, such as Retford, is questioned. The location of the proposed new villages, straddling either side of the A1, will</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercoates Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>lead it to becoming a dormitory community with residents heading straight onto the A1 towards locations such as Doncaster and Newark daily for work. Such patterns are likely to lead to little benefit to the existing towns in Bassetlaw. Housing growth in Retford and Worksop is likely to stimulate growth and regeneration in those towns to a greater degree, with residents more likely to shop and spend there. Whilst the garden communities make an employment allowance, such developments are more logically and sustainably located near existing urban areas. The potential workforce in closer proximity is greatly increased and infrastructure capacity is likely to be readily available. It is a wrong to assume that a large number, if any, future residents of the Garden Villages would work at the employment available close by. This would be dictated, amongst other things, by the proposed employment uses and the price of the dwellings. It could be the case that large numbers of people from Retford, or further afield, commute into the Garden Villages, with residents heading out elsewhere. Considering that the planning system cannot control where residents work, it is considered sensible to locate such development where it has the greatest chance of being served by a local workforce. Proposals such as North Lane, Retford, adjoining existing urban areas are more sustainable in both the short and long term. The delivery of large strategic sites are well documented as being difficult to deliver, particularly on brownfield land. In Rushcliffe Borough, Nottinghamshire, of the six strategic sites allocated for development within the Rushcliffe Core Strategy, only 1 delivered as intended. This is in part due to the complexity of delivering such sites. It is also due to the need for large investment in upfront infrastructure costs to service the strategic development. Appreciate the Garden Villages are only proposed to deliver a quarter of their total capacities during</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>the plan period, this could still be optimistic. Research from Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners outlines that the determination period of an application of 500+ dwellings is in the order of 5.3 to 6.9 years. For the most part, this time period is due to complex planning issues. When an application is determined quicker than average, this is a result of matters being substantially addressed prior to submission which, when combined with the determination period, still adds up to the same amount of time; as the report states “there is rarely a way to short-circuit planning”. Whilst the Plan and supporting documents refer to the extant permission at Bevercotes Colliery, this permission dates from 2001. This permission should be treated with a degree of trepidation, despite more recent variations of the permission and some of the conditions having been discharged. If the Council intends to proceed with these proposals, sufficient allowance should be made during this plan period to ensure the delivery of the assessed housing and economic requirements, separate from the garden villages. This would mean the allocation of at least another 1,000 dwellings in sustainable locations. A significant amount should be directed towards Retford, to ensure it is delivering a quantum of development commensurate with housing need in the location and its sustainability credentials. If, the Garden Villages deliver, this should be seen as windfall, supporting the government in its aims of boosting significantly the supply of housing. This approach protects the social and economic interest of the District, whilst addressing the local and national housing shortfall. The promotion of this strategy should not come at the expense at the future growth and associated investment in Retford, particularly considering likely housing need in the town.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP197	IBA Planning Ltd.	<p>The principle of this is welcomed – and considered very exciting. This presents the Council with a fantastic (and once in several generations') opportunity to plan and deliver the very best, creative and sustainable new settlements – and that opportunity should not be missed by settling for conventional development often promoted by national housebuilders. In my experience, whilst national housebuilders will necessarily default to convention, they are often quite willing to raise the design bar as and when the need arises – and the Council should therefore not be frightened to insist on the very best levels of design, creativity and innovation which could put the new villages and the District on the map nationally, thereby also presenting an opportunity to secure significant inward investment and attract an additional and more diverse, skilled workforce into the area. Unless the above is sought, there is a real danger that, despite this amazing opportunity, the resultant developments will present themselves on the ground as little more than large dormitory villages, not at all dissimilar to many of the unremarkable urban extensions we see up and down the country.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP193	White Young Green on behalf of Stadium Development	<p>The proposed two new Garden Villages at Gamston Airfield and Bevercotes Colliery are supported. Consider that the proposals present a unique opportunity to develop significant brownfield sites in close proximity, both in private ownership in a predominately rural district. In doing so this will not only assist the district in achieving and delivering its housing supply requirements but the pressure to develop greenfield sites in less sustainable locations is reduced. The evidence base to support the selection of sites provided by the Bassetlaw New Settlement Study (2018) to identify the two proposed Garden Village sites is robust and sound. In the opening paragraph of the policy, reference is made to “the requirements below being fully met”. Consider that at this stage, care must be had to avoid language which could be overly prescriptive such as “fully met”, when detailed work in relation to the design, development and delivery of the settlements will be set out in other documentation, particularly the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which is envisaged to set out comprehensive a Masterplan and Design Code for each settlement.</p> <p>1) Good Quality Design – the requirement for the villages to have distinctive characters and to be of innovative design are supported, albeit we would suggest exemplary construction standards definition would be consider at the time of actual construction. Consider some of the considerations set out in 1) e. are perhaps unnecessarily detailed and specific, such as ‘urban heat island’ effects which are not considered to be particularly relevant to a low-density garden village.</p> <p>2) Housing – the delivery of 4,000 homes across the two sites is supported, of which a minimum of 1,000 new homes will be delivered by 2035. The proposed distribution of dwellings across the two sites is supported, as is the mix of house types and tenure and percentage of self-build plots.</p> <p>3) Village Hub – the delivery of a village hub in each settlement is supported, and a hub provides</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>an opportunity to not only provide facilities on scale to support the new villages, but to serve the existing settlements in the vicinity which have limited provision.</p> <p>4) Employment – the allocation of 15ha of employment land at Gamston Airfield is supported, with sufficient flexibility to ensure that the site can accommodate demands arising at the time.</p> <p>5) Infrastructure: Community Services and Facilities – the provision of facilities including nursery and primary education facilities in each village are supported. The provision of a secondary school at Gamston Airfield is supported in principle subject to a detailed assessment of need and capacity in existing secondary school facilities. Provision of facilities should be in step with the delivery of dwellings, the majority of which will be delivered beyond the plan period. Health care facilities in each village are supported as are recreational spaces including parks, sports pitches, play areas and allotments. We welcome the exploration of “high quality communications technology” but flexibility is required over what this may entail.</p> <p>6) Infrastructure: Transport – support maximising sustainable integrated transport and connections between the two new villages and existing settlements through the implementation of a Travel Plan for both sites. Support the establishment of a network of pedestrian and cycle facilities between the two villages and existing settlements. Reference in b) to a dedicated pedestrian and cycling green bridge over the A1 is too specific at this stage. Paragraph 12.20, 4th bullet point, refers to a principle of “Delivery of an enhanced pedestrian and cycle routes between the new settlements, over the A1 to ensure optimum connectivity”. Wording should be included at 6b) as it is sufficient to secure the requirement without being unnecessary prescriptive and premature over the form of the solution.</p> <p>7) Infrastructure: Flood Risk The requirement for a Strategic Drainage Study for both sites is supported, as is the</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>delivery of any necessary flood mitigation measures and ongoing management of flood alleviation/drainage schemes. 8) Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure The principle of delivering biodiversity gains, increase connectivity of habitats and where possible restoration/recreation of habitats is supported. 9) Energy The principle of an energy strategy exploring the use of renewable and low carbon sources is supported, but regard must be had to avoid being over prescriptive in the policy regarding what form these measures may take given the speed at which the technology in the sector advances. Note that the term Gamston Airport/Airfield is used throughout the plan. Suggest it is more appropriate to use the term Gamston Airfield to describe the site. North Nottinghamshire Garden Villages brochure attached.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP205	Fisher German on behalf of P Hinds	<p>Support the proposed Spatial Strategy, but have concerns with the promotion of two garden villages. The sustainability is questioned. Do not consider the delivery of the two villages to be more sustainable than delivery in and adjoining existing settlements in Bassetlaw. Raise concern that the location of the proposed new villages, straddling either side of the A1, will lead it to becoming a dormitory community with residents heading straight onto the A1 towards locations such as Doncaster and Newark daily for work. Such patterns are likely to lead to little benefit to the towns of Bassetlaw. Housing growth in the District's existing villages as well as towns needs to be the focus of the strategy to stimulate growth and regeneration these locations. The Garden Villages will not deliver these same benefits. If the Council intends to proceed with the Garden Villages, this should be seen as windfall, supporting the government in its aims of boosting significantly the supply of housing and contributing to housing delivery in the next Plan period.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP206	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	<p>Has a highway plan been approved for this unprecedented increase in traffic? Current infrastructure is unsuitable for such an increase- it is already dangerous due to insufficient speed restrictions, and narrow bends in Gamston Village. Exiting our drive-way is already very dangerous. Are the roads going to be improved before the start of construction? The use of heavy plant and increased works vehicles will be an immediate inconvenience to commuters. How will this be managed? How will the increase Impact on traffic entering/exiting A1 – this is currently a problem with only approximately 300 residents in Gamston, how is it going to be improved with an additional potential 14400 residents? (Assuming 4 people per property) How many more petrol stations/convenience stores and other facilities are going to be provided to supply the increased population? And how will this impact the area? What impact will this population explosion have on Emergency Services; Hospitals, Doctors, Policing, Fire Services, which are all currently insufficient. How will it affect the Ambulance/Paramedic/Fire Engine response times to the surrounding areas? The police in Retford are underfunded and understaffed, and reluctant to come this far out of Retford, what additional measures will be put in place to police the new village? Brough on the outskirts of Hull was a smaller project and had its own police station built within the site. When this project is filled with young families it will have a larger population than some towns in the UK and should morally be marketed as such. Parking in Retford centre is already inadequate – how can this be improved? Currently top water from the airport runs under the road and through our land which adds to the existing problem with the river Idle. The river Idle is cleared in July each year which causes the river to back up and flood large areas of land including ours. What plans will be put in place to deal with considerably more top water</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>coming from roofs, drives, roads, car parks ect? Local Wildlife will be affected by increased footfall/littering/potential increase in illegal poaching and malicious behaviour that occurs already. How do you propose to manage this? The mosquito infestation on our neighbours flood land has been reported to the council by our neighbour, cannot go outdoors in the summer. Been bitten 32 times in one afternoon and had to have medical attention. Will this now be dealt with by the council or will buyers not be made aware of the severity of the issue? What precautionary measures will be made for young children/adults trespassing onto private farmland and estates/lakes/wetland area as this already happens but on a smaller scale? (policing in farming/rural areas is notoriously difficult) Who will be responsible for such risks, how will Home insurances be affected by this? Increase in co2 emissions affecting wildlife habitats, environment, other health concerns and asthmatics (co2 increase of 4.6 metric tons per year each car a total of 66,240 metric tonnes from this estate. added to current 690 metric tonnes at the moment.) Is this in line with your government policies on looking after its constituents? The Airport is a fail-over for Doncaster Airport – what is the alternative? The airport is also a training centre for Pilots, will this be relocated? What provision is being made for the current traders on the Airport? Are local businesses and jobs going to be affected? Currently pay one of highest rate bands in this part of the country for the privilege of living in a rural village, the rates should reflect living among social housing in future bills. Pay a considerable amount of money for our property due to its location and seclusion. Have spoken to Hunters estate agents who have told us that if the build goes ahead at the airport our property will take a considerable drop of a minimum of 20% in value. Are there any plans to compensate the residents of Gamston and Elkesley? This appears to be one</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>of the biggest housing developments under taken in the north of England, appreciate that new housing has to be built, building such a massive quantity in such a small village would appear to be unprecedented. From the councils point of view it appears you want to complete your targets of new builds in one big hit, all at the expense of the residents in Gamston/Elkesley and Retford whose lives will be devastated by these proposed plans.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP208	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	<p>Objection: What is the purpose of shutting down a working airport, to build 1000 required houses when there is room for 1,125 homes at a vacant site currently used for illegal raves and fly-tipping? Throughout the Draft Bassetlaw Plan Part 1: Strategic Plan (DBPPI) it is made clear that there is a demand for new housing in the Bassetlaw area . The numbers are shown in detail and are understandable. The plan shows that 1000 homes are required over those planned in existing urban areas. The Garden Villages seems to be the answer to the 1000 home problem. While I have no reason to doubt that these homes are required within Bassetlaw, I do doubt the need to create two new villages to provide them. Both the Colliery site in Bevercotes and the Gamston Airport site, according to the plan, have sufficient space for over 1000 new homes. Why, therefore, is there a need to spread the required 1000 homes over two sites one of which in the words of the plan is "nestled in the gentle undulations of lush, green farmland"? (These alone are strange words to describe "brownfield land"). The aim of the plan was never to find two sites. Why did that change? I understand that the only answer available is because, after the period of time covered by the plan, there may be a need for a further 3000 homes in the area. This seems, therefore, to be a plan, planning for circumstances outside of the remit of the plan. Should we set aside the AI (previously developed land?) for the year 2198? At what point does our planning for beyond the plan period cut off? My remark about the AI is facetious of course, but highlights the point which is, shouldn't the plan really only plan for the period covered by the plan?</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP208	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	<p>Objection: Current utilisation of the airport (employment). The proposal will involve closing down a business area serving the Bassetlaw region with more than 100 jobs most of which are "high quality", to create a housing estate and no jobs. I am aware that new businesses tend to be small, small businesses tend not to have the capital to build premises. I understand that the land will remain vacant for five years, and then the rules will be relaxed (if not before) and with such fantastic links to the A1, 15 hectares of warehousing will doubtless arrive. It is difficult to see how empty land constitutes employment opportunities being created. If this plan is about efficiency, then should it not develop the wasteground at the Bevercotes Colliery site into a "garden village" or, more realistically, "housing estate", then encourage the airport based businesses to flourish and grow?</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP208	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	<p>Objection: Current utilisation of the airport (land use). As a working runway, some of the land at Gamston airport is used for aircraft to take off and land on. This is an exquisitely efficient use of a runway. The hangarage is used for aircraft storage and maintenance, equally efficient at an airport. The office space is used by office workers, employed by companies based at an airport. The rest of the site is farmland. This also seems relatively efficient. Gamston is a working airport for business, leisure, flight training and the Children's Air Ambulance, home to 10 independent aviation-related businesses, providing employment for around 100 people, training facilities for emergency services as well as having a large acreage of productive arable agricultural land. It is hard to see how 15 hectares of wasteground is more efficient from a business point of view. It is also hard to see how a plan to build 375 homes built on a site spacious enough for 1,125 is in any way efficient. Especially when the land is described by the planners in 12.11 DBPPI as a "former spoil heap" and "large</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		parts of the site remain open and are frequently accessed for informal recreation and subject to occurrences of antisocial behaviour, including raves, fly-tipping and off-road vehicle use." As is the case with Bevercotes colliery.	
DBLP208	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	<p>Objection: selective disregard for the NPPF. The plan fails to mention, and one therefore assumes pays no consideration to, its statutory duty Under Section 9, Paragraph 104(f) of the NPPF dated July 2018 which requires that Planning Policies should:- "recognise the importance of maintaining a national network of general aviation airfields, and their need to adapt and change over time - taking into account their economic value in serving business, leisure, training and emergency service needs, and the Government's General Aviation Strategy."</p> <p>Despite searching through a lot of "evidence" in the appropriate section, I have been unable to find any "evidence" that it conforms with the NPPF in this instance.I have, as the manager of a business located at the airport in question, not been contacted. I have not heard of other airport business employees having been contacted. I have seen absolutely no official representation of anything at all at the airport site in relation to this plan . I would even suggest that a lot of secrecy has surrounded the plan. Untrue statements have been made by representatives of the airport management in support of the Garden village plan. So I wonder how deeply anyone is concerned about the "economic value in serving business, leisure, training and emergency service needs, and the</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		Government's General Aviation Strategy." Or the need for a national network of GA fields.	
DBLP208	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	Objection: loss of pilot training schools. The Bassetlaw Draft Plan, should it be adopted, will at a stroke, wipe out 5 pilot/flight training schools at Gamston Airport. These cannot simply be relocated like an ordinary business because obviously, they require an airfield and other airfields already have established flying/pilot training schools. The current size of these businesses suggests that they are unlikely to relocate even if there was a similar sized airport with limited flying schools anywhere in the UK.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP208	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	<p>Objection: creation of "high quality" employment. Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd is based at Gamston Airport, providing flight inspection and validation services, navigational aids and communications equipment as well as airfield lighting systems, to both civilian and military customers worldwide. Part of a New Zealand based group (Radiola Ltd) with a total of 23 employees (increased from 14 three years ago), Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd has seen a steady growth period over the last three years building from 2 employees breaking into the UK and Europe market, to 8 salaried staff maintaining more than 4 contracts UK wide and many more contracts worldwide. With continuing growth at a greater rate expected and an increase in owned aircraft underway, Radiola will be forced to relocate out of the area. With no similar sized airfields in Bassetlaw this genuinely "high quality" employer will be forced to offer employees an option to either relocate with the company or volunteer for redundancy. DEA Aviation Ltd, operate and maintain a fleet of 10 "Special Mission" aircraft at Gamston Airport. One of their primary roles is to provide Airborne ISR (Intelligence, Surveillance & Reconnaissance) services to the UK Government and European Agencies, some of which are related to national security. First formed in 2006 DEA Aviation Ltd has invested heavily in its Gamston Airport operations in order to be prepared to keep pace with the future growth potential within the Airborne ISR market. Providing employment to more than 70 people most of whom are salaried and in highly technical and professional roles, DEA will without question be forced to relocate out of the area. Other companies based at Gamston Aiport : • The five training schools • The airport staff consisting of cafe staff, Ramp handlers, ATC controllers, Fire service personnel, and various other personnel crucial to the operation of the airport, • Gemstone aviation, • Contrail Flight Services, • and the</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>potential new tenants involved in anti-drone technology for airport security (due to recent drone activity at Gatwick and Heathrow Airports this field is in an enhanced growth period) who are due to open their doors in the next few weeks. The above companies are providing "High Quality" employment to more than 100 personnel across the airport, with the potential to grow in all areas. My understanding of high-quality employment fits perfectly with the salaried, professional, technical sort of employment included in all of the companies mentioned above. A more technical understanding might be available from the All Party Parliamentary Group on General Aviation website where they promote scientific, technological, engineering and mathematical (STEM) skills and high-tech jobs.</p> <p>"The All-Party Parliamentary Group on General Aviation promotes the objective - as set out by British Government - of making the United Kingdom the best country in the world for General Aviation, and to stimulate interest in the sector. Our goal is to ensure that General Aviation inspires both current and future generations to take up science, technology, engineering and mathematics , thereby creating high-tech jobs and growth in all nations and regions of our economy. In order to achieve this objective, the All-Party Parliamentary Group believes that a network of General Aviation airfields must be protected and enhanced by the government." "Put simply, the importance of General Aviation to boosting scientific, technological, engineering and mathematical (STEM) skills in the wider economy cannot be overestimated ." (http://www.generalaviationappg.uk/) So, with the closure of Gamston Airport, these high-tech growth businesses would be forced out of having any form of presence within Bassetlaw.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP208	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	<p>Objection: creation of "high quality" employment. The plan makes many references to how it will encourage employment in the Bassetlaw area, including the notion of "high quality" employment, although at no point that I can see does it define "high quality" employment, nor how it will encourage any sort of employment, nor yet what sort of businesses will be encouraged. "Promoting economic prosperity through the delivery of high-quality employment space and advanced communications technology, capitalising on the sites' location adjacent to the A1 and to the south of Retford." (excerpt /ram: 12.20 DBPPI} "As these settlements will be delivered over a long period of time, it is expected that they will need to be designed to meet emerging working practices. It is expected that there will be a higher percentage of home/flexible working that will drive the need for higher capacity, future adaptable communications infrastructure to be designed into the schemes from the outset." {12.23 DBPPI} Here, I think, we are reading about high-speed internet being the encouragement for new businesses . Relying on the new residents of the Garden Villages bringing their own employment with them, employing one or maybe two personnel at best . The assumption made by Bassetlaw planners being that they will be high-quality jobs. "The delivery of the new settlements must include new employment opportunities to ensure they are truly sustainable villages, not simply large housing estates. Therefore, the expectation is for the new villages to deliver at least 15 hectares of employment land. This growth will help meet the requirement across the district, as identified by the 2018 Economic Development Needs Assessment (EDNA)." {12 .22 DBPPI} It is understood that this is a very proactive plan for the development of new businesses. Is there any way that Bassetlaw can ensure that only, or at least some, businesses offering "high quality" employment will be permitted to build</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>on the 15 hectares of wasteland? Will utilities be built into the land left aside? Is there any guarantee at all that the businesses will not simply be warehousing, lorry parks, factories, as so often seen up and down the country "capitalising on opportunities associated with close proximity to the A1 corridor." (excerpt from: 12.18 DBPP1} From conversations with the planners at the meetings in various locations around Bassetlaw, the answers are not forthcoming, or flatly in the negative. A definition of "high-quality employment" is also non-existent or open to anyone's interpretation according to the planners. I have seen no hints or realistic suggestions in the plan which come close to replacing more than 100 salaried jobs. Especially when compared to the STEM skilled jobs provided through the continued operation of the general aviation airport supporting more than 10 independent businesses which is threatened.</p>	
DBLP208	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	<p>Objection: infrastructure. It is safe to assume that upgrading the A1 junctions closest to the proposed Garden Villages will take place. It is hoped that will solve those particular ongoing safety issues. The narrowing of the bridge as it is not capable of supporting two-way traffic, and the perilous on/off ramps travelling both north and south on the A1 at the junction of Dover Bottom and Twyford Lane. What about the traffic travelling East and West from the proposed sites? Will bypasses for Bothamsall, Walesby or Ollerton be provided? Will traffic calming measures or bypasses be installed into Darlton, Dunham or Newton on Trent? The traffic pressure through Retford and Ordsall is already high at peak times, will a potential additional 1000 vehicles be catered for? Another route bypassing the toll bridge over the Trent to avoid the significant bottleneck which will doubtless become a problem with the enormous increase in the number of commuters. We will effectively plonk 4000 homes in the same area without a</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>steady evolving period of improvement in the wider infrastructure which is already failing to fulfil the requirements of our modern trends. We are already seeing failures on the part of the council to control the traffic flows around Bassetlaw. 50 mph speed restrictions with average speed cameras along the A638 don't seem to have stopped at least 4 vehicles failing to jump the River Idle in Gamston and Eaton in the last 3 years. This at the current level of traffic let alone a further 1,380 vehicles as a probable minimum. {1.38 vehicles per household, east of England, www.statista.com }</p>	
DBLP208	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	<p>Do not support this ludicrous notion. When I was young I heard that you cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear. The villages, towns and cities of Great Britain have grown and evolved over centuries. the communities are born out of years of shared history. Building a "garden village" is a wishful way of saying building a typical housing estate with your heart in the right place. A housing estate designed for the most "efficient" use of space and best financial return, built as cheaply as possible, and provided with the absolute minimum allowed amenities and facilities do not make a "garden village". However much Bassetlaw Council wishes it does. I also wholeheartedly condemn the closing of businesses in the interest of "promoting business". A contradiction, which when said out loud sounds like a joke. It is impossible to force democracy onto people not yet ready for it. It is not possible to create a community overnight. It is very easy to force people into a lifestyle that they have no choice but to accept. Having said all of that, I will have to move out of the area to follow my job to another airport when Gamston is just a big bunch of ridiculous houses centimetres apart. No, I do not support Bassetlaw in their proposal to make the same mistake being made across the country and not instead learn from them.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP209	Individual	<p>Objection to the inclusion of Retford (Gamston) Airport.</p> <p>1. Closure of the airport will result in the loss of a business area in the Bassetlaw region that currently provides over 100 jobs which are already "high quality", such as aircraft pilots, engineers, operations staff, technicians, ground handlers, flight inspectors, air traffic controllers and fire officers. You are proposing to replace this with 15 hectares of empty land which will be protected by Bassetlaw for the next five years so that only new businesses providing "high quality" employment can build there. However, most new businesses tend to be small and often do not have the capital to build new premises. They would therefore be unable to set up on the airport site. I gather that after five years, the protection rules will be relaxed so that any business will be able to come in, including those that only provide low quality employment, such as warehouses and factories. How will this be an improvement to the current employment opportunities in the area? Surely it would make better sense to develop the waste ground at Bevercotes Colliery site and encourage growth of businesses at the airport site, especially as the Bevercotes site is described in the plan as a "former spoil heap" and an area "subject to occurrences of antisocial behaviour, including raves, fly-tipping and off-road vehicle use".</p> <p>2. At no point in the plan does there seem to be a definition of the high quality employment proposed to replace the high quality employment already in existence at the airport. This is clearly defined in the All Party Parliamentary Group on General Aviation website, where they promote scientific, technological, engineering and mathematical (STEM) skills and high-tech jobs: "The All -Party Parliamentary Group on General Aviation promoted the objective - as set out by British Government - of making the United Kingdom the best country in the world for General Aviation, and to stimulate interest in the sector. Our goal is to ensure that General</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>Aviation inspires both current and future generations to take up science, technology, engineering and mathematics, thereby creating high-tech jobs and growth in all nations and regions of our economy. In order to achieve this objective, the All-Party Parliamentary Group believes that a network of General Aviation airfields must be protected and enhanced by the government. Put simply, the importance of General Aviation to boosting scientific, technological, engineering and mathematical (STEM) skills in the wider economy cannot be overestimated." (http://www.generalaviationappg.uk). The closure of Gamston Airport would force these high-tech growth businesses out of Bassetlaw completely.</p> <p>3. You state that "the present use of the site is considered to be an inefficient use of land which could otherwise be developed for a use which is in much need". However, Gamston Airport is a working airport for business, leisure, flight training and the Children's Air Ambulance. It is also used by Nottinghamshire Police between 12 and 15 times per year for TPAC training . There are 10 independent aviation-related businesses which provide employment for over 100 people, as well as training facilities for emergency services. In addition, there is a large area of productive arable agricultural land. This strikes me as an extremely efficient use of the land which would not be improved upon by demolishing the site and following through with your plan.</p> <p>4. The Bassetlaw Plan is supposed to conform to duties laid out in the National Planning Policy Framework. This states that planning policies should "recognise the importance of maintaining a national network of general aviation airfields, and their need to adapt and change over time - taking into account their economic value in serving business, leisure, training and emergency services needs, and the Government's General Aviation Strategy" (Section 9, Paragraph 104(f)). However, there appears to be no evidence</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>that the draft plan conforms to the NPPF at all in relation to this aspect, even though Gamston Airport does already serve business, leisure, training and emergency service needs. 5. Closing Gamston Airport would result in the loss of five pilot training schools, further reducing the "high quality" employment in the area. It is predicted (by Boeing experts) that an additional 800,000 pilots will be required worldwide over the next 20 years. However, a high proportion of pilot training is being drawn outside of the UK due to a more advantageous tax regime towards flight training in countries such as Spain, and a more proactive approach to general aviation in the USA. Closing the five training schools at Gamston Airport will make this proportion increase. In addition, there is a national shortage of flying instructors as well as pilots and, again, closing the flying schools at Gamston Airport will make this situation even worse. The training schools cannot easily relocate as space at other airfields is required but is difficult to come by. 6. You state that there will be highway improvements and I hope this refers to upgrading the A1 junction closest to the proposed Garden Villages. The slip roads onto the A1 at that junction are incredibly short and extremely dangerous as a result. The bridge that goes over the A1 at that junction has been narrowed as it is unable to support two-way traffic, so that will need to be strengthened and opened fully to have any hope of coping with the huge increase in traffic. However, has any thought been given to the road travelling between Ollerton and Gamston, past the proposed Garden Villages (A638)? The increase in traffic as a result of the proposed Garden Villages would be enormous and that road would be unable to cope with it. Will bypasses be built to reduce the pressure in these areas? If they are to be built, how much disruption will that cause for the years it takes to build them? In addition, there is already high traffic pressure through</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>Retford and Ordsall at peak times so the extra vehicles will merely add to that and make the daily commute even worse than it already is.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP213	Individual	<p>Objection to the proposal of development on the greenfield airfield. Are you aware of the numbers & variety of wildlife on greenfield Airfields? Not just the usual birds & Hawks but adders, numerous owls, woodcock , butterflies field mice and Hares. Give wildlife a home, space for people to view nature-airfields are wonderful, friendly places & on poor flying days, at dusk & early morning they do not mind if you visit to view wildlife & enjoy a walk.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP214	Individual	<p>Objection to Gamston Airport proposal: I am writing as a light aircraft owner and pilot , who is resident at Durham Tees Valley Airport , which after considerable public support has been bought by the local Authorities to prevent its closure . Once an airport is closed it can never return as the cost is to high . Gamston Airport is one of the best examples of a General Aviation Airport in the Country and has invested considerably in hangars and other infrastructure. I am also aware of Government Committee All Party Group on General Aviation, who are pressing for the protection of small airports, recognising their important role at present and increasing role in the future stating that 'they play a vital part in the countries economic success. This does not seem to have been taken into account in you draft plan, and it is not appropriate to simply say that an airfield represents poor use of land without taking account of the present and future benefits to the community that exist as have been identified by the public, local MPs, Mayor , and Councils in the case of Durham Tees Airport. The Committee also points out that ways should be explored for airfields and residential housing to co-exist at these areas providing the residents of the new housing recognise that they are living next to a airport/field. Any concerns over noise is easily resolved as with Gamston and the organisation of traffic patterns to avoid flying close to or over residential areas.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>However as found with a number of airfields some residents simply do not like aircraft flying in the area, despite the airfield being present before they moved to the area and press unreasonably for its closure by any means. As previously stated I am a private pilot and owner of an aircraft, I have no financial or other interest in Gamston Airport other than having visited it on numerous occasions. It is a jewel in the small airports that exist in the country and needs to be preserved and not simply swept away for a few extra houses.</p>	
DBLP212	Individual	<p>Objection to the Gamston Airport proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is currently an epidemic that the Medical Entomology & Zoonoses Ecology, Emergency Response Department Science and Technology (ERD S&T) Public Health England are trying to understand and battle. The epidemic is an extremely rare and dangerous flood plane mosquito called Ades Vexans. The Gamston area is totally infested with the organism and any housing in the area would exacerbate the problem and put many more people at risk whilst also making the new properties almost impossible to sell. It is mosquito hell. • There will be an increase in traffic and there is already a dangerous amount of traffic cutting through Rectory Lane of Gamston on a daily basis. • House prices in Gamston will be reduced due to the village losing its rural and quiet feel. • House prices in Gamston and surrounding areas will be reduced due to the closure of Gamston Airport. Many people utilise the airport as a form of transport. • Businesses will suffer due to the transport link the airport brings being closed. • A fantastic training resource bringing on new pilots will be lost. • The mass housing will generate more noise and general pollution to the area. • The lakes at the airport contain some very exciting bio diversity along with the Great Crested Newt I believe. • Bevercotes is also a fantastic nature reserve. • The diversity and wildlife that the Maune and the Mead hold is incredible and this development will have a 	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>direct impact on these important tributaries. At the end of the day myself and my family chose to live in Gamston because it is a quiet low population centre with no shops, pubs or many people. On our doorstep we have country walks into the Bevercotes areas and down the river past the airport. This is why all villagers have paid a premium to live in Gamston and it would destroy our homes having the village expanded by thousands of homes. Gamston is also an easy commute to Retford where I do my business. I am a major employer of people with some 50-60 people in Retford. As my business is generally internet based, if Gamston becomes a mass housing estate I will find myself having to move and thus have to relocate my business also to another area, county or even country. The plan is preposterous in my view and will destroy so much good.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP219	Planning and Design Group on behalf of the Welbeck Estates Company Ltd	<p>The garden village concept is welcomed in principle. Concerns are raised in relation to the overall deliverability of the two proposed garden village locations. Alternative, or additional long-term, strategic garden village sites will need to be considered in the future. Questions are raised in relation to the expected trajectory of housing supply on both sites and their relative deliverability. In order to deliver 1,000 homes, both sites would have to consistently deliver around 72 dwellings per annum from the estimated year of adoption in 2021. Not unfeasible, it is highly unlikely as neither site appears to have gained the momentum to facilitate the commencement of dwellings at 2021. Considerable lead-in times should be expected after adoption to allow for the production of SPD, cooperative master planning, decisions and negotiations associated with major strategic planning applications, any necessary site remediation and the satisfactory delivery of all pre-commencement infrastructure. Even where this runs smoothly it is not unreasonable to assume that the sites will only be delivering at the very end of the Plan's timeframe, whereby the delivery of 1,000 dwellings is very aspirational.</p> <p>The 2018 Bassetlaw New Settlement Study Methodology raises doubts over the viability of both sites. The methodology states that expected viability at Bevercotes is only marginal exacerbated by the need for significant off-site infrastructure contributions or works, including A1 junction enhancements and the creation of a Bothamsall bypass. Doubt is cast on the headline viability appraisal for Gamston given that an existing land use value has not been reliably attained. Significant off-site infrastructure contributions or works will be required to facilitate the development, such as A1 junction enhancements and significant improvements to the local highway network. Question the deliverability of both sites within the timeframe of the Plan. Consider that further rural</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>land allocations that fully adhere the garden village concept will be required to provide more market contingency and flexibility in the delivery of new homes across Bassetlaw. Further land allocations could act as a complementary, or alternative, approach in the delivery of sustainable rural development. There is an opportunity to deliver a new network of 'heritage villages' in Welbeck's land ownership. These would be tied to the philosophy and influences of the surrounding estates and parks that are characteristic of south west rural Bassetlaw. It could harness the opportunities created by the surrounding landscape aesthetically and take the form of individual villages linked together as part of a joined network. A network of 'heritage villages' would meet the Council's adopted new settlement core principles. This includes the creation of a free-standing community, not placing settlement coalescence at risk, include the ability to pursue exceptional design principles and benefit from proximity to a range of existing rural communities. While a joint garden village option is available, there remains complementary, or alternative, opportunities available for locations to be assessed for a new rural settlement. Opportunities as a whole must be further invited, justified and tested. Where the current housing trajectory continues to rely heavily on the proposed Garden Villages' further objection will be raised.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP220	Individual	<p>The Garden Villages proposal is tantamount to being a new Town development as it concentrates most of Bassetlaw's housing target in two places and does not need a lot of infill in the existing Retford villages. It achieves the current Government's requirements. By looking at a 30+ year projection there seems to be no consideration that Government policies will change over the years and it may be that there are two part-finished villages with insufficient facilities because there have been local, national and even international political changes. It is a garden village idea presentationally but realistically it is urbanisation of a rural and attractive area. The 'Garden' Village concept seems inappropriate when houses will be 'dumped/deposited' onto an area and as most new houses seem to be placed on site locations with postage stamp gardens! If this plan is more or less a 'fait accompli' (and feedback at local consultation sessions appears to be the case) propose that one Garden Village is built – preferably on the available site of Bevercotes and that if appropriate this model is then used for another site at a later stage. Having read the report into assessing the suitability of three sites (Carlton, Bevercotes & Gamston) the Carlton site is more conducive to development as it is close to an urban area such as Worksop and not far from Sheffield. It is much closer to existing services such as regional and local hospital facilities and a greater concentration of existing and potential industries and employment opportunities. The two villages will be 'one community'. Each village would form its own identity and would not wish to be a single community particularly with the A1 separating them. Take on board that these areas are mostly Brownfield and are ripe for development. Proximity to each other is not a valid consideration because each one will have its own identity and will be separated by the A1 intersection even if road upgrading</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>takes place. It appears there is a lack of information relating to the service providers in these villages and how they will tie in with current pressurised services, facilities and lack of qualified staffing. Recruitment in many of these public and private services and enterprises in this area is already very difficult. The rationale for the proposed two sites appears to be that they are both close to the A1 and B6387 connects the two sites and provides good connectivity with Retford and the East Coast mainline. Realistically the B road is narrow in places with bad bends and the A1 slip roads are short and the immediate stretch of the A1 is congested. This part of the A1 has had several accidents even since the Elkesley bridge has been finished. Local villages such as Bevercotes and Eaton are going to be more 'rat runs' and dangerous with narrow roads, bad bends and Eaton and Gamston bridges both significantly causing many road accidents. With 10000 extra people in the area it will mean that there will be too many vehicles for this updated road infrastructure. Cannot see that the house builders would be interested in investing in an updated road infrastructure until after the first 15 years. Retford Train Station surroundings and parking areas are packed. There is mention that 40000 journeys are made to use Retford Station now never mind when an extra 10000 people are living in the area!! It is well-known that young people want to live in or near large cities for employment, access to universities and colleges but for leisure and retail. Two garden villages whilst providing new housing may not be too attractive to young employed people and the new villages may have a predominance of older people who may not contribute directly to the local economy as much as they would if nearer to city conurbations. Many people will no doubt commute to local towns and cities and not to the Retford area. There should therefore be a focus around current centres of the population</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>where there are appropriate employment opportunities and public services which could be expanded more easily and economically than setting up new standalone facilities in rural areas. Understand from people who have lived in new villages elsewhere that schools and other services and facilities are not provided until at least 10 years into a large house project. Does not take into account the economic development and nature of potential employment. Increasing the population does not necessarily guarantee any economic growth or even the population investing in their locality. These villages could become dormitory settlements whereby employees and employers commute to the cities as this already seems to happen increasingly in the Retford area. Initially there could be a lack of facilities and qualified staffing for such a large expected population. According to BDC staff at the consultation events it is not proposed to supply new school places until several years into the house building and perhaps not until the end of the first 15 year phase. New Schools are mentioned but wonder if house builders will be prepared to build them in the early stages of the new houses' development.</p> <p>Suggest the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reconsider the 3 areas which were previously considered for garden villages. Carlton still needs consideration because of its proximity to economic and social opportunities in Worksop and Sheffield. • Reassess the need for new residential development on the Bevercotes and Gamston sites by looking at Retford and existing large villages where the concentration of population would be close to retail and leisure facilities. These facilities may need some enhancement but not new builds. • Investigate moving industrial and employment opportunities onto Bevercotes (already designated as industrial land) and Gamston sites from areas in and around Retford and use the industrial sites for new housing as they would be close to the A1 network, 	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>mitigate environmental issues and the use of local roads. • Further liaison with Notts County Council and regional authorities to ascertain the best way forward. Why were NCC representatives from highways, education, fire and other NCC services not present at the consultations?? • Ensure that further consultations involve local people who are likely to be affected immediately – A Gamston session was requested by the local Parish Council and only took place 5 days before the end of the consultation period. As a local Parish Councillor witnessed a number of local people who were rather disgruntled with the lack of information. If this current proposal is accepted there will be no air traffic from Gamston over the local area although there will be a loss of those businesses and jobs. There could be a heightened image and profile for the Garden Villages regionally and nationally with the creation of this fairly modern concept. This may be about the Council's prestige and not have a beneficial impact on the lives of the local people.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP221	Gladman Developments	<p>Support the identification and allocation of the North Nottinghamshire Garden Villages. In particular the identification of the Former Bevercotes Colliery. The identification and delivery of the Garden Village will provide assurance that the long-term housing and employment needs will be delivered not only during the current plan period but will provide certainty in housing and employment land delivery for future Local Plans. The majority of the site comprises previously developed land offering the sustainability advantages of turning previously developed land back into use. The site has extant planning permission (09/05/00002) for employment development supports the principle of development in this location. Masterplan attached. The site could be extended to accommodate additional housing and employment land to assist in meeting Bassetlaw's housing needs in full. The proposed site offers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A minimum of 1,500 homes - Primary School - Village Centre consisting of Doctor's surgery, pharmacy, community building, retail and leisure facilities. - Sports park - Allotments - Pub/restaurant <p>Employment space. The Garden City ideas have been one of the main design drivers behind the scheme with the integration of green space within the built environment of paramount importance. This has led to the inclusion of tree lined streets and avenues, the creation of recreational, woodland and sports park, the establishment of leisure walks and the realignment of the bridleway to connect to the Robin Hood Way. Consider that modifications to the policy are required. Would be happy to work with the Council to find the most effective policy: consider that the policy should be separated into 3 distinct parts. This could include a section containing aims and objectives (or aspirations), another being joint requirements for the two sites combined and then a separate section for each site with any site specific requirements. Some aspects are</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>overly precise and are not yet borne from any evidence - it is important to get the balance between setting the parameters and affecting the deliverability through onerous requirements where further work is required with input from consultees, before it is known what a solution might comprise. May wish to rephrase the need for requirements to be 'fully met' when some relate to qualitative requirements and objectives or aspirations for the two sites, rather than precise measurable elements of the scheme. There is not a reference to the requirements for an Environmental Impact Assessment that will need to consider the cumulative impacts of the new settlements and any committed development. It would be helpful to clarify that there are some matters where there will need to be a joint approach, which could reasonably be included in a section of the policy, which would then allow both sites to come forward with separate applications and separate phasing, but with the joint parameters that would also be established as part of the planning obligations.</p> <p>Recognise the importance of good design, concerns regarding a SPD to set out a comprehensive master plan and design codes for each of the Garden Villages. This could more efficiently be progressed through conditions for each scheme against a policy that sets out key parameters. This could save time in the early planning stages of the project and provide greater certainty that the 1,000 dwellings can be provided in advance of the end of the plan period. It is likely that there is a range of character areas and rather than innovative and/unique design, will focus on high quality design that will assimilate within the respective surroundings of each site, to deliver an exemplary village with high sustainability credentials i.e. reflecting the Garden Village principles. Much of this is included in the explanatory text and could be moved or duplicated in the policy. These read as a range of aspirations or objectives for this site and could be</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>identified as such. 1A and ‘contemporary constructions techniques’, this might be better identified as exploring the opportunity to develop part of the site via modern and innovative construction techniques. 1c and 1d are supported. 1e – in terms of ‘minimising energy and water consumption’ this is too onerous and could be better worded as part of an overall approach to include solutions to reduce energy demands and water consumption. Otherwise this could require ecohomes, which do not believe the Council are advocating and this has not been considered as part of the viability assumptions. Do not consider that a low density garden village would give rise to ‘urban heat island effects’ and in terms of solar access, Bevercotes has a significant amount of trees. Could be addressed by an overarching policy to explore sustainable energy solutions that maintain flexibility for the most appropriate solutions for each site (which may be different for each site and/or comprise a number of solutions to be incorporated). Approve of self and custom build homes there are issues surrounding the delivery of such forms of development on larger sites. Note paragraph 7.20 states that the Council has received in excess of 60 requests to be put on their Self Build Register from June 2016 to July 2018 and the Council have included some of the location needs (which do not identify the Bevercotes area) but it is not evident whether these requirements would be content for a plot on a large site or a plot on a small site through Neighbourhood Plans. There does not appear to be sufficient demand for this form of housing to justify this policy. If this is retained then it should allow for flexibility and allow self-build plots to revert back to market housing as part of the wider scheme after a period of time i.e. 12 months. This will ensure that housing delivery is not stalled where there is no demand for such provision. Happy to explore this further in order to appreciate the number of</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>plots. Secondary education: further studies are required to inform the requirements. Unclear what is meant by 'high quality communications technology' - clarify the aspects that should be considered, rather than setting a high bar without an idea of how to meet this aspiration and how this should be reflected in the viability assumptions. There are a range of options being considered for cycle links. A dedicated green cycle bridge is the least likely of all of the options and would need to comprise a number of bridges in order to bridge the river and slip roads. It is not apparent how this could avoid comprising the vehicular solution for the junction that has already been the discussed with Notts CC and Highways England. The vehicle solutions have been the subject detailed design, road safety audits and departure applications. To include this specific cycling requirement without taking account of the other infrastructure requirements could pose an unreasonable requirement that could prevent the sites coming forward and has also not been a feature of the viability considerations or technical feasibility. A new dedicated cycle bridge across a 'live' dual carriageway would represent a £5 million plus cost to the schemes and would need to be compared against competing policy aspirations. Other solutions that could achieve the connectivity without requiring a dedicated new bridge. 6c: it could be advantageous to allow for community bus opportunities to provide linkages particularly in the early phases of the schemes, ahead of sufficient critical mass to start the public transport services. This can be included as part of a strategic travel plan submitted as part of an outline application. Support the 1st paragraph of 7, but have concerns in 7a. Whist it is noted that it is stated, 'where appropriate' it could be taken to mean that off-site betterment is required, necessary or might be in accordance with what is reasonable. The FRA would need to demonstrate</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>that there are no negative downstream effects. This lies beyond the requirements of the NPPF and whilst the opportunity might be considered, there would be a concern if there was a requirement for these sites to deliver off-site downstream betterment. This could impinge upon the masterplanning of the sites. 8a: 'an overall net gain...' should be added in order to reflect the joint working across the two sites to meet the Garden Village principles. See the applicability of 8b and 8c to Gamston Airfield, the wording for Bevercotes will need to be different in order to reflect the different character and mitigation requirements. Energy: the wording does not allow sufficient flexibility depending upon the eventual solutions for the sites. The solution would be to replace 'and' with 'and/or' throughout.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP222	Individual	<p>The development of these two garden villages should not be done in isolation. Every effort should be taken to integrate the new villages with the surrounding villages, through road and cycle access. Ensuring existing services are enhanced in surrounding villages rather than introducing new services which will have a negative impact on existing services. Ensure present Educational Services are maintained in Elkesley & Gamston and expanded before new facilities built. Children who have started their Secondary Education at Tuxford should not be made to transfer to the new Secondary School. The impact of these two developments should have a positive rather than negative impact on surrounding villages.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP224	Individual	<p>Cycle access on roads between Elkesley and Bevercotes is difficult because of the dangers presented by the roads - in particular the A1 trunk road. Cyclists have for years used rights of way (illegally) to travel safely between Elkesley and Bevercotes. Most of the way is along existing bridleways to the south of the river Poulter. Unfortunately there is a section of path, to the north of the river Poulter, that is not a bridleway – it is designated as a footpath and therefore cyclists should not ride on it. An upgrade of this footpath to a bridleway will allow cyclists to travel safely between the two villages without the danger of being confronted by the landowner. The path in question runs from Brough Lane, across a field, for approx. 100m to a bridge - known locally as stone bridge – which crosses the river Poulter. Bridleways continue from the south side of the bridge. Upgrading this footpath would be a inexpensive but effective way to improve connectivity between the villages giving access to shared facilities and employment opportunities.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP225	Individual	<p>Live in East Markham - object to the proposals to convert Gamston Airport into housing. Do not fly, but do not want that opportunity to be removed for future generations in Bassetlaw. If this airport is closed, it is extremely unlikely that it would ever be replaced in Bassetlaw. So there must logically be an extremely good reason to close it. It is not like knocking down old shops, warehouses or farm buildings. The reinstatement cost of the airport would be absolutely huge and commercially unsustainable. Cannot see local or central government subsidising the establishment of a new airport either. Closing it would cost a number of highly skilled jobs that would never return. It would see the loss of fixed wing and helicopter flight training and associated leisure opportunities. If the logic is to build hundreds of houses near to the A1, just build them on a farmer's field. There are thousands of acres next to the A1 and any farmer would be delighted to receive millions of pounds in value uplift were agricultural land used. Converting agricultural land would be much cheaper and allow Bassetlaw to receive greater taxes and levies out of the massive development gain made by the farmer.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP226	Retford Civic Society	<p>The proposal to close the district's airport and replace it with a new village is regrettable. The airport is, and should continue to be, part of the economic infrastructure of the District. If it closes the area will be less attractive to investors. Air travel is a growing feature of economic life and Bassetlaw is well placed at present to benefit from this growth. But this advantage will be lost if the airport closes. The idea of new villages on previously developed land has some attraction, not least being that it would reduce pressure for development elsewhere. If the new villages are to proceed there must be robust arrangements in place from the start to ensure that each is developed in accordance with an agreed masterplan. This must ensure that from an early stage in the development</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		residents of the villages have good access to schools, shops, bus services and jobs. Must avoid just creating an isolated housing estate in the countryside lacking the facilities to be a balanced community.	
DBLP227	Pektron Group Ltd	<p>Concerned on behalf of our business which is a significant user of Retford/Gamston airport. Pektron Group Ltd is a manufacturer of Electronic assemblies, primarily for the vehicle industries. Turnover approaching £60 Million, and employ around 400 staff, who are mainly located at our head office in Derby, and at operations in Detroit, Michigan, USA, and Redditch in the West Midlands. Have two business aircraft based at Retford/Gamston Airport, a Citation CJ4 business jet and a Beech Super King Air 250 twin engine turboprop. These two aircraft represent an investment of around \$15 Million. Do not make such a significant investment and base the aircraft at Retford/Gamston for no reason. The aircraft are vital tools that enable our executives and highly skilled design engineers to visit and communicate with our customers throughout Europe. The choice of this airport is significant. The airport is around 40 miles from our head office, but the facilities are such that cannot find a better location to base the aircraft. There are small grass airfields suitable for leisure and training use, and there are major international airports such as East Midlands, but neither is a solution. The small airfields are not suitable due to length and runway surface, and places like East Midlands are primarily focussed on scheduled airline transport and do not prioritise Business users. They cannot offer the unrivalled convenience, simplicity and service at Retford/Gamston, which is regionally important. Suggest that this company chooses this</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>airport despite the fact we are in a neighbouring county demonstrates the strategic importance of this vital transport infrastructure asset. By basing the aircraft at Gamston inject significant money and employment into the Bassetlaw District. The UK has long suffered with the destruction of transport infrastructure, a process which started with the Beeching cuts, the repercussions of which are still hampering the development of rail transport in the UK. It is for this reason that the NPPF mentions the importance of General Aviation airfields. Retford/Gamston is a nationally recognised and award winning example of this requirement and is an important part of this nationally important transport network. The plan fails to consider the importance of such a superb asset, and trivialises the value of the airport by saying it is "inefficient use of land". The airport offers most of the environmental benefits of the Green Belt but is a vital infrastructure asset of national importance. It would be more efficient to build a garden village on agricultural land, as the economic impact would be significantly less damaging. The Council should be proud of this facility; it is the best in the region, and should be treasuring and nurturing the airport rather than looking for reasons to destroy it.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP228	Individual	<p>The construction of two new villages appears to have been added at a late stage. In relation to Rural Bassetlaw, clearly, these proposed new villages are not, as stated: ‘proportionate growth through a careful mix of planned and managed organic development’. They risk severely damaging the local environment while blighting nearby rural communities.</p> <p>Proposals to build new towns on Gamston Airfield and the open space of the former Bevercotes Colliery are inappropriate for the locations. The Plan itself recognises that these proposals would jeopardise existing business; destroy open landscapes; threaten recently restored open habitat and; create excessive local traffic. The Draft Plan is therefore contradictory and confused. Section 12.15; “The former Bevercotes Colliery is enclosed within dense woodland, while Gamston Airfield is nestled in the gentle undulations of lush, green farmland.” Section 12.17 How can a new housing development on a. a currently open, green airfield, and b. in a wooded site, be considered ‘inherently rural in nature’? With these factors in mind, neither site is suited to housing development without significant detrimental impacts to the surrounding environment. Less experienced local planners may not be aware that in 2003 an ‘administrative oversight’ led to the deletion of a footnote in PPG3, noting that airfields and hospital grounds should not be considered as appropriate brownfield sites. Current definitions of previously developed land make no reference to airfields or flying sites. As a result, developers and local planning authorities are increasingly and inappropriately treating airfields as brownfield sites for land redevelopment, leading to the loss of an important part of national transport infrastructure and the destruction of significant areas of natural habitat within airfield boundaries. Gamston Airfield is a busy, popular general aviation airfield, with a vital history. It is in open countryside, and supports</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>thriving commercial businesses. Gamston Airfield is repeatedly stated to be 'brownfield land', despite considerable confusion and continued debate on the classification of open areas within active airfields. It is recommended that the proposal is withdrawn and the Council work closely with the All-Party Parliamentary Group on General Aviation (APPG-GA) to discuss new planning guidelines aimed at further protecting airfields. There are likely to be significant commercial opportunities to further develop the site as a vital asset, without adversely impacting the local environment. May wish to seek advice from Stratford-upon-Avon District Council, who are committed to keeping the thriving, yet similarly threatened Wellesbourne Airfield open as a strategic asset to the local and national economy. If Gamston continues to operate, and Bevercotes is built on, what measures will be taken to ensure that any proposed development at Bevercotes does not impact lawful flying? Any development should recognise recent planning policy which ensures that it will be up to developers building new properties nearby to identify and tackle noise problems. Under the new guidance, the onus will fall on the developers who build the houses to soundproof the properties.</p>	
DBLP229	Individual	<p>Support the principle of two new garden villages. The villages would be better located at Bevercotes former colliery and Cottam Power Station. Gamston airport is a popular rural airport and an employment site. Would be better if it was retained as an employment area to compliment the nearby new residential development at Bevercotes. The owners of Cottam PS have recently announced that the power station will close in September 2019 and this would be a good location for a new settlement. The delivery of a garden village at Cottam PS could be on a similar timescale to a garden village at Gamston airport.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP230	Individual	<p>The suggestion that the site is currently underused and the land use is ineffective wholly false. The airport supports on average 16 flights per day, is home to a flying school and employs many highly skilled local residents. The classification as a brown field site in its entirety is misleading as the airport only utilises approximately 25% of the proposed site with the rest being laid to productive farm land. The suggestion of building in two phases a total of 2500 homes would lead to the loss of this facility, the highly skilled employment opportunities and productive farmland. It would appear that no thorough assessment has taken place in terms of road capacity and road safety as this falls to the responsibility of the county council and highways England in relation to the A1. The characteristics of the roads connecting Gamston, the surrounding villages and smaller settlements are not constructed to a modern standard conducive to modern vehicles and driving. The above can be evidenced through identifying many fatal crashes over the space of just a few years. The river crossings of the Idle and its tributaries are unsafe, with three cars colliding with the bridge on the B6387 in Gamston over the space of just four months. The bridge at Eaton has been partially demolished by vehicles on two occasions in the past two years. The bridge over the A1 on the B6387 at Doverbottam has been subject to single lane traffic controlled by lights for over a year due to structural weakness. The A1 junction and the slip roads may be improved as part of any development, but not the bridge itself as it is only deemed to support a B road. Looking at national trends, each residential property provides 6 car movements a day per house. So would create serious congestion into Retford, onto the A1 and on to other nearby towns. Over time these car movements will be doubled as most homes have additional cars as families grow up. More preferable to encourage and retain industrial and commercial ventures on the two sites as it</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>would produce many times less small traffic, with much of the large heavy traffic straight onto the A1. The plan refers to other sites have been considered and discounted as Garden Villages. If this were a true consultation, the identity of these discounted sites should not be withheld nor should the reasons for discounting them. The area is rural in nature and all of the surrounding villages also retain a rural feel. It is not possible to retain a rural nature with 4000 houses. It might be better called a new town as a descriptor, the two closest towns namely Retford and Tuxford had just over 9000 and 2000 properties in the 2011 Census. The Council do not hold the remit for school provision. Gamston C of E and Elkesley Primary Schools are near to capacity, but serve their local communities well. Suggested the new Villages would have schools these not be up and running prior the completion of the first phase of 600 properties. So where would the children go. New schools are only authorised when existing demand proves the need for investment and this is assessed at Notts County Council. This is a non political process which only becomes an obligation with certain criteria. In the meantime, the pressure would be on existing facilities. Retford would not be getting an appropriate share of new residential development. Development in Retford is sustainable with existing health facilities and schools. It makes sense to focus new development in urban areas such as Retford and NOT the rural villages. The suggested facilities in the new Villages do not sound congruent with other locally provided new settlements. E.g. the Kings Clipstone Garden Village, does not have the economic, leisure or social facilities outlined and this is a picture across the country. Health facilities in Retford are short of staff. Primary and secondary healthcare and mental health services are struggling to operate e.g. Medical Imaging department in Retford only operates 2 days a week because of shortage of staff. Patients have to</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>travel to Worksop, Doncaster and Sheffield for hospital treatment. Qualified clinical staff prefer to work in the larger hospitals. Bassetlaw hospital has difficulty in recruiting staff. It is one of the smallest hospitals in the country. Modern health workers like to be where the specialisation is, in the larger hospitals. The proposed growth is likely to be older. It is not a good idea to put these people in Eastern and Northern Bassetlaw a long way from main health provision and hospitals.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP232	Elkesley Parish Council	<p>The plan favours a small area of the district with housing, on top of the very large growth figure of 20% that is already identified for the villages already. The key ethos of a garden village is having an area that you live in, that you can walk or take local transport to work, but former ministers and MPs have made it clear that developments on a small scale may struggle to fit in all the community facilities that would be needed make it self-sustaining. Government has also said that the developments will be distinct new places, with their own community facilities, rather than extensions to existing areas. The proposed area is attached to an existing village so is not a distinct new place, and its not large enough to make it self-sustaining like a garden town. Good garden villages are those that have been developed by business to house workers, like Bournville. This proposal does nothing to address the needs of the existing population or those of any new residents - it is not comprehensive and become a ghost village during the day and a sink estate by night. Makes assumptions on behalf of other agencies that it has no control over and is not able to guarantee, for instance: schooling and roads are controlled by NCC. No agreement by NCC to provide services - spending on roads has reduced over the last few years, health services are at breaking point and the NHS are having difficulty getting more surgeries into the area. The availability of hospital cover for children during the evening has been recently withdrawn at Bassetlaw hospital and there are no overnight services. A large housing development should be more evenly spread across the district and close to essential services as possible. "The New Settlement Study" only looked at large scale housing sites, it did not look at any areas in Retford or the surrounding district to supply a smaller quantity of housing spreading more evenly throughout the area? There is no discussion about extending the Shireoakes or Harworth developments. Both developments</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>already have a “broad range of community services and facilities” available and are “strategically well located with good road links to the M1 and A1 via the A57 and good rail links to the wider region”. Both on the north side of the district close to the existing Bassetlaw Hospital and Worksop College, and in easy reach of the main cities of Worksop, Sheffield, Rotherham and Doncaster. Whilst this Plan identifies the need for employment there is no discussion regarding the loss of the skilled jobs within Gamston, or the replacement jobs being industrial. The assumption is that this “will provide local employment opportunities for the new residents as well as existing rural village working age population.” This quote is demeaning and implies that new and existing residents are not skilled workers. Within the local villages there are doctors, teachers, nurses, Members of Parliament, Judges, farmers and more. To say “providing B1c, B2 and B8 uses to meet local demand”, is implying you don’t expect any skilled professionals to live in the area. The range of employment opportunities should be broad enough to cater for professionals and unskilled workers looking for employment. Concerns over the very high volume of houses proposed for both sites and the assumptions that have been made to quantify the proposal. The proposal utilises a brownfield site when currently there are over 400 acres of existing farmland that are still in use and producing crops and employment in the district. BDC has not correctly identified the amount of brownfield and farmland areas, and people have not been able to make an appropriate informed decision on the merits of the proposal. Would like to see the amounts displayed correctly and what cost considerations have been used in order to validate using rural locations for mass housing. This proposal assumes that the people who live on the Garden Villages will either use the A1, work from home or work on site. This is naïve considering the</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>majority of people currently either work in Retford, Worksop and surrounding villages, and not everyone will either work away from Retford or within the garden village area. With a development of this size and in this area, families will have to travel for everything, work, school, supermarkets and social events. It is estimated that from every household there will be 6 journeys per house a total of 6000 per day rising to over 24,000 upon full completion of the development, in addition to the industrial traffic. Over the 17-year period from 2018 that will be a vast number of extra vehicles, using the existing local rural road network and A1 corridor. Do not see any traffic assessment included to support the assumptions that have been made regarding vehicle usage. The proposal only discusses improvements to the highway network including access to the A1 for the use of vehicles, but not how the A1 will be upgraded to support the increased traffic flow. What the timescales are for this and what funding has been identified to complete this. Does not identify which roads on the existing network will be upgraded, over what timescale and what funding has been identified to complete this. Does not identify any agreement with NCC to upgrade these roads. Have concerns over the rural road networks ability to cope with the increased demand, even with a staged approach to development. Currently Brick Yard Road is very low priority for maintenance and floods on a regular basis and gritting is rarely done except in prolonged periods of bad weather. The road doesn't have footpaths or streetlights, and in a world where we are promoting walking and cycling this proposal in its current form does not address these problems. The B6387 between the A1 and Gamston is fairly well maintained, it doesn't have streetlights or pavements until you reach Muttonshire Hill, it's not conducive to promoting walking or cycling. The proposal highlights the requirement for a dedicated pedestrian / Cycle</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>bridge between the two sites, but it does not address the issues of pedestrians or cyclists wanting to leave the site to another location by foot or by bicycle, where pavements or lighting are not available. Would like to answers prior to any agreement to the proposals. Would like a specific pedestrian / cycle bridge from the Gamston airport site to Elkesley to enable families from either side of the A1 to use either facilities safely without having to resort to using a vehicle. There doesn't appear to be any Air pollution data included. Would like to see official data on current Air Quality for the area including a prediction of the air quality based on the average vehicle movements that would be applicable to both sites on development. Air quality in the area at present is higher than the average for Bassetlaw based on BBC data of NO2, and the current Air Quality should be assessed prior to any consultation or development plan being implemented. The proposal indicates that both sites will be treated "holistically" "without the drawback of coalescence" the plan shows the airport directly at the top of Muttonshire Hill, an existing part of Gamston village. Looking closer at the development boundary, the most northern edge of the site would almost meet the existing site on the south side of Ordsall that has previously been earmarked for housing development. Fail to see how this development has not got the "drawback of coalescence". Discusses shared facilities between the Airport and Bevercotes, but not with the existing villages. A holistic approach to housing is good practice, it needs to be done without marginalising the existing villages. Like to see specific proposals and commitment to investment in schooling and other facilities in the existing villages shown. While the proposal identifies that facilities are to be supplied, it lacks substance on the specific facilities and any milestones regarding timescales for supplying them. Local schools have capacity for new children</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>but dependent upon where the housing is situated will determine if it's within walking and/or cycling distance for parents and children. Would like to see a more detailed plan of the sites and clarity of where the housing and facilities are proposed within the sites. Milestones for the supply of any facilities should also be provided. The plan needs looking at in a district-wide holistic manner with appropriate assurances from relevant agencies. The plan needs to address the missing areas, take into consideration the views of local residents and Parish Councils, before being brought out for further consultation.</p>	
DBLP233	Individual	<p>The development of the garden villages should not go ahead. Will have a detrimental effect on the surrounding villages, it will not enhance them. The environmental impact, extra traffic on small country roads will cause numerous problems and cause untold problems for the wildlife. Totally against the proposed development.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP234	Individual	<p>Object to the proposed redevelopment of Retford Gamston Airfield. Local and national government policies are reacting to the increasing need for new homes, especially affordable homes. The political pressure to rectify this housing shortfall should take a balanced approach. The need for employment to support uptake of new houses is equally important. The Airport directly supports approximately 100 skilled jobs. Section 3.2 of claims that this will have a 'relatively limited' economic impact and new jobs will be created within the garden village. This fails to define the type, skill level or numbers of new jobs that would be created, whether permanent or temporary, or what facilities will be created to house the jobs. The national tendency for large supermarkets and the move to on-line shopping indicates that retail is unlikely. Without a clear plan as to how new jobs are to be created and considering the differential in skills, and income, generated from the new jobs then the new plan is simply to destroy jobs in favour of houses. The approach fails to consider that the airport has a wide range of users from students to executives, to aviation businesses. These highly skilled people are the current and future entrepreneurs who are likely to invest and take a risk to generate new employment for others. Removing the airport is likely to result in their move outside of Bassetlaw having a negative economic impact. The destruction of skilled employment to build houses is contradictory to strategic objectives 4 and 6 for economic development and fails to recognise the opportunity the airport presents as a local economic hub. It would remove a vital local and national facility that is impossible to re-create once destroyed. The plan would displace 10 independent businesses and over 50 based aircraft, including business jets and the Children's Air Ambulance, with no alternative accommodation in the area. Has significant flaws and ignores the national requirement to</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>maintain a strategic network of airfields as outlined in NPPF paragraph 104f. It fails to consider “the importance of maintaining business, leisure, training and emergency service needs” and Paragraph 10.3 disregards the locally and nationally significant transport infrastructure provided by the airport. The aims for development at the airport also contradict paragraph 10.5 which seeks to support such opportunities. The plan references the airport site as ‘brownfield’ however planning legislation requires this to be suitable or redundant brownfield land, which as an active airport this is clearly not. Other suitable brownfield land is available for housing development in the local area. The local consultation meeting stated that other airports, such as Scampton, could replace Gamston. This is a fallacy as the closure of other airfields is causing pressure on the few other local airfields. Netherthorpe is too small, Scampton is unlikely to open to General Aviation, and Doncaster is unsuitable due to its scale and Public Transport role. The draft local plan makes a case for local housing need in Worksop (9.7) but does not provide the same level of evidence for Retford. The plan states that Retford has experienced significant housing growth in recent years since 2011, without the need to destroy existing infrastructure. The ‘garden villages’ are to be targeted at Sheffield overspill. This is counter to the documents stated aims and a risky endeavour given the distance from Sheffield. It is likely that commuters living at Retford and working in Sheffield would not be in the ‘affordable housing’ bracket as transport to Sheffield is not easy and costs/travel time is prohibitive. Those willing to travel that distance would be in the minority and not require the scale of development planned. If the aim is for Sheffield overspill, then brownfield sites further north on the A1M at Blyth or Tickhill/Styrrup would likely be more successful. Fails to provide evidence for the scale of development or the viability</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>of the development at Gamston, or Bevercoates. It is also not backed up with a viable economic argument that would generate the needed employment in the area. Gamston represents an opportunity to act as a focus for skilled economic regeneration. Examples of other airfields in the UK and Europe show that airfields can become economic hubs. Gloucester Airport is an example of a thriving UK small airport that is owned by 2 district councils. They have supported the airport and its continued growth over many years which in 2017 was home to around 180 aircraft and 40 aviation-related businesses employing more than 500 people, plus a further 2000 jobs on the adjoining business park. There is enough land available at Gamston to create a larger business park, leisure facilities and further hangars. Expanding the range of businesses at the airport to include a technology centre or similar would make it more attractive and increase economic activity. This in turn would generate more skilled jobs, demand for houses in Retford and retain the airport. The airport would complement and support housing development on its periphery and at Bevercoates.</p>	
DBLP239	Individual	<p>Strongly object to the 2 new garden villages.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● the local rural roads will not manage, anyone driving to Worksop will go through Bothamsall which is used dangerously as a trunk road ● there is major chaos when the A1 shuts due to accidents (which is quite a lot) and traffic is gridlocked in Retford ● concerns over where the new house owners children will go to school. Local schools are already bursting at the seams. ● The same applies for doctors surgery and Bassetlaw Hospital which cannot manage and has a children's ward which is only open in the day and has to ship patients to Doncaster at night. ● there are better locations which could be added onto instead of building new 'villages' - Retford/Ordsall/Worksop ● by building on the airfield you are taking away numerous businesses which 	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>cannot be relocated elsewhere. So taking away people's livelihood • by removing the 'No fly zone' from the current airfield we will be subject to much larger planes and noise pollution as well as major light pollution from these massive new built areas.● the slip roads at twyford bridge are already a major safety hazard, it's not safe to put hundreds more cars a day onto the a1 on those slip roads - there is not adequate slip road to get into the a1.</p>	
DBLP240	Individual	<p>Clear that considerable thought has been put into the plan overall and there are some excellent proposals contained within the draft report. Object in the strongest possible terms to the 'garden village' at Retford (Gamston) Airport. Bevercotes colliery is a better location for housing and would allow the provision of sustainable housing without the adverse impact on nationally significant air transport infrastructure and local businesses that would result from the development of an otherwise thriving regional 'General and Business Aviation' airport. It is possible to achieve a balance between aviation and housing or industrial developments; this can be achieved by building on the land that is not fully used for aviation purposes within the airport curtilage whilst retaining an active airport. Part of the site bounded by a strip of land immediately to the West of runway 03-21 and the disused 1940's airfield perimeter track can easily be developed. This would result in the loss of the smaller crosswind runway but would allow upwards of 99% of air traffic movements to continue, affecting only the smallest of aircraft on a few days each year. The plan shows a lack of awareness of significance of the airport at a local and national level. The loss of approximately 100 highly skilled technical and STEM jobs at the airport site and throughout the region, including flight training, engineering and support services contradicts strategic objectives 4 and 6</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>(economic development). It is understandable that the true scale of economic activity has not been considered because it is likely that only landowners (not tenant businesses will have been notified during the drafting of the plan). Investigate this further see https://www.saveretfordairport.co.uk/#business</p> <p>The plan is misleading in stating that the development uses 'predominantly previously developed land at Gamston Airfield'. It should be noted that the letter and spirit of national planning policy cannot be used to treat all aerodromes and airport sites as easily developable 'brownfield land'. Most of the land is currently undeveloped and in productive agricultural use. The All Party Parliamentary Group for General Aviation has addressed this point - refers to their letter. Does not take into account the requirement to maintain a strategic network of airfields as outlined in NPPF paragraph 104f. This is not referenced in the plan. Do not appear to have considered 'the importance of maintaining business, leisure, training and emergency service needs'. Paragraph 10.3 disregards the locally and nationally significant transport infrastructure provided by the airport. The aims for development at the airport contradict paragraph 10.5 which seeks to support opportunities to retain and create new community and transport infrastructure, facilities and services. This paragraph seeks to improve economic growth in Retford but it is difficult to see how relatively low skilled work in a garden village could compete with employment at the airport in skilled engineering roles and how growth could occur if airport businesses (including the European Headquarters of companies such as Radiola Aerospace, DEA or the flying schools which require an operational runway) are driven away from the area. Other airports across the region are unable to adequately accommodate the business and aviation activity that would be displaced by the proposed 'garden village' including 10</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		independent businesses and over 50 based aircraft including business jets, helicopters and light aircraft. The airport also currently provides a home for a Children's Air Ambulance. Makes a case for local housing need in Worksop (9.7) but does not provide the same level of evidence for Retford. Indeed, the plan states that Retford has already experienced significant housing growth in recent years since 2011, this being without the need to destroy existing infrastructure.	
DBLP241	Individual	I can't beleave you can possibly be serious about your proposal regarding Gamston airfield .Has the world truly gone mad ?	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP242	Individual	<p>Object about the proposal to build houses on and destroy Gamston airport. This proposal if it goes ahead will mean another piece of valuable aviation infrastructure is lost from this country, which is extremely short-sighted and will mean valuable highly skilled jobs will be lost from the Retford area. Once lost these people and skills will be gone from the area . Travel by aircraft quite a lot, in small private aircraft across the country and spending money wherever I visit.....if the airport at Gamston is bulldozed in favour of a "Garden Village " (which is a nonsense term for just new housing estates) this income stream from myself and hundreds of other visitors will be lost to you.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP243	Individual	<p>Object the plans for Gamston airport to be turned into a garden village. Live on the B6387 and know how busy and heavily congested this road can be in particular when the A1 when is closed which is a regular occurrence. The speed limits are often ignored and there have been frequent accidents involving the bridge over the river, one of which only occurred 3 weeks ago. Inviting more traffic onto this road would just be increasing the accident risk, the safety of those who live on the road and the pollution and noise pollution caused by increased traffic. There is a lack of information regarding how it will effect our local services such as policing and healthcare - work locally for the NHS and witness on a daily basis how demand is outwaying the ability to supply. Services are struggling and by increasing the population to the extent proposed can only have a detrimental effect. Understand a GP practice is planned - this does not consider how local hospitals, community health services and policing will be able to cope with such an increase in population. Schooling is a big worry. Understand the development would be completed over a number of years however there are limited places currently at local schools and to accommodate more pupils until the new schools are built</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		would have a negative effect on those childrens' education If the local schools were to expand will lose the benefits of being a rural school. Light pollution would also effect those living near the site including myself. Gamston village is a small, quiet yet adequately served village. By expanding the village on this scale it would lose its identity and rural yet close to town feel which is the reason why I chose to raise my family here. There are more appropriate and less disruptive sites available within the Retford area which would benefit from development rather than destroying a village that does not need or would benefit from more than doubling in size.	
DBLP244	Individual	It would be a shame for the area to lose Gamston Airport which supports not only the airport but a few small businesses with staff from the surrounding area. Gamston airport has been providing a service and businesses for many years and it would be a shame to lose this facility. It is also part of the history of the village. Considering the area around Retford/eaton/gAmston there are other areas to utilise without any businesses having to suffer or close. Each year with the increasing problem during the summertime with mosquitos it is not an ideal Village for families - are increasingly unable to sit outside during the summer months or have windows open without flyscreens in place which is far from ideal for children who maybe susceptible to infection/disease from Bites. The road between the A1 exit and Gamston regularly floods in heavy rainfall with water across the road and is a danger to motorists. There are current issues with the A1 flyover road with constant traffic restrictions and in increasing the number by 1000's of vehicles from the proposed villages would can only increase these problems. Drs surgeries are unable to cope with the number of patients as it is we are unable to get to see a GP and only offered telephone appointments which if far from acceptable. The infrastructure	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>of the area is currently unable to cope and the small road bridges in the villages are constantly being damaged and have weight restrictions so how are these going to be adapted for the increased usage? The A1 slip road is inadequate for exiting the Road without concern for your safety. Would be interested to hear why such a small Village needs to lose the airport and provide such a huge number of houses. There are already numerous housing estates being built by developers in the local area and concerning in that many are shoddy and provide purchasers with constant problems due to poor workmanship and inferior quality products used in their builds! Regularly hear of the homebuyers ongoing problems with large developers such as Harron HOmes, Persimmon group with poor reputations in the area. They have huge profits and bonuses for executives whilst putting profit before purchasers. It would be sensible to provide small builders and self builders with the opportunity to build their own high quality individual dwellings that will enhance the area. With Less Homes being build but far improved in quality it could only be an improvement for buyers and homeowners.</p>	
DBLP245	Individual	<p>Open space should be a prime consideration in the new villages and any new commercial or industrial development which could enhance policies 14, 18 and 19 may be more suited to the new villages. There should be no out of town shopping areas unless they cover both Retofrd and Worksop. If there is a need then a development within the boundary of the new garden village at Gamston would be convenient.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP246	Individual	<p>Gamston has NO local amenities; there is no shop or health facilities. Roads are under-funded and dangerous – 2 cars have been pulled out of the river in the past 6 months alone. Our walk to school includes crossing the main road where vehicles regularly speed past my 8 and 9 year old at 60mph. This is dangerous and an accident waiting to happen. The quiet village road past Gamston Church will have increased traffic as it already is a cut through - there is no way to expand this road. A significant number of new homes within a 2.2km radius will only increase the traffic and the likelihood of severe injury or death to local residents. The main road connecting these 2 new villages to each other and the A1 is in desperate need of repair. The bridge has been reduced to single lane traffic with no intention to repair in sight. This is a Nottinghamshire County Council issue. With that in mind how can the plan suggest it is the developer's responsibility to correct and maintain the infrastructure? Have limited public transport services and these will only decrease with lack of funding. This leaves no choice for residents (old and new) but to drive. Village school (and other local schools) are only a few places off full capacity. To have such a massive increase in families locally will only stretch educational resources further in an area that is working hard to achieve high standards. Nearest health facilities, shops etc are in Retford, Ordsall, Tuxford –have moved into the area knowing this and are happy to NOT have these facilities close to home. Enjoy spending time and money supporting local shop owners in Retford, value their contribution to the community where town centres are dying due to out of town retail and housing. The vitality and future prosperity of the town centre is something that needs addressing NOW and not left to diminish in the future. The environmental impact on our village, its residents and visitors will be huge. Aside from a huge increase in traffic, lacking road systems and general expenses</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>for the maintenance of a heavily used road network valuable farmland will be developed into a concrete jungle for homes. This will impact on waste, flooding, wildlife (hares, stags, partridges, buzzards, hawks are all present) and ALL residents quality of life and that is before discussing the pollution from additional cars, homes, lights etc. Fortunate to have Gamston Airport in our village. The Plan states that one positive outcome will be to reduce aircraft noise. There is currently very limited 'noise' from the airfield. If we lose this valuable local asset the air-space restrictions will be lifted and we will get INCREASED noise from lower flying larger commercial aircraft out of Doncaster. Two garden villages close to each other is ludicrous and does not constitute a 'balanced growth' or 'spreading the population' throughout Bassetlaw. Map on Page 33 clearly shows towns and villages occupy both the northern and southern half of the region with area to the south and east of Worksop and to the east Retford being underdeveloped.</p> <p>Support the proposal of residential dwellings on the old Bevercoates Pit site due to its previous use. Do not support the proposal at Gamston Airport. Fortunate to have a growing industry and a highly skilled workforce present at the airfield in our community. Should be encouraging children and students to strive for such employment opportunities so Bassetlaw can 'lead the way' encouraging and supporting viable businesses for the benefit and future growth of our local economy. Should not be instrumental in closing specialist businesses and diminishing current and future employment opportunities for residents. Why should residents of Bassetlaw only aspire to be employed in low skilled/ low paid roles? Aware there is space around the airfield that can be used for light industrial operations - with the existing infrastructure to the A1 and HGV's not needing to come through the village, this would be the better option. The Plan does not plan for the future,</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>specialist highly skilled industry needs to be encouraged and taken advantage of, as does the expansion of viable businesses (as stated in the Plan) that already occupy the Gamston Airfield site. Having previously lived in a 'Garden Village' have experience of planning and on-going development issues such villages bring. These will become a problem with these Villages. The layout of dwellings and the design of road networks were ill thought through, 90 degree sharp bends, a maze of through-roads and cul-de-sacs. Steep inclines making winter mornings lethal (no council grit service) if you could get off the estate at all. Minimal parking provided and garages build to 70's regulations (modern cars don't fit) means cars, vans, motorhomes, caravans are all forced to park on the narrow roads. This in turn made estate roads single lane traffic. As children born on the estate mature the number of cars per household increase, coupled with children living at home for longer often meant those '2.4 households with 6 journeys per day' ended having at least 4 cars with 18 journeys per day (as no public transport links) and that was before visitors! Our neighbours in a 5 bed house actually had 7 cars, 5 of which parked on the road! Facilities promised in original plans - shop/pub/community centre/nursery/ play-parks/ Doctor etc never materialised. 10+ years on residents are still fighting for a basic play-park due to developers arguing that it isn't their responsibility even though it was in initial planning documentation. Do not be naïve that the plans will not be changed. Light industrial units were scrapped in favour of more housing and amenities (which still haven't materialised). Residents use health services in neighbouring villages (which are full). The improved education did not materialise with locals travelling between 2 and 15 miles in a car to other provisions. Some 15+ years after phase 1 the local parish council continues to address the roads appear to be too narrow</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>and of unsuitable layout (90° bends) to allow for safe access of emergency services and utilities, No bus stops. The whole of Cavendish Estate still only has one access route. Emergency services may not be able to reach the estate. Still no amenities such as shops, schools etc have been added to the plans. The open space with play park needs better access. The plans show several properties with only one car parking space. Without suitable connection to public transport residents are likely to be relying on more than one car per household. Any surplus vehicles would be parked on the road adding to car parking and emergency access problems. For 3 years battled to get a broadband provider as local telephone exchanges were at capacity. This meant our exchange was some miles away and broadband speeds under 0.5mbps which under current legislation meant no one would provide to us. It took complaints to Communications Ombudsman to start the ball rolling. Emergency services struggle to get onto the estate due to lay out and parked cars. There is only one entry/exit point meaning it can effectively be cut off. Due to the intrinsic nature of the development locals felt pushed out as their prime leisure and dog walking areas were built upon. Green spaces incorporated into the design are affectively used for dog fouling. There is still very much an 'US and THEM' feel and the development lacked any community feel. Many people didn't know neighbours as it was and still is a commuter village (town). Immediate local economy provides a high proportion of low skilled low paid work and so prices the 'locals' out. Due to most households commuting many residents choose to spend their money in areas nearer their work place (for example food/ leisure shopping). Only need to look at the decline of Mansfield Town centre to acknowledge this.</p> <p>Such a large percentage of households commuting has left the area like a 'ghost town' for the majority of the day, a race track</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>from 5pm onwards and a car park at the evenings and weekends. This makes it unsafe for children to 'play out'. Leisure time is also more diverse, using local country parks to dog-walk but spending money on days out further afield – Sheffield, Birmingham, Nottingham, Chesterfield etc.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP247	Individual	Object to the proposed closure of Gamston Airport. The Local Plan refers to Gamston Airport as a brownfield site. Such sites are old redundant, former industrial areas. Gamston Airport is certainly not in this category. It also grossly underestimates the scope and type of employment at Gamston Airport. It also disregards the government's desire to support general aviation.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP248	Individual	Objection to the plan involving the building of houses on the Gamston Airport. The Airport is a solid source of revenue and jobs for local people as well as offering transport options bringing in much needed outside investment. Trust you will reject any plans for projected building that will negatively affect this valuable resource	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP249	Individual	Development as total inappropriate completely destroying the small airport and completely ruining the small village of gamston. Putting this into perspective gamston has at the moment less than 80 homes but the plans are giving figures of 4000 new homes to be built. Completely out of proportion ! The infrastructure even with the new development will add great strain on the road network and destroy the lovely village atmosphere I enjoy being a gamston resident, indeed my grandparents and great grandparents lived and loved this village and am appalled that Bassetlaw could even contemplate such a devement. Not against a percentage increase in housing around the village but a increase of 4000 homes on a village of less than 80 is completely wrong !	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP250	Gamston with West Drayton and Eaton Parish Council	<p>Gamston with West Drayton and Eaton Parish Council conclude that they are unanimously opposed to the plan in its current form. The plan doubles the population of a rural area. Question why the sites have been selected, from a number of possibilities, to take forward the plans for residential development to meet the needs of a growing population. The selection criteria for the sites are not transparent and not helpful. The Council recognise and accept the need to develop housing and related services for a growing population but they are unsure why this plan has been presented on such a scale as they are aware that the Council is 7.9 years ahead of its building needs. Given the high levels of deprivation in Worksop, and places like Harworth and Bircotes, it would make sense to divert scarce economic resources away from a dubious proposal, such as the one at Gamston Airport and surrounding rural villages, to housing and economic developments in deprived areas. Although Gamston airfield is officially designated a brownfield site, its current usage and location seems more relevant to concerns that one might have were it designated a greenfield site, especially when you compare it with the former Bevercotes Colliery. Development at Bevercotes would be more acceptable than at Gamston. Concerns around the impact of such a development on Gamston itself, not least - given the ambitious target figures for new housing on the site - on the road infrastructure and the impact on surrounding villages. The Plan refers to sustainable economic development as part of the overall vision for Gamston but is short on detail as to what precise economic developments might be and what impact such developments might have on the local infrastructure. The direct carbon cost of building new homes is the start of the impact on the local environment. New homes need maintaining, as does the infrastructure associated with them: streets, lighting,</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>electricity, sewers, gas and telecommunications etc. New houses are likely to increase the amount of car transport and they can destroy the surrounding valuable countryside or wildlife rich brownfield sites and rural areas. The local plan will destroy nationally important aviation infrastructure leading to the loss of advanced technology and engineering businesses and pilot training. It will leave the Children's Air Ambulance without a base in the Retford area and will result in the loss of approximately 100 highly skilled jobs. Understand the ethos of a Garden Village that embraces the ability to live and work without the need for anything more than local transport which is self-sustaining and environmentally responsive. The plan is too large for the proposed area and is attached to the end of an existing village, similar developments have failed in their aspirations of community and resulted in ghost towns, poorly designed and creating multiple and complex environmental and social problems for residents. The "New Settlement Study" only looked at large scale housing sites, alternative options exist by exploring areas of Retford that could be developed on a smaller scale, where their impact on the existing infrastructure would be of no real consequence. Retford offers access to rail connections and removes the further need for people to use, in particular the A1 road and its feeder network in order to shop and work etc. The roads around the Gamston are not suitable for heavy and sustained traffic. Residential properties create a greater burden of car usage i.e. approx. 6 journeys per day per property. Gamston and the Bevercotes would be more suitable for industrial development and the housing needs met elsewhere.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP251	Individual	Support the creation of the two new villages and support a larger number of houses being built on these sites as opposed to the numbers being put forward for Worksop and Retford.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP252	Individual	As a part-owner of a thriving limited company based at Retford (Gamston) Airport, strongly object to the inclusion of Retford Gamston Airport in the Bassetlaw Draft Plan. Section 3.2, Results of the Bassetlaw New Settlement Study Methodology relative to Gamston Airport states: "The single significant negative effect relates to the loss of employment land through cessation of airport operations. However, the scale of employment opportunities is likely to be relatively limited" There are roughly one hundred, often highly skilled jobs provided at the airport, either directly by the airport or on-site cafe (Gamston Aviation), five Approved Training Organisations (ATOs) and Declared Training Organisations (DTOs) which provide training towards European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) standards and other specialised aviation related businesses including the children's air ambulance. Many of these businesses provide employment in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) roles directly. Para 12.9 of the Plan states: "Whilst development of the site would result in a loss of airport related employment the new village would provide opportunities for new employment" All current businesses at the airport are very specialised and require an airport site to operate from. Other airports across the region are unable to adequately accommodate the business and aviation activity that would be displaced by the proposed	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>'garden village'. Many other airfields would also be effected as multiple local airfields provide maintenance facilities that Gamston-based aircraft use. The Plan underestimates both the scale of potential job losses and the value of the airport in providing highly specialised services to the local and national economy. There is also a contradiction as the Visions and Objectives states: "Facilitating development opportunities that will enhance Bassetlaw's economy through the delivery of new and the expansion of existing enterprises, providing jobs across urban and rural Bassetlaw." Para 3.2 makes clear: "In order for the Bassetlaw Plan to be successfully developed and adopted, it will need to be in conformity with the NPPF" The NPPF 104(f) requires planning policies should: "recognise the importance of maintaining a national network of general aviation airfields, and their need to adapt and change over time – taking into account their economic value in serving business, leisure, training and emergency service needs, and the Government's General Aviation Strategy." It is clear that the Draft Plan is not taking this in to account and is not in conformity with the NPPF and is wrong to consider the airport as "inefficient use of land" (12.10). Look elsewhere at poorly-utilised land (such as the Bevercotes site) redevelopment of which will not effect existing business and operations.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP253	Branton Knight Ltd	<p>Section 3.2 Results of the Bassetlaw New Settlement Study Methodology relative to Gamston Airport states that:- “The single significant negative effect relates to the loss of employment land through cessation of airport operations. However, the scale of employment opportunities is likely to be relatively limited” Most disturbing that the loss of employment on the Gamston Airport site is passed off so flippantly without any corroborating evidence or supporting statement of facts as to how many jobs would be lost or what businesses would be affected. Paragraph 12.9 of the Plan states:- “Whilst development of the site would result in a loss of airport related employment the new village would provide opportunities for new employment” And no attempt to quantify the job losses, or potential gains, from any redevelopment of the airport site. How many of the planning department staff have visited Gamston Airport to find out exactly what happens there? How many of the elected members and Planning Committee members have visited? It is not just about a handful of jobs but 10 businesses that could be forced to close because they are all aviation industry related companies. Sets out details of 13 businesses/operations operating on the airport site including specialist engineering firms, flying schools, maintenance contractors, Childrens Air Ambulance, café and the airport itself. Only the first 2 itemised have direct employees of the current owner of the airport, Gamston Aviation Ltd. All have invested time and effort of their owners and staff to start the businesses and grow them but in most cases also the funding of investments in both onsite infrastructure and aircraft. There is around 100 jobs that will be lost with 10 separate independent businesses having to be wound up in addition to Gamston Aviation Ltd, and another, Dukeries Aviation Ltd, that will have its business severely adversely affected. Airport is also used by Nottinghamshire Police between 12 and 15 times per</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>annum for driver training in TPAC (Tactical Pursuit And Containment) on the little used runway designated 14 / 32. The draft plan mentions that 17,000 people from Bassetlaw commute daily for work to such as Sheffield, Doncaster, Newark and the surrounding areas. Strongly encourage the Council to look at all the tangible benefits of preserving Gamston Airport, to retain the existing businesses and employment but also for it to continue to provide a strategic resource to Bassetlaw to help attract new businesses to the area. Without a large influx of new businesses to provide employment for people locally then building thousands of new houses will achieve is to vastly increase the number of commuters out of Bassetlaw providing a limited contribution to the local economy as well as creating more road traffic and so mitigating any efforts made to reduce carbon emissions and limit the environmental impact. Paragraph 3.2 states that:-“In order for the Bassetlaw Plan to be successfully developed and adopted, it will need to be in conformity with the NPPF” but has failed to provide any mention of, and therefore no consideration to, NPPF Paragraph 104(f) which requires Planning Policies should:- “recognise the importance of maintaining a national network of general aviation airfields, and their need to adapt and change over time – taking into account their economic value in serving business, leisure, training and emergency service needs, and the Government’s General Aviation Strategy.” The Council has not evidenced that it has fulfilled its duty under the NPPF, in fact quite the contrary relative to paragraph 104 f). Suggest look at the Government’s General Aviation Strategy and information from the All Party Parliamentary Group for General Aviation, especially the Airfields Working Group, Two of the fundamental issues that the APPG are working to address are those of adequate and cost effective pilot training in the UK and the fact</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>that aviation is at the heart of high-tech jobs and skills and so is promoting STEM jobs through General Aviation. Boeing experts predict, that an additional 800,000 pilots will be required worldwide within the next 20 years. Because of a more advantageous tax regime towards flight training in Spain, and a much more proactive approach to General Aviation in the USA, a high proportion of pilot training is being drawn outside of the UK which needs to be addressed. There is also a national shortage of flying instructors as well as pilots and yet the Plan, will wipe out 5 pilot / flight training schools. These cannot be relocated because they require an airfield and other airfields already have established flying / pilot training schools. The airfield is also home to several High-Tech Businesses & Jobs including DEA Aviation Ltd operate and maintain a fleet of 10 “Special Mission” aircraft providing services to the UK Government and European Agencies, some of which are related to national security. DEA Aviation Ltd has invested heavily in its Gamston Airport operations in order to be prepared to keep pace with the future growth potential within the Airborne ISR market. Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd provide flight inspection and validation services, navigational aids and communications equipment as well as airfield lighting systems, all to both civilian and military customers worldwide. The closure of the airfield will see the demise of two very high-tech companies and the loss of high-tech jobs and overall loss to the local economy. Pektron Group Ltd will be forced to relocate their 3 aircraft out of Gamston – who use it to fly staff and customers to their base in Derby. Another high-tech growth business would be forced out of Bassetlaw.</p> <p>As well as having a large acreage of productive arable agricultural land how can it be possibly be deemed to be an “inefficient use of land” (12.10 of draft plan). It is disappointing that the Council is using the provisions of what is seen as</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>flawed legislation that allows a wider airfield / airport site, irrespective of its additional use as agricultural land, to be considered in its entirety as ‘Brownfield’. Natural England are a statutory consultee on plans that are likely to cause the loss of 20 hectares or more of BMV (Best & Most Versatile) land.</p> <p>There is around 96 hectares (238 acres) of land in continual use, within the wider Airport site, for productive arable farming. P 49 of the NPPF states that:-“Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality.” The ALC map for the East Midlands Region shows that the agricultural land is a mix of Grade 2 and 3. Grade 2 being Very Good and Grade 3 being Good to Moderate. Having contacted Natural England note that the Council has consulted Natural England but not early enough for their comments to be available before the Plan was published.</p> <p>The Council should take due account of several airfields that have been retained e.g. Wellesbourne Airfield ~ Stratford-on-Avon, Wolverhampton Halfpenny Green Airfield, Redhill Airfield - Reigate & Banstead Borough Council, Welshpool, Powys - attracts a wide range business aircraft & visitors but they are encouraged by both the airport and the local authority having seen the benefits. It actively promotes the town, local amenities (accommodation, dining, car hire, cycle hire & taxis) as well as the region of Mid Wales - an integral part of the “Rural Hub – similar to the plan for Retford, Sywell Aerodrome in Northamptonshire. With the right management, and the right local authority attitude then General Aviation airfields can, and do, thrive and provide numerous advantages to the local existing business community as well as providing a wide range of jobs from catering to high-tech airframe and avionics engineers.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP254	Individual	<p>Object strongly to the building proposal on Gamston Airfield. There is already substantial building works proposed at the Bevercotes pit site. The removal of Gamston airfield doubles the land site for residential and commercial residences. The area is also a designated no fly zone for Doncaster Airport. The cessation of Gamston current flights would open the potential for polluting and disruptive passenger airliners. This directly impacts the health of all new and current residents of the local area. If there are to be new residential developments, why allow polluting vehicle traffic directly overhead? The area is not big enough to sustain the proposed developments when coupled with Bevercotes. The road infrastructure is primarily rural with poor condition and size roads for the dramatic increase in vehicular traffic. This applies to passenger vehicles but more appropriately to the extra demands with commercial deliveries including passage of HGV, articulated lorries.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP256	Gamston Flight Training	<p>Strong objection to the proposed development at Gamston Airport. Shocked to find that BDC were considering closing Gamston Airport to build a housing estate. Gamston is a General Aviation facility and is an award winning airport famous for its high standards of service to the GA community, throughout the UK but also Europe. It is a major asset to the local area and lifts the local areas profile significantly. Apart from the many commercial and private movements of aircraft and people, Gamston Airport is a large training base for Private and Commercial pilots. Operated from Gamston for 15 years and from my school carry out training and examining of all levels of pilots from private to commercial. Work for, and on behalf of, the Civil Aviation Authority examining our future airline pilots and have many qualified private and commercial pilots come for their annual revalidation of their licences. From a pilots point of view it's a great airport to operate from. From my point of view it's a great place to work, with very few other UK GA airfields that tick all the boxes that Gamston does.</p> <p>Gamston Airport fills a training/testing requirement that other larger airports cannot meet. Doncaster for example, will not accept training flights for months because of reaching capacity. At Gamston there has been an application with the CAA for almost 3 years for GPS approaches approval which is close to being implemented. This will be a huge asset as well as taking the strain off Doncaster and Humberside Airports. At the moment am obliged to fly to either Blackpool or Liverpool to the west, or Gloucester or Cambridge to the south to complete revalidation flight tests, where only part can be completed at Gamston. The local major airports ie: East Midlands, Doncaster, Humberside, Leeds Bradford, do not have this facility. Once the change is implemented, such Flight Examinations can all be carried out at Gamston. From a cost and environmental point of view, this change will be major - and will place Gamston</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>Airport at the forefront in UK GA airports. There are a number of companies based at Gamston that carry out important work, from medical transplant flights to military contracts. An important development for us that has been approved by the airport management, is the acquisition of a Spitfire which took part in the Battle of Britain and is being restored at Biggin Hill. The restoration is due to be completed and the Spitfire positioned at Gamston Airport in January next year. The cost is £3.2M, a serious investment. This would be a major lift for the profile of the airport and the local area, attracting many visitors from all over the world. Because of the proposed closure, the investors are having second thoughts about basing at Gamston, without some assurance the Airport has a future.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP257	Individual	<p>The plan to create two new large ‘garden villages’ adjacent to each other in rural Bassetlaw, is not the correct way forward. Strategic Objective 1 in relation to ‘the Bassetlaw Plan Vision’ is to ‘manage the scale and location of development to support a balanced pattern of growth across urban and rural areas’ (6.13 page 36). Two new ‘garden villages’ adjacent to each other surrounded by tiny villages and hamlets will contradict this objective and could potentially result in an urban development built in a rural area but without any improved facilities, as has already happened in other areas across the UK. Page 73 seems intent on achieving this ‘dream’ of building the garden villages as it states that, ‘Worksop has not met its housing requirement since the Core Strategy was adopted, it is considered appropriate to reduce the town’s requirement to 1600 (24%) as a percentage of the overall delivery. This is still a significant proportion of the requirement but it recognises that there is a need to support the delivery of a new settlement and rural communities in the delivery of housing’. In other words, building in the town is being reduced to make way for swallowing up our Nottinghamshire countryside, which is not acceptable. Table 7 The Neighbourhood Area Housing Requirement & Supply for 2018 to 2035 shows a requirement of only 24 new houses in the villages of Gamston, West Drayton and Eaton and 8 in Markham, Clinton, Bevercotes and Milton, which is classed as rural Bassetlaw, so why should these villages have to have an additional 1,000 new houses built in a large development amongst them? Even the town of Retford will only provide another 853 houses in this timescale! The Plan calculates that there will be a requirement across the WHOLE of Bassetlaw for 390 dwellings per annum for the plan period. This methodology is flawed because the calculations are based on figures from 2017 to 2018 when many more houses were built than in previous years, so is this a true</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>reflection of the actual requirement or should the calculations have been based on a longer period of time? Surely the population of Bassetlaw is not expanding that rapidly and these new houses must be to accommodate people coming from outside the area. Bassetlaw have exceeded the requirement for new housing and are 7.9 years ahead of building needs.</p> <p>Strategic objective 6 is to 'Promote rural Bassetlaw as a living and working landscape, where new development responds to local needs and opportunities, and protects the intrinsic character of the countryside'. This demand is not local and two new urban developments or garden villages will not protect the intrinsic character of the countryside but seriously detract from it. Policy 12 sounds unrealistic and reminiscent of the vision in the late 1950's and early 1960's for the Park Hill flats in Sheffield and look what happened there! Desperate need and high ambition created a long-term nightmare for residents for years to come. The B6387 is subject to flooding every winter in the location of the fishing ponds that were the result of subsidence a few years ago. Retford cannot cope with the amount of traffic coming through as there are regularly queues to get around the town and that will only get worse if the new development goes ahead. The access on to the A1 at Twyford Bridge is extremely dangerous and would require major work to cope with the extra traffic. How will this infrastructure be funded? Developers will not want to soak up their profits on carrying out this work and the Community Infrastructure Levy won't cover the additional expense. Air pollution will increase. It is high due to the proximity of the A1 but with possibly 12,000 extra vehicles (allowing for three per house), this will be much worse. Light pollution will increase due to all the additional streetlights, illuminated street signs etc. The Daily Mail 11th February 2019 that 'Light pollution is affecting 'more than half' of key wildlife areas causing disruption to plants and</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>animals' natural cycles'. The report stated that this will get worse with continued economic development. This must be a good reason to restrict any future development to already illuminated areas such as towns or larger conurbations rather than amongst small villages whose street lamps are turned off at night. There will be a lack of employment in the area. By closing the airfield jobs will be lost. Once the building work has been completed, the villages will not be self-sufficient but reliant upon commuting for employment. The study acknowledges this by stating that it expects a number of the new residents will actually be working from home. A massive assumption! The crime rate will increase and will not have any extra police to deal with it. The Office for National Statistics reports that the crime rate in Nottinghamshire increased by 11% in the year to September 2018 in comparison to the National Crime rate which only rose by 7%. The new development will only add to that further. The proposal will include a medical centre and pharmacy but the hospitals will not be able to cope with the growing population. The proposals include a lot of assumptions regarding the infrastructure. It seems to think that the lives of the existing residents will be improved by this development and will be doing us a favour by 'supporting rural communities'. Residents moved to this rural conservation village without any facilities, for a reason and it wasn't to be surrounded by a new housing estate, higher crime rate, higher pollution levels, lack of employment opportunities and much busier roads. There are alternatives: The idea of expanding present rural service centres (for example Tuxford which has a number of shops and facilities), although not ideal, would make more sense than building new towns from scratch. At least some of the facilities would be there already and could be improved and built upon. The proposed North Nottinghamshire Garden Community would provide 1000 new</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>houses before 2035. It would be more balanced to spread these out between the other four spatial strategy strands of Worksop, Retford, Harworth and Bircotes and Rural Bassetlaw. Redevelop the site at Cottam Power station when that closes in September. Bassetlaw is well ahead of fulfilling the housing requirement, so what's the rush?</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP257	Individual	<p>The New Settlement Study is a desktop study based on data available from the Internet. Google maps were utilised which are now well out of date, hence some of the information gleaned is incorrect and the study is misleading. Policy 12 states 'The main objective (of the study) was to identify land for housing purposes which could form an independent settlement without the drawback of coalescence with existing settlements'. This statement is contradictory, as part of the reason for an area being put forward as suitable for development by the study was that it had some amenities in close proximity that could be utilised by residents of the new settlement! Page 10 of the study deals with environmental and landscape considerations and states that, 'It will also be important that the size and scale of any new settlement respects the relationship with existing settlements and to avoid coalescence and negative impacts on existing communities'. So how does this sit with building 'North Nottinghamshire Garden Community', a large housing estate the size of a small town, only 500 metres away from Gamston conservation village? Gamston village has only 246 inhabitants at the last census and is surrounded by farmland and open fields with the River Idle flowing through it. The only amenity is the school which is at full capacity. The village is quiet and is the reason for people choosing to live there. The operational airfield with its significant wartime history is good for the local economy, by providing jobs and attracting visitors from other parts of the UK and Europe, many use the hotels and restaurants in the surrounding towns and villages. The airfield would be closed if the proposed development goes ahead. The study links Gamston with the neighbouring village of Elkesley, being within 800 m of the proposed site, but on opposite sides of the A1. It awards them points towards the proposed development stating that when combined, they provide 'excellent access to</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>existing primary services' of two primary schools, a shop, PO, medical centre and pharmacy. In reality, there is NO medical centre or pharmacy and the PO is situated within Elkesley Memorial Hall and only open for two afternoons per week! The Sustainability Appraisal Appendix 5 page 381, also states there are a number of recreational/ sports facilities within 800 m of Gamston Airfield. There are not! When describing the reasons for Gamston Airfield being selected, the study also states that 'No heritage assets are located on or in close proximity to the site' (page 35). There are a number of listed buildings in Gamston conservation village; the main one being the Grade 1 listed St Peters Church. This will be in direct line of sight of the proposed development, which according to the detailed assessment will be 500 m from the village. There were initially six possible locations identified for the proposed garden villages but three were discounted by the study following the Sustainability Appraisal. Some of these were discounted due to negatives in relation to public transport and proximity to heritage sites and also that they were greenfield. In relation to public transport, Gamston airfield had similar distances and facilities and is only 500 m from the conservation village and Grade 1 listed church. Appears that the reason for the airfield being selected is that it is brownfield. In relation to the runway, hangars and associated buildings this is correct, but a large area of this site is ALC Grade 2 agricultural land and should be greenfield. The study is factually incorrect, very misleading and appears biased towards proposing Gamston Airfield as a suitable site by using a play on words and making the information fit. It would seem that the decision has already been made to develop the adjoining sites, and that the residents of Gamston and the surrounding villages will be bullied into accepting the proposal. If the villages go ahead there needs to be more emphasis on the infrastructure</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan– Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>surrounding them which will need massive improvements including new roads to by-pass the existing villages. Gamston Airfield scored well in the study in relation to the road network, but the information was incorrect, describing the B6387, Ollerton Road as a dual carriageway (page 77, table 4.4.3.1), when actually it is a narrow road with sharp bends, at least three of which are 90 degrees. There is a very narrow bridge on one of these bends (Muttonshire Hill junction with Rectory Lane) and this has been the location of many road traffic collisions. This is the main road that the village will emerge onto and is the main road into Retford from the airfield, running directly through the village of Gamston. (Carlton in Lindrick was discounted from development because access to the site was from the A60 that travels through the conservation village into Worksop). Double standards!</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP259	Historic England	<p>it is not clear how the draft Plan is consistent with its own policies in terms of Chapter 16 text and associated Policy 21 in respect of Chapter 12 North Nottinghamshire Garden Villages and draft Policy 12 relating to the proposed garden villages at Gamston Airport and the former Bevercotes Colliery site. Chapter 16 and draft Policy 21 set out requirements for the consideration of non-designated heritage assets, which potentially exist on both sites, yet the evidence base information contained in the 2018 Settlement Study and Sustainability Appraisal methodology don't make any reference to these. Gamston Airfield is a former World War Two and Cold War military airfield, now a civil airport. It functioned as a military airfield between 1942 and 1945, and was reopened between 1953 and 1957. The wartime airfield was provided with three tarmac and concrete runways, heavy bomber hard standings, four type T2 and one type B1 aircraft hangar. There was temporary accommodation for the base personnel. Initially it was used as a satellite for training crews based at Ossington (14 pilots Advanced Flying Unit) and later it was an operational bomber base, used by 82 (subsequently renumbered as 86) Operational Training Unit, 93 Group Disposal Unit, 3 Aircrew School and 30 Operational Training Unit. From July 1945 it was used as the main resettlement camp for repatriating Royal Australian Air Force personnel. After a Hiatus in activity it reopened in 1953 as a satellite base for military jet aircraft. After the military left in 1957, the airfield was used as a motor racing circuit and for agriculture. Are aware that in 2001 a number of wartime military buildings including the control tower as well the runways and part of the perimeter track were said to still be extant and aerial imagery indicates that some elements may still be in place. The Bevercotes Colliery was developed between 1953-8, and included the construction of a model Koepe winding system</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>with twin concrete winding towers. Was one of the deepest coal mines in Britain, working to a depth in excess of 1000m. It is not clear whether the towers remain at the site or not but, notwithstanding that issue, there is the potential for non-designated industrial related heritage at the site since we understand the site has not been remediated. It is unclear from the 2018 Settlement Study Tables 2.1 and 2.2 how non-designated heritage assets have been considered with since there is no reference to them. Furthermore, Page 33 of the Sustainability Appraisal methodology accounts for designated heritage assets only. The study sets out that for both sites 'no heritage assets are located on or in close proximity to the site'. Since both sites have the potential for containing non-designated heritage relating to previous uses it would be expected that the study information would include information and assessment of this matter. Without such information it is not clear how non-designated heritage assets have been considered as part of the Plan process in respect of the two garden village sites. It is not clear whether there should be additional criteria required as part of Policy 12 in respect of the historic environment informing any masterplans for the sites - Policy 12 Part 1b refers to local man-made and natural heritage only.</p>	
DBLP260	Individual	<p>Object to the plan to build housing on the site of Gamston Airport and the adjacent land. The Airport is a valuable asset for the community and supports a considerable number of jobs. The closure of the Airport would result in a long term loss to the local economy. The area to the west of the Runway is actively farmed. Bassetlaw should be proud of this valuable local asset and must do everything possible to support its long term survival for the good of the community.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP261	On behalf of All Saints Parochial Church Council, Eaton and Gamston	<p>Find the suggestion that the site is currently underused and the land use is ineffective wholly false. The airport supports on average 16 flights per day, is home to a flying school and employs many highly skilled local residents. The classification as a brown field site in its entirety is a misleading as the airport only utilises approximately 25% of the site with the rest being laid to productive farm land producing arable crops. The suggestion of building in two phases a total of 2500 homes would lead to the loss of this facility, the highly skilled employment opportunities and productive farmland. If the building of this many homes were to be allowed, it would appear that no thorough assessment has taken place in terms of road capacity and road safety as this falls to the responsibility of the county council and highways England in relation to the A1. The characteristics of the roads connecting Eaton and Gamston, the surrounding villages and smaller settlements are not constructed to a modern standard conducive to modern vehicles and driving. This is evidenced through many fatal crashes over just a few years. The river crossings of the Idle and its tributaries are unsafe, with three cars colliding with the bridge on the B6387 in Gamston over four months. The bridge at Eaton has been partially demolished by vehicles on two occasions in the past two years. The bridge over the A1 on the B6387 at Dovrbottam has been subject to single lane traffic controlled by lights for over a year due to its structural weakness. This junction and the slip roads may be improved as part of any development, but not the bridge as it is only supports a B road. Each property provides 6 car movements a day per house. So the "Garden Villages" would create serious congestion into Retford, onto the A1 and to other nearby towns. Over time these car movements will be doubled as most homes have additional cars as families grow up. It would seem preferable to encourage and retain industrial</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>and commercial ventures on the two sites as it would produce less small traffic, with much of the large heavy traffic would be straight out onto the A1. The draft plan refers to other sites have been considered and discounted. If this were a true consultation, the identity should not to withheld nor should the reasons for discounting them. The area is rural in nature and all of the surrounding villages retain a rural feel. It is not possible to retain a rural nature with 4000 houses. It might be better called a new town, the two closest towns namely Retford and Tuxford had just over 9000 and 2000 properties respectively in the 2011 Census. The Council do not hold the remit for school provision. Gamston C of E and Elkesley Primary Schools are near to capacity, but serve their local communities well. Whilst the new Garden would have their own schools, it is not envisaged that these would be up and running prior the completion of the first phase of 600 properties. So where would these children go. New schools are only authorised when existing demand proves the need for investment and this is assessed at Notts County Council. This is a non political process which only becomes an obligation with certain criteria. In the meantime, the pressure would be on the existing facilities. It would appear that Retford would not be getting an appropriate share of new residential development.</p> <p>Development in Retford is sustainable with existing health facilities and schools. It makes sense to focus new development in urban areas such as Retford and NOT the rural villages. The suggested facilities in the new Villages do not sound congruent with other locally provided new settlements. For example, the Kings Clipstone Garden Village, does not have the economic, leisure or social facilities outlined and this is a picture across the country. Health facilities in Retford are short of staff. Both primary, secondary healthcare and mental health services are struggling to operate e.g. the Medical Imaging</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>department in Retford only operates 2 days a week because of shortage of staff. Patients have to travel to Worksop, Doncaster and Sheffield for hospital treatment. Qualified clinical staff prefer to work in the larger hospitals. Bassetlaw hospital has difficulty in recruiting staff. It is one of the smallest hospitals in the country. Modern health workers like to be where the specialisation is, in the larger hospitals. The proposed growth as a consequence of these Garden Villages is likely to be older. It is not a good idea to put these people in Eastern and Northern Bassetlaw a long way from main health provision and hospitals.</p>	
DBLP262	Anglian Water Services Ltd	<p>Note that it proposed to develop two new garden villages with further residential development anticipated beyond the plan period. The scale and timing of development proposed should be aligned with the provision of suitable water supply infrastructure and the anticipated timing of delivery of this infrastructure.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP263	Individual	<p>Object to the proposed 'garden village' at Gamston Airfield. The sole criteria for locating the garden village on Gamston Airfield is that this land would "accommodate at least 1000 homes" (section 12.2). There is insufficient evidence in the Plan of a detailed analysis of the impact of the proposed 'village' on the existing communities that are most affected (Gamston and Eaton), and on the surrounding infrastructure. Have serious concerns about the increase in traffic through Eaton. The narrow, single-file bridge has been damaged by vehicles twice in the past two years. In January 2018 it was closed for 4 weeks for repairs causing significant disruption to residents, and we are waiting to find out how long it will be closed for repairs following the latest incident which resulted in a vehicle crashing through the bridge wall and ending up in the river. The bridge is not built for the volume of traffic that exits the A1 at Elkesley, travels down Jockey Lane and through Eaton towards Retford, or that travels through the village to and from Ordsall. Recent counts of traffic through Eaton show an average of 113 vehicles travelling through the village between 8 - 9am, and 117 between 4 - 5pm. Any increase in traffic from the proposed 'garden village' will further exacerbate the problem, particularly given that the Eaton side of Ordsall is expected to expand by a further 1000 houses. Not only is the bridge unsuitable for the volume of traffic, but the road through the village. There are no footpaths alongside the road, and with vehicles often parked alongside it, pedestrians have no choice but to walk into the path of the traffic. Do not allow my children to walk unaccompanied through the village for fear of an accident. As a governor at Gamston CofE Primary School, am concerned about the impact of a new school being built in the 'garden village'. The school has the villages of Gamston, Eaton, Rockley and West Drayton as its catchment, yet an gaining population means that there are not enough primary school</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>aged children in those villages to make the school viable, so it relies on children coming to it from outside catchment (out of its Pupil Admission Number of 14, only 1 or 2 children each year live in catchment). If another school were to open in the area, this brand new school would attract children away from Gamston School and render it unviable. It is currently operating with 99 children, and in 2017-18 had an in-year deficit of £47.7k due to rising staffing costs. In order to reduce staffing costs, in September the governors decided to replace the full-time head with an executive head shared across 3 schools, but any reduction in pupil numbers, and GAG funding, will severely impact its finances. If the 'garden village' were to be built, it would be better to expand the existing school (there is sufficient space on site for additional classrooms and parking) and ensure its future. Concerned about inaccurate facts and assumptions in the plan. It states that Gamston Airfield is in a "highly prominent location adjacent to the A1(M)" (page 93). This is inaccurate as the A1 has not been upgraded to motorway status in this area. The statements about Gamston Airport are inaccurate states that "It is currently a small scale commercial enterprise that serves the needs of local businesses". Publicly available information shows that there are 10 independent businesses based at the airport, some of which have UK and Europe-wide aviation-related contracts. The plan would lead to the direct loss of highly skilled technical jobs, but there is no evidence in the plan to demonstrate the type or amount of employment that would be created by the 'garden village' to replace this. Will have an adverse impact on the local environment and ecology. Few people have access to the airfield means that is a haven for a variety of wildlife, including deer. The run-off will likely have an impact on the residents of Gamston, with the river Idle already causing occasional flooding in the area. Current agricultural land will be</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>lost for the development. Unclear where the residents of the ‘garden village’ are expected to work. With the closure of Cottam power station and uncertainty over the future of Rampton Hospital, two of the major employers in the area, there are not enough existing opportunities for employment to sustain a population growth of this size. The largest employing city in the area is Sheffield, so housing developments to the west of Bassetlaw, closer to the road and rail networks that link the district to Sheffield, would be more appropriate. The airport and associated businesses should remain, the Council should invest in the business and industrial section of the airfield to generate additional employment opportunities rather than losing them, and the agricultural land should remain for farming. Other areas in the district should be considered for development that have the infrastructure that could better cope with the demands of additional housing of this significance, particularly areas such as Shireoaks with its proximity to the M1 and the rail network.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP264	Individual	<p>To develop a generally greenfield site which currently employs over 100 people cannot be justified when there are already plans for over 1000 homes in Ordsall. The proposed development will create additional strain on an already busy road network. The A1 regularly suffers from lengthy delays in the Bassetlaw area resulting in stress to the A638 and minor roads through villages adjacent to the proposed site, namely Eaton and Gamston. The environmental impact from the construction of this development will result in a greatly increased flood risk to the river Idle and its tributaries. This area is currently arable land and is well drained. By concreting over a large area of land, this will create further strain on an already largely rural draining system. The creation of a new community in an otherwise peaceful and attractive rural environment is going to vastly detract from this beautiful part of North Nottinghamshire. The proposed site lacks adequate public transport, has no meaningful or quality employment opportunities and offers little in the way of integrating into an established rural community. New developments of this sort maintain a dormitory status where there is little that enhances the neighbouring area. The Council have not explored other more suitable brownfield development sites within Bassetlaw. There are potential development sites within Retford, Tuxford, and Worksop that already have more suitable amenities and infrastructure in place to serve the communities. With plans and development already taking place to a large scale in Ordsall and Retford, do not see how the Council can justify the development of housing to such a large scale at the Gamston airfield site.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP265	Individual	<p>There are a number of inaccuracies in the report which although minor can incorrectly influence. Gamston is well connected to the village of Elkesley, there is no direct connection. Re Gamston Airport “Given that there is only a small amount of agricultural land between the hardstanding, the majority of the site is considered to be previously developed.” 400 acres or 162 Hectares is not a small amount of agricultural land. West of the site is the B6387 which is a dual carriageway, this is incorrect. The nearest villages Elkesley and Gamston provide limited employment opportunities with a shop and post office in each”. Gamston has neither. There is no mention of any air quality survey been taken with the proximity of the A1 and the pollution caused and the effect this could have on the residents of the potential houses. This is important as the wind direction is mainly from the south west. With regards the “Visual receptors in the wider study area Visual receptors in the wider area (medium range up to 2km and long range over 2km) are shown in Figures 4.1.13 No mention of the village of Eaton or any properties with in the village, which is at the North end of the airport were considered thus this should be considered. The omission of this is unacceptable. The report says “Furthermore, there is a direct route to Retford along the A638.” The crossing of the river in Gamston has a 90 degree bend after it and is a cause of a number of recent accidents so is not suitable for an increase of such a high level of traffic. It states that the location of the new settlement should also deliver benefits to existing rural communities, through improvements to a wider number of services, facilities and infrastructure: no consideration has been given to Eaton as it has to the village of Bothamsall. As it is located immediately north of the site it will receive a rise in through traffic from the development as residents aim to reach the A638 a significant increase in traffic may lead to the</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>requirements of additional road works. The amount of buildings are quote in various numbers from 3001, 3758 and 4000 dwellings which will be the correct figure as this could be misleading. The balance of recommended houses on any of the developments by ADAS is flawed and doesn't correlate with the economic development in the areas put forward. Energy: no mention of ground source heating yet this is proving a method of reducing the carbon footprint at any site. The report claims "Carlton-in-Lindrick is the strongest parish out of all those reviewed, in terms of having multiple primary services plus other secondary services. Furthermore, the parish is in close proximity to several other parishes, particularly Hodsock which also contains several primary services. A new settlement could provide additional services and facilities which would be mutually beneficial for both the new and existing communities in this area, as well as enhance existing services located here. Especially if the new settlement could be located along the 2.5km road contours which link the Carlton in Lindrick and Hodsock parishes. Carlton in Lindrick also has a good road network to larger settlements such as Worksop." So with the location between Worksop and the development at Blyth / Harworth it would be ideally sited to ensure development of economic growth in an area in need of it. The development of two sites at Bevercoates and Carlton would have a greater benefit both enhance the economic growth of Bassetlaw and dilute the strain on the road system a super development concentrating it all in one which only has a "Rural Road network". What consideration has been given to the following "The renewed interest of the garden city/village movement has been integrated into the NPPF paragraph 52 which states that "The supply of new homes can sometimes be best achieved through planning for larger scale extensions to existing villages and towns that follow the principles of Garden Cities". And</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>Table 1.1: Size and key characteristics of a Garden Village (Source: Places for all ages: Delivering the Future Garden Village October 201511) Size 500-5000 homes Timescales: 5-25 years Key Characteristics Expansion of existing small settlement(s) Within catchment of town or city Located on an existing transport corridor Partly or mostly self-sufficient in terms of local social infrastructure Small-scale employment, but most jobs in nearby towns and cities Land east of Carlton-in-Lindrick is undesignated land with no physical constraints. The level of services in the location is a major strength to the site as it contains the most primary services for the parishes that were reviewed. The site has good road links and access to larger areas such as Worksop. Developing a new settlement in this location could meet several objectives for developing Garden Villages, in terms of proximity to larger settlements and self-sufficient services. Interesting choice of facilities that could provide the opportunity for community function needs within the site such as; a primary school, a GP/pharmacy, community hall, local center, library or hairdressers. Yet no mention of a senior / high school as the age of residents increase.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP265	Individual	<p>This site or as it should be referred to as Bunkers Hill already has a small amount of industrial buildings and a fully working airport that supports many business with about 100 people working there no consideration to developing that in conjunction with the business development aimed within Bassetlaw has been considered yet it can continue to add economic, social advantages to the area with more needs for pilots and associated services. Highways around Gamston are a rural network of minor roads so by recommending upgrading access to Brick Yard Road and Jockey Lane will need to take into consideration the effect the increased traffic movements through Eaton which has a pinch point over the river that will need addressing to deliver a stronger inter-connectivity to rural village clusters in neighbouring parishes. More effort needs to be made to replacing the industries that have been lost in Bassetlaw, mines, Paper mills, Ropeworks , Hosiery so by developing a core strategy and in turn develop the specialist business / industries you want to attract is paramount to increasing employment in the area rather than losing it to neighbouring authorities. This fundamental point is what made the towns and villages work , employment went people wanted to live nearby!!</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP267	Sustrans Bassetlaw Rangers	<p>Strongly support Section 12 – the Garden Villages, paragraph 12.20, bullet points 3 & 4: connectivity between them and Retford by sustainable transport modes</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP267	Sustrans Bassetlaw Rangers	Strongly support Policy 12 – Transport, paragraphs a & b: pedestrian and cycle links	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP268	Individual	<p>The close proximity of the two sites to each other, given that a larger number of sites were originally considered. An earlier planning document from less than 10 years ago suggested development to be unsustainable in rural villages. This appears to be a U turn. Many of the proposals for the new villages appear to contradict some of the main objectives set out by the council (including pollution, transport, services, flood risk, ease of movement- detailed later in this response) Gamston does not currently have many of the essential services a new development would need. There is no gas to the village and no mains sewage system. Some years ago, Gamston was severely affected by flooding. The water stopped just short of our house. The sewage plant that waste is pumped to overflowed, causing effluent to escape and kill a number of trees in our garden. Should the garden village be built, this could potentially cause additional difficulties with surface water. Such a development would totally change the character of the area. There are less than 80 properties in Gamston. A further 600+ in the first phase would change the existing village beyond recognition. The current road system is not fit for purpose and often dangerous. When there is an accident on the A1, traffic comes through the village and causes gridlock. Similarly, roadworks in Retford cause delays on surrounding roads. The bridge over the A1 (Twyford Bridge) is currently traffic light controlled due to it being unsafe for more than one</p>	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>lane of traffic. There have been a number of accidents on the bridges in both Eaton and Gamston. Since Christmas, 6 vehicles have ended up in the river at Gamston at the bottom of Muttonshire Hill. As most houses are likely to own at least one or more vehicles and undertake several journeys a day, increased housing will result in more traffic, more pollution and decreased safety and ease of movement. Any development of services would be slow to appear. Residents at the consultation event cited garden villages in other areas where, 14 years on, many services promised in the original plans, had not come into fruition. Increased housing would bring with it increased need for emergency services, the infrastructure of which is insufficient. Retford no longer has a police station and the cover provided by the fire and rescue service has been dramatically reduced. There would be fragmentation of the countryside in one of the most rural areas of Nottinghamshire, a feature which currently brings visitors and tourism to the county. Would result in loss of a viable airfield as well as loss of businesses and skilled workforce currently employed at the site. This would result in them seeking employment away from the area which is in direct conflict with the proposed aims of the plan. There would be a negative impact on health and wellbeing as a result of more traffic pollution and congestion, difficulties accessing emergency services, loss of woodland, increased flood risk etc. Gamston is currently a conservation village. Whilst this proposed development lies outside of this, it seems to be in total conflict with the general character of the nearby area. Retain proposal for Bevercotes as a garden village but retain and develop Gamston Airfield more on the commercial side, creating employment opportunities and, close proximity to the A1 for vehicles will reduce traffic through residential areas. Use areas such as Shireoaks and Retford for increased housing where services such as health and retail</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>already exist alongside a transport infrastructure. As road and rail networks are already (or are planned to be) available, this will create greater ease of movement and be more environmentally sustainable. Residents will be able to walk or cycle to these stations and be able to access areas such as Sheffield within a relatively short period of time. Look to neighbouring more urban authorities to take on some of the building allocation in order to protect valuable rural areas.</p> <p>Expand existing primary schools, such as Elkesley and Gamston rather than build new ones. Further develop in wards of deprivation such as Worksop and Harworth to bring growth and wealth to these areas.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP269	Individual	<p>The Council state their “main objective was to identify land for housing purposes which could form an independent settlement without the drawback of coalescence with existing settlements” [para 12.2.] however the Town and Country Planning Association [Understanding Garden Villages: An Introductory Guide; TCPA.; January 2018 p. 15] suggest it is impossible for a new community of a smaller scale to be a distinct and separate settlement: it will always be part of a hierarchy of settlements”. Consequently “when considering a new community at a small scale, the right location is essential to avoid unsustainable commuting patterns”. The proposed Garden Village will be a car dependent estate, apart from opportunities of local employment on the Airfield many will have to travel further afield. If the objective is that young professionals will commute to work the opposite side of the coin is that for non-car users and the elderly/disabled it will become an isolating dormitory village. The concept of creating pedestrian and cycle links [Policy 12 para 6a] that will be used between the villages is ‘on the road to nowhere’ – there is pedestrian access on the A638 to Rockley, Gamston and/or Eaton of similar distances to that proposed between the new villages. Rarely does the existing population of these villages walk to the next village as the route only take them into the next hamlet of houses - it is easily projected that this will be the case for the new villages and specifically for the elderly/disabled who might not be able to make use of these pedestrian and cycle links. Two car families are not uncommon and this volume of cars increases as the family’s adult children seek car-dependent employment outside the settlements. The initial 625 dwellings on the Airport multiplied by a potential of two cars per family plus traffic generated by the Community Service Facilities [Policy 12; para 5a-c] and the anticipated growth of business on the 15 hectares at Gamston Airport</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>[Policy 12; para 4] projects the possibility that the amount of cars could be well in excess of 1,200 vehicles*. The number of journeys per car per day has not been included here. It is important to note that after 2035 the proposals for Gamston Airport site are 2,500 dwellings. Bassetlaw Air Quality Annual Status Report August 2016 Ref: BDC/ASR/2016 states the air quality in rural areas is good but “the main concern is the A1 which runs directly across the district from the north west to the south east, a busy trunk road which carries significant cross-country traffic, most of which does not originate from Bassetlaw or have Bassetlaw as a destination. The district therefore suffers the effects of pollution which the authority states they have no direct control over or can put measures in place to control” however, the authority does have a measure of control – the solution is not promote further traffic along the A1 route by building 4000 dwellings on the Gamston/Bevercotes site from 2018 to beyond 2035. A good number of vehicles [see *above] will require access to the A638 [toward Retford, the nearest town]. The A638 already experiences traffic problems into Retford, due to new building along London Road, these problems multiply exponentially when traffic is diverted from the A1 through Rockley/Gamston/Eaton after accidents and other events. Some cars and lorries coming from Markham Moor onto the A638 via Rockley/Gamston/Eaton toward Retford continue to exceed the speed limit, there is no paving on the left side coming out of Gamston toward Retford and the paving on the right side is too narrow in places and ends at Eaton resulting in the need to cross the road to connect with paving on the opposite side. It would not be a safe road to rely on as a cycle link from the Airport to Retford. The Plan identifies the close transport links to the East Coast Mainline. With increasing rail costs and railway parking charges at Retford Station ranging</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>from £4-£5.50/ per day it may be uneconomical to travel from the village to the station by car in order to link to larger towns and cities for employment. Currently accessibility and connectivity from the Airfield to the Rail Station using public transport would involve a 15 minute walk to the bus stop on the A638, a bus to London Road and a 0.711 mile walk to the station [14 minutes at a walking speed of 3mph], making it less accessible than implied. The loss of airport related employment [para 12.9] is deeply concerning. Retention and growth of existing established businesses in this area is essential alongside new commerce – waiting for potential investment and growth of new businesses on the 15 hectares site at Gamston, which may not happen at all, is a risky strategy. The Governments ambition for more housing in addition the housing market stakeholders requirement for a return on their investment presents a conflict that does not sit easily with the ethos of Garden Villages [Understanding Garden Villages : An Introductory Guide; TCPA.; January 2018]. The Councils plan for the development of Community Services and Facilities [Policy 12; para 5a-c] is not reassuring when we learn of the deeper crisis facing the NHS and Teaching professions.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP270	Individual	<p>At 1.4 the draft LP sets out the intention of the consultation paper stating: “the principles contained in it are not fixed and we welcome alternative ideas suggesting how the issues outlined might be addressed” However, there is a clear inference at 1.10 and throughout the document that the LPA’s mind is already set re: garden village delivery. Garden village development should not have its own policy, garden village delivery should not be a Strategic Objective, garden village delivery is merely a proposed delivery mechanism at this stage. The wording used in the “Vision” for the new Garden Villages belies the vanity project status of the proposal and the flowery rhetoric continues for the entirety of page 90. Throughout the totality of the 17year draft plan, 2018-2035, the district is proposing a mere 1777 units across 73 settlements. The findings of the 2017 LAA should be heeded and settlements with primary schools given a level of growth of 30% leaving those of the 73 without primary schools at 10% growth. Policy wording will be that an average of 20% growth is awarded across the eligible (73) rural settlements.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP272	Individual	<p>Objection to new villages: There is more than enough new building going on in Retford - we are swamped with it and people are having difficulty selling their older property in consequence.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP272	Individual	Objection to new villages: Appears to be a case of putting the cart before the horse in the fact that no industrial development is being planned alongside it. Question - who is going to want to move there.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP272	Individual	Objection to new villages: It might appear to be a good idea to site the villages near the A1 which might benefit one person in the household but there is nowhere to go beyond the A1 so most people will gravitate to Retford on quite unsuitable roads. I understand that Jockey Lane is being suggested as the road of choice out of the Gamston airfield site which would mean that they would go through Ordsall a high density residential area with houses with no garages and therefore on road parking, or along Ordsall High Street equally blessed with on road parking, which means that through Eaton village would probably be their chosen route. We already suffer with short cutters in abundance speeding through the dangerously curved village. The bridge has just been seriously damaged again. Ordsall High Street and Eaton will bring them onto London Road which is already oversaturated with traffic and with more houses being built at the moment which will bring further traffic chaos.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP272	Individual	Objection to new villages: Gamston airport has had a subsidence problem a number of years ago and I am presuming Bevercotes Colliery will have the same. The subsidence may have been seen to but insurance companies tend to have long memories and many people will be uncertain about buying property where there has been a history of subsidence .	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP272	Individual	Objection to new villages: Gamston Airport. It seems to me wrong to close a viable airport to make way for housing. Surely the owner should be encouraged to develop industrial units on site which could be transferred by air instead of using the already congested roads. Money talks! We have already lost two market gardens to the lucrative house building industry When we come out of Europe and are being encouraged to grow more of our own food they will be missed.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP272	Individual	In relation to the new villages and their impact on Retford: It mentioned in the pamphlet that in case of extra railway travellers something would have to be done with the area surrounding the station. I don't know what other than knocking houses down . Having the most expensive station carpark on the line doesn't help matters and sometimes one can't even park to buy a ticket or meet a passenger. The surrounding residents suffer enormously with on road parking. No room for any more. Seems they don't run a bus from the town to the station.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP272	Individual	<p>I realise that my voice is very small and probably of little consequence but being a home owner in Eaton I would ask that when/if the plans get under way that you find a way to secure the road through our village from further traffic.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP274	Individual	<p>If the garden village on Gamston Airfield was to get the go ahead, is an opportunity for an Anaerobic Digestion Plant to be built to service the site. Interested in AD plants having supplied feedstocks to existing local plants. As a local farmer in Gamston, have the land that could be used to grow and store crops that could feed such a plant, and may have funds to help build and operate such a site in the future. An AD plant would be able to supply homes and businesses with a clean, renewable and carbon neutral source of heat and power. This could be heat from the process itself fed into a district heating system, electricity generated onsite from the gas produced, or even the gas fed into a local gas grid and piped around the site to each property. Perhaps there could be some link up with the sewage treatment facility giving enormous environmental benefits. Would such a scheme fit in the proposed plans? In full support of the proposed Garden villages. Concerned about any extra traffic between them and Retford that might be generated. In Gamston, the T junction where the B6387 meets the A638 is a poor junction due to reduced visibility in both direction. A mini roundabout would really improve this junction. As an added benefit, a mini roundabout would act as a natural speed reducer on the main road that passes through the village. This still means all the traffic will pass through the village so a Bypass built from the northern end of Gamston</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>Airfield heading east over a new bridge over the River Idle and joining the A638 with a roundabout halfway between Gamston and Eaton. A Bypass that would serve both Garden Villages would be to build a road from the tight bend on the B6387 at the top of Muttonshire Hill heading north before heading east, again over a new bridge over the River Idle and joining the A638 as above between Eaton and Gamston. Building a bypass would protect both Gamston and Eaton from extra traffic, and reduce the pressure on the existing river crossings in Gamston, Eaton and Ordsall. This is especially important to Eaton as recent vehicle damage to this bridge has been very disruptive and is also unsuitable for HGVs.</p>	
DBLP275	Individual	<p>Object to the garden villages at Gamston airport and Bevercotes. The road system is not fit for purpose. When there is an accident on the A1, traffic comes through the village and can cause gridlock. There are less than 80 properties at present. The proposed development will change the character of the area. Gamston does not have many of the essential services that a new development would require. Existing businesses operating from Gamston airfield would close or relocate, creating unemployment which is contrary to the stated objects in the plan.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP276	Individual	<p>The Plan and New Settlement Study have glaring inconsistencies re Bevercotes/Gamston site being the best approach for housing and growth. Misrepresentation and misleading justification show blatant disregard for the existing communities in Gamston, Elkesley, Bothamsall as well as belittling the national significance and economic opportunities afforded to Bassetlaw by the operating Airfield and associated businesses. Principles of the Garden City/Village movement aimed to find potential sites which 'have the opportunity to support an independent and sustainable community which also has minimal impacts on its surrounding environment' [BNSSM page 3] and in relation to NPPF as well 'It will also be important that the size of any new settlement respects the relationship with existing settlements and to avoid coalescence and negative impacts on existing communities' [BNSSM page 10] To build a new 'garden village' of 2500 houses within 100m of the historic village of Gamston, which only has 104 dwellings, is preposterous. The impact of residents and employees would increase the traffic exponentially, along failing and inadequate infrastructure and with a second site of 1500 houses less than 2km away will heighten this negative impact. 'Garden Villages' are Urban Sprawl/glorified housing estates with a nicer label. The plan indicates that access is via the A1 or Jockey Lane, but no mention how vehicles travel from the existing access to the airfield via the B6387. This single carriageway goes through Gamston and adjoins the A638 at Gamston. The B6387 carries most of the traffic between Ollerton, Nottingham and Retford. Live in Gamston on the B6387 by the tight bend adjacent to the bridge, in the last 13 years have seen multiple road traffic accidents with cars hitting the bridge, scraping the house and ending up in the River. Highways and Notts County Council done nothing to make this road safer. Leaving our drive is perilous with visibility poor. Walking the children to school</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>involves crossing fast traffic and using public footpaths which is difficult and dangerous. The developments will increase traffic - measures should be put in place to eradicate traffic or calm it. Construction Traffic will make worse the poor road conditions. Most homes own 2 cars = 6 local journeys a day, an additional 12,000 journeys per day in phase 1. Lifting to 48,000 residential journeys once complete. Business and construction traffic additional. The Twyford Bridge on the A1 is structurally unsound and needs repair/replacing due to the scale and mass of the developments. Highways/Council need to fix this junction urgently and not tie it to the development. To be told at the Consultation that "if I wanted the A1 junction to be done I need to have the 2 garden villages to pay for it" was unprofessional. The A1 is a commuter belt and this 50mph zone is an accident black spot. When there is a problem on the A1 all traffic travels through Retford by the B6837 or A638. This gridlocks Gamston, Rockley, Eaton and Retford. Easy access to the A1 will make these commuter villages. This does not support economic growth in Bassetlaw due to the infrastructure currently in place, and will not deliver growth. People will commute to other areas daily - there is limited employment in Retford and more job-losses in the future, people will need to travel from these sites. Bus and Rail facilities have been declining to and from Retford. There are only 10 services a day from Retford to London. Car parking at the station is inadequate. The local train services to Sheffield and Lincoln are infrequent and are not easy to switch modes to get to work. The increasing rail fares are prohibitive (£11,500 annually to London). Local journeys (South Yorkshire, Lincoln) would be better served by driving due to journey time to the station, station parking and station facilities. To say that Gamston is well served by buses is incorrect. The 37/X37 is the only stops at the village hourly and only travels between</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>Newark and Retford, not the places listed. The first service into Retford arrives at 9am (too late for work) and leaves at 6.20pm. The Study states that 'Retford is accessible within 30 minutes through a combination of walking and public transport' [BNSSM page 35]. This is not in government guidelines. Walking from Gamston to Retford town centre is a minimum 5km walk and would expect residents to walk to the bus stop in Gamston in 16 minutes (1.8km), along poor footpaths by a busy A638, and Markham Moor to Whitehouses doesn't have a dedicated cycle lane. There are 2 small primary schools in Gamston and Elkesley, which are near capacity so residents will have problems accessing school places at the outset. This is managed by Notts County Council. Gamston school is accessed off the busy A638 with limited parking and pedestrians have to cross the busy road without assistance. Should additional places be required whilst a 'new school' was being developed it may lead to children being taught in temporary accommodation, which is unacceptable. The Study states incorrectly that 'Elkesley and Gamston provide limited employment opportunities with a shop and post office in each' and that a 'medical centre and a pharmacy' can be found [BNSSM page 89] - this is not the case. Only 1 exists – the post office in Elkesley is a pop-up in the Memorial Hall on a Monday and a Friday. Hardly adequate for the additional residents and businesses.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP276	Individual	<p>Woefully underestimated the flood risk to neighbouring waterways and Gamston lowlands. The development is not at risk of flood due to its elevated position but the land to the south-eastern side has a significant fall to the River Idle lowlands/Wetlands and is constantly in flood. Any changes to the surface water runoff from the development would impact these areas, cause a significant risk increase in Flood Zone 3 at Gamston and Eaton and overload the infrastructure in Retford, as experienced in 2007 (with central Retford under water) . Our property sits in Zone 3, not on mains drainage and served by Septic Tanks. Any flooding to properties would risk sewage and/or other pollutants entering the watercourse. Bevercotes would discharge into the River Maun/Meden which feed the River Idle, adding further impact. The remediation of the sites would require significant measures to 'wash' soil of contaminants (arsenic within the pit waste) which will enter the watercourse. Would be a significant impact on Air Quality, Noise and Light Pollution through additional traffic and construction works. Light spill will be considerable to the detriment of wildlife and residents. Gamston is a Conservation village and the development will be visible from more properties than the Study indicates. Photos of the site were not taken from Gamston. The nearest property in Gamston is only 35m away from the site, not 500m as stated in the desktop study. Recreational space will be created which include lakes in the central hub. During the summer have a significant mosquito problem in and around Gamston and the wider area, reaching into Retford, Tuxford and Worksop. This will exacerbate the issue for residents. Existing local services are at crisis point with Retfprd Police station closed, Fire and Ambulance services struggling and rural communities will be harder to access. Bassetlaw Hospital is experiencing significant cuts. To propose large developments would pull on resources</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>in the area. The loss of the operating Airfield would be felt locally and nationally. There are well established businesses on-site and despite the study noting that there would be numerous job losses it seems that the loss of highly skilled, quality jobs is acceptable. These people moved to the area, have enhanced our community with their diversity. Many of the people own houses, live in the community and attend schools. This is what the local plan sets out to achieve. The council would be displacing them, causing considerable harm and would take the bespoke professional skills that they bring. The Airport serves more than just a few 'rich people parking their planes'. The children's Air Ambulance is there. As the largest private Airfield in the UK Gamston has economic potential for aviation-based companies - this must not be overlooked. The airspace above the Airport protects Retford and the surrounding villages from low flying, frequent flights to Doncaster Sheffield Airport. Without this there will be an increase in planes at lower altitudes, adding to noise and air pollution. Currently it has more plane manoeuvres daily than Finningley and apart from a few larger planes being noisy for a brief time the Airport and local communities co-exist well. Airports have been classified as 'Brownfield sites' since 2003. The site also consists of Class 2 Farming land. The Study uses Class 2 land to exclude some sites. Should changes to local infrastructure be necessary the majority will be over Class 2 land. The airport and farmland only came forward due to the lobbying of landowners to develop and profit – and the Airport owner has not marketed the Airfield for sale as an existing or growing entity, only as land for housing. This is disconcerting – there would be interested parties that would buy and develop it as a aviation hub creating more jobs in the area. The Airport should remain operational and the diverseness of operations should be protected. BDC is 7.9 years ahead of Government</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		targets for Housing so In-fill would be preferred, enhancing rural areas in small scale. Development of In-fill currently fulfils the needs of the NPPF without the need to build the Garden Villages.	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP277	Individual	<p>The Council state their “main objective was to identify land for housing purposes which could form an independent settlement without the drawback of coalescence with existing settlements” [para 12.2.] however the Town and Country Planning Association [Understanding Garden Villages: An Introductory Guide; January 2018 p. 15] suggest it is impossible for a new community of a smaller scale to be a distinct and separate settlement: it will always be part of a hierarchy of settlements”. Consequently “when considering a new community at a small scale, the right location is essential to avoid unsustainable commuting patterns” The Village will be car dependent, apart from opportunities of local employment on the Airfield many will have to travel further afield. If the objective is that young professionals will commute for non-car users and the elderly/disabled it will be an isolating dormitory village. Creating pedestrian and cycle links [Policy 12 para 6a] between the villages is ‘on the road to nowhere’ – there is pedestrian access on the A638 to Rockley, Gamston and/or Eaton. Rarely do people walk to the next village as the route takes them to the next hamlet - this will be the case for the new villages and specifically for the elderly/disabled who might not be able to use the links. Two car families are not uncommon and this increases as adult children seek car-dependent employment outside the settlements. The initial 625 dwellings multiplied by a two cars per family plus traffic generated by the Community Facilities [Policy 12; para 5a-c] and the growth of business [Policy 12; para 4] means the amount of cars could be in excess of 1,200 vehicles*. The number of journeys per car per day has not been included.</p> <p>Bassetlaw Air Quality Annual Status Report August 2016 Ref: BDC/ASR/2016 states the air quality in rural areas is good but “the main concern is the A1 which runs directly across the district from the north west to the south east, a busy trunk</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>road which carries significant cross-country traffic, most of which does not originate from Bassetlaw or have Bassetlaw as a destination. The district suffers the effects of pollution which the authority have no direct control over or can put measures in place to control" however, the authority does have a measure of control – not promote further traffic along the A1 by building 4000 dwellings. A good number of vehicles will require access to the A638 to Retford, the nearest town. The A638 experiences traffic problems into Retford, due to building along London Road, these multiply when traffic is diverted from the A1 after accidents. Vehicles coming from Markham Moor onto the A638 via Rockley/Gamston/Eaton toward Retford exceed the speed limit, there is no paving on the left side from Gamston to Retford and the paving on the right is too narrow and ends at Eaton resulting in the need to cross the road. It would not be safe to rely on as a cycle link from the Airport to Retford. The Plan refers to close links to the East Coast Mainline. With increasing rail costs and railway parking charges at Retford Station (£4-£5.50/ per day) it may be uneconomical to travel from the village to the station by car. Connectivity from the Airfield to the Rail Station using public transport would involve a 15 minute walk to the bus stop on the A638, a bus to London Road and a 0.711 mile walk to the station [14 minutes walking speed of 3mph], making it less accessible than implied. The loss of airport related employment [para 12.9] is concerning. Retention and growth of existing established businesses in this area is essential – waiting for investment and growth of new businesses is a risky strategy. The Governments ambition for housing and the housing providers requirement for a return presents a conflict that does not sit easily with the ethos of Garden Villages [Understanding Garden Villages : An Introductory Guide; TCPA.; January 2018]. The Councils plan for the development of Community Services</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>and Facilities [Policy 12; para 5a-c] is not reassuring when we learn of the deeper crisis facing the NHS and Teaching professions.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP278	Individual	<p>Not opposed to development of more housing - would prefer the site to be smaller and on the Bevercotes site and not both because Bevercotes is in need of major rejuvenation. It's used for illegal raves and illegal motor cross. Live in Bothamsall and have ridiculous amounts of traffic using the village daily as a commuting rat run from Mansfield to the A1 and vice versa. Fear what would happen if 1000s of houses were to be passed. The roads are in a sorry state, particularly on the stretch coming out of the village to the A614. The traffic shoots through, most not abiding to the speed limit. The pavements are very narrow and it's dangerous. Fear for my children's safety. It's tricky coming out of my drive which is after a slight bend. Who will want to live in these houses? The facilities around us are limited. The access to and from the A1 is dangerous. Not opposed to a smaller development if road infrastructure could be considered to divert the commuters to the A1 / A614 via another route and not through Bothamsall.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP279	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	<p>Am an engineer and flight inspector of Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd at Gamston Airport providing flight inspection and validation services, navigational aids and communications equipment as well as airfield lighting systems, to civilian and military customers worldwide. Radiola has seen a steady growth over the last three years from 2 employees to 8 salaried staff maintaining more than 4 contracts UK wide and more contracts worldwide. What is the purpose of shutting down a working airport, to build 1000 required houses when there is room for 1,125 homes at a vacant site used for illegal raves and fly-tipping? "The aim of the study was to find an area of land which would meet the District's housing needs by being able to accommodate at least 1000 homes on a site size ranging from 50ha-150ha. The main objective was to identify land for housing purposes which could form an independent settlement without the drawback of coalescence with existing settlements.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>Bassetlaw's rural communities represent almost a third of the district's population, therefore careful consideration was given to identifying locations that would both benefit from significant investment and provide wider strategic benefits." (12.2 Bassetlaw Plan). It is clear that there is a demand for new housing in Bassetlaw. The numbers are shown and are understandable. The plan shows that 1000 homes are required over those planned in existing urban areas. The Garden Villages seems to be the answer. Doubt the need to create two new villages to provide them. Bevercotes and Gamston Airport, have sufficient space for over 1000 new homes. Why is there a need to spread 1000 homes over two sites one of which is "nestled in the gentle undulations of lush, green farmland"? (Strange words to describe "brownfield land"). The aim of the plan was never to find two sites. Why did that change? Understand that the answer is because, after the plan period there may be a need for a further 3000 homes. This seems to be planning outside of the remit of the plan. Should we set aside the A1 for the year 2198? At what point does planning beyond the plan period cut off?</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP279	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	<p>This will close down a business area serving Bassetlaw with more than 100 “high quality” jobs, to create a housing estate and no jobs. “The delivery of the new settlements must include new employment opportunities to ensure they are truly sustainable villages, not simply large housing estates. Therefore, the expectation is for the new villages to deliver at least 15 hectares of employment land.” 12.22 DBP. The new settlements will require demolition of buildings and hangar space serving employment to over 100 people to be replaced by 15 hectares of empty land. Land which for the next five years can be protected by Bassetlaw so that only new businesses providing “high quality” employment can build there and then the rules will be relaxed and with such fantastic links to the A1, 15 hectares of warehousing will arrive. Working in a warehouse is not as high quality as aircraft pilots, technicians, engineers, operations staff, flight inspectors, ground handlers, fire officers and air traffic controllers. New businesses tend to be small and do not have the capital to build premises. It is difficult to see how empty land constitutes employment opportunities being created. If the plan is about efficiency, then it should develop Bevercotes and encourage the airport based businesses to flourish and grow? “The present use of the site is considered to be an inefficient use of land which could otherwise be developed for a use which is in much need” (12.10 DBPP1) As a working runway, some land is used for aircraft to take off and land, this is an efficient use of a runway, the hangarage is used for aircraft storage and maintenance, efficient at an airport, the offices is used by office workers, employed by companies based at an airport. The rest is farmland. This also seems relatively efficient. Gamston is a working airport for business, leisure, flight training and the Children’s Air Ambulance, home to 10 independent aviation-related businesses, providing</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>employment for around 100 people, training facilities for emergency services as well as having a large acreage of productive arable agricultural land. It is hard to see how 15 hectares of wasteground is more efficient from a business point of view. It is also hard to see how 375 homes on a site spacious enough for 1,125 is efficient when Bevercotes is described as a “former spoil heap” and “large parts of the site remain open and are frequently accessed for informal recreation and subject to occurrences of antisocial behaviour, including raves, fly-tipping and off-road vehicle use.” Selective disregard for the NPPF: The plan fails to mention its statutory duty under NPPF Paragraph 104(f) which requires that Planning Policies should:-“recognise the importance of maintaining a national network of general aviation airfields, and their need to adapt and change over time – taking into account their economic value in serving business, leisure, training and emergency service needs, and the Government’s General Aviation Strategy.” Have been unable to find any “evidence” that it conforms with the NPPF. The proposal would see the loss of five pilot training schools reducing the “high quality” employment in the area and in the UK. Boeing predict that an additional 800,000 pilots will be required worldwide in the next 20 years. Because of a more advantageous tax regime towards flight training in Spain, and a much more proactive approach to General Aviation in the USA, a high proportion of pilot training is being drawn outside of the UK. There is a national shortage of flying instructors as well as pilots and the Plan will wipe out 5 pilot/flight training schools. These cannot be relocated because they require an airfield and other airfields have established flying/pilot training schools. The current size of these businesses suggests they are unlikely to relocate even if there was a similar sized airport with limited flying schools anywhere in the UK. “Whilst development of the site would result in a</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>loss of airport-related employment, the new village would provide opportunities for new employment."(12.10 DBPP1). With continuing growth at a greater rate expected and an increase in owned aircraft underway, Radiola will be forced to relocate out of the area. With no similar sized airfields in Bassetlaw this "high quality" employer will be forced to offer employees relocation or redundancy. DEA Aviation Ltd, operate and maintain a fleet of 10 "Special Mission" aircraft at Gamston. One of their primary roles is to provide Airborne Intelligence, Surveillance & Reconnaissance services to the Government and European Agencies, some of which are related to national security. DEA Aviation Ltd has invested heavily in Gamston to keep pace with the future growth potential in the Airborne ISR market. DEA have more than 70 people, most are salaried and in highly technical and professional roles, DEA will relocate out of the area. Other companies at Gamston Aiport: five training schools, airport staff consisting of café staff, Ramp handlers, ATC controllers, Fire service personnel, and various other personnel crucial to the operation of the airport, Gemstone aviation, Contrail Flight Services, and the potential new tenants involved in anti-drone technology for airport security who are due to open soon. These provide "High Quality" employment to more than 100 personnel, with the potential to grow - fitting with the salaried, professional, technical employment.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP279	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	<p>Refers to the All Party Parliamentary Group on General Aviation website where they 'promote the objective – as set out by British Government – of making the United Kingdom the best country in the world for General Aviation, and to stimulate interest in the sector. Our goal is to ensure that General Aviation inspires both current and future generations to take up science, technology, engineering and mathematics, thereby creating high-tech jobs and growth in all nations and regions of our economy. In order to achieve this objective, the All-Party Parliamentary Group believes that a network of General Aviation airfields must be protected and enhanced by the government.' "Put simply, the importance of General Aviation to boosting scientific, technological, engineering and mathematical (STEM) skills in the wider economy cannot be overestimated." (http://www.generalaviationappg.uk/) The closure of Gamston would force these from any presence in Bassetlaw. The plan refers to how it will encourage employment in Bassetlaw, including "high quality" employment, but it does not define "high quality" employment, how it will encourage any sort of employment, or what sort of businesses will be encouraged. "Promoting economic prosperity through the delivery of high-quality employment space and advanced communications technology, capitalising on the sites' location adjacent to the A1 and to the south of Retford." (12.20 DBPP1) "As these settlements will be delivered over a long period of time, it is expected that they will need to be designed to meet emerging working practices. It is expected that there will be a higher percentage of home/flexible working that will drive the need for higher capacity, future adaptable communications infrastructure to be designed into the schemes from the outset." (12.23 DBPP1). High-speed internet is referred to as being the encouragement for new businesses. Relying on the new residents to bring their</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>own employment with them, employing one or two personnel at best. The assumption is that they will be high-quality jobs. "The delivery of the new settlements must include new employment opportunities to ensure they are truly sustainable villages, not simply large housing estates. Therefore, the expectation is for the new villages to deliver at least 15 hectares of employment land. This growth will help meet the requirement across the district, as identified by the 2018 Economic Development Needs Assessment (EDNA)." (12.22 DBPP1) It is understood that this is a very proactive plan for new businesses. Is there any way that Bassetlaw can ensure that only, or at least some, businesses offering "high quality" employment will be permitted to build on the 15 hectares? Will utilities be built into the land left aside? Is there any guarantee that the businesses will not be warehousing, lorry parks, factories, "capitalising on opportunities associated with close proximity to the A1 corridor." (12.18 DBPP1). The answers are not forthcoming, or flatly in the negative. There is no realistic suggestions which come close to replacing more than 100 salaried jobs. Especially when compared to the STEM skilled jobs provided through the continued operation of the general aviation airport supporting more than 10 independent businesses which is threatened.</p>	
DBLP280	Individual	<p>The proposed plan will create more traffic on the B6387 through Gamston on Muttonshire Hill / Rectory Lane which includes Hather Close to the A638 Gt North Road. Hather Close occupants are all senior citizens, do they really need to put up with more traffic. If Commercial units are built how will the B6387 through Gamston cope, is not a good road for HGV traffic now so what will it be like. The volume of traffic including HGV's is quite busy during peak times now, so the extra traffic will be worse, traffic from the A1 already cuts</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		through Gamston. Build new houses but give a new access road to the A638.	
DBLP281	Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England	Appreciate the logic for Policy 12 and broadly welcome the development principles. The proposed cycling and walking route between the 2 villages and across the A1 needs careful design to be attractive and (perceived to be) safe, and overall the A1 needs to be ‘tamed’, otherwise community severance is built into the design. It is also our view that Bassetlaw should consider the creation of a Green Belt around the settlements to prevent future sprawl and encroachment into the countryside. The creation of new Green Belt around large new housing developments is supported in NPPF paragraph 72.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP282	Individual	Object to the two garden villages. The effect of the combination and interconnection of these two major developments is to build a town in a rural setting. 4000 houses in total compared to about 7000 for Retford. The nature of the area will change from rural to a sprawling conurbation stretching from Retford. People in the new town will have to commute because there are few local jobs for them. The roads and infrastructure are woefully inadequate e.g. one lane Twyford Bridge , access to A1, 90 degree turn over the Idle into Gamston, the congestion in Retford and the road leading to it – not to mention the local facilities. Your objective must be to develop and conserve the nature of the area. This would be possible developing Bevercotes but combining this with a huge development at Gamston destroys a pleasant area and leads to a deterioration in quality of life. If Gamston is no longer to be	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		used as an airport it should revert to agricultural use combined with industrial/commercial development on its fringes. The area cannot support thousands of people – the garden village at Bevercotes will be enough to challenge facilities, infrastructure and the nature of the area.	
DBLP285	Individual	Object to the plan to close Gamston Retford airport. Am a businessman and private pilot and often use the airfield to travel to business meetings. Gamston is a real gem of an airfield with superb facilities and without it the local area would be losing a great asset and would also be cutting itself off from the rest of the country. There aren't any new airfield being developed in the UK and the existing infrastructure is vital to the training of new commercial pilots which are in ever increasing demand. It is ludicrous that airfields are being closed across the country in order to build new houses, at the expense of reducing our transport infrastructure. If this trend continues we will be driving commercial pilots abroad to do their training, and cutting off local economies from the rest of the country.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP292	969674	No support for any policy apart from delivering new employment land. A better plan would be to keep the main runway Hangars and dispersal area and develop the far side of the airfield with more leisure facilities. There is already a shortage of schools, Doctors surgeries and employment around Retford. Where are the occupants of these houses going to go? Where are the occupants going to come from?	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP293	969694	No support for any policy. The loss of the airport is an outrage, I am completely opposed to it. It is well used land and allows businesses to prosper in the area. A few corner shops won't replace the cumulative loss of the airport.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP294	969747	No support for any policy apart from those which seek to address climate change. The loss of the airport would be disastrous. Gamston Airfield is a brilliant facility for the community. The Council should be proud of it and not destroying livelihoods and history. This smacks a simple land and money grabbing exercise.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP295	969800	No support for any policy. Lots of businesses depend on Gamston Airport and it should not be built on.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP296	975737	Support for 2 new villages but concern about the location. The sites for the new villages are not well served by transport. It would be costly for people on low incomes to live there due to the cost of transport. Anti-social behaviour could become a problem. There is a lack of job opportunities in this area. It could result in migration from other areas, which wouldn't help Bassetlaw.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP297	975757	No support for any policy apart from those which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment. The irrevocable loss of this important airfield would be a travesty. The whole idea of classification as brownfield was a mistake and this is an opportunistic affront to the preservation of our land and our culture, commerce and aviation. Find other land.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP299	975914	No support for any policy. Opposed to a new village at Gamston Airport. New housing should be directed towards Worksop, and Harworth & Bircotes. Building more houses increases climate change. New homes need maintaining and so does the infrastructure (roads, street lighting etc). New homes are likely to increase the amount of traffic and destroy the countryside and wildlife.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP301	977042	No support for the policy. Who will live there?	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP303	978627	Opposed to the proposition to create a garden village on the Gamston Airport which is the only suitable general aviation airfield for hundreds of people in the region who fly either for business or recreational purposes. Closing the airport would be a significant loss to the people whose aircraft are based at Gamston but the people wishing to fly to it. There has been a steady reduction of general aviation airfields over the last few decades and, in years to come will regret not having the facility to fly or even train new pilots. In terms of suitability for housing, the airport site is very close to and downwind of the A1 which carries high volumes of noisy heavy freight traffic. This would not create a good environment to live. Quite clearly the people recommending conversion to housing have never lived near a busy trunk road - it is a constant 24 hour source of intrusive noise and foul air! Any housing development would consequently be of low quality and not produce the benefits claimed.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP305	986296	Object to the closure of Gamston Airport. Surely there is somewhere else to build the houses it seems ridiculous to close a busy airport and shut down several thriving businesses I will not support any closure of retford gamston airport	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP306	986333	Object to the closure of Gamston Airport. Gamston airport is a hugely important place as it stands. It provides work for many people including a cafe for visitors which is often used by cyclists as well as aviators. It should be encouraged to expand not be lost to infrastructure.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP307	986349	No support for the closure of Gamston Airport. No support for 2 new villages. There are many empty properties which could be utilised. It would destroy existing facilities and farmland/forestry.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP308	986480	Object to a new village at Gamston Airport. Gamston airport is a fantastic asset to the area it provides over 100 highly skilled jobs. The flight training schools are second to none. Without any other local airports in the region that can accommodate what Gamston does it should not close. Other brown field sites are Available locally. This is a thriving airport that provides everything that's needed. Please do not close it.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP310	986858	No support for the 2 villages. The airport is a large employer (which has been drastically underestimated by your proposal). This plan would also reduce the availability of pilot training facilities locally to virtually zero.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP311	986993	No support for the closure of Gamston Airport. Gamston airport provides over 100 skilled jobs, it's a thriving airport which has 5 Flight schools and a busy restaurant. I completely object to the proposed plan to build plans it will make flying in this region very limited. It would displace multiple businesses and employees and leave the region without any local airstrip. Gamston have a fantastic reputation both in the uk and Europe.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP313	987594	No support for the closure of Gamston Airport. Save the airport local jobs for local people	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP314	987642	You state that the airport is a brownfield site yet there are over 400 acres of land being farmed. Item 1. Good Quality Design, this is something I would suggest should be provided on any new build construction within Bassetlaw and doesn't require the creation of Garden Villages to deliver this. The objective of promoting a locally character through distinctive features can not be measured on either site. Item 2. There seems to be a mismatch between the size of the 2 proposed Garden Village sites and the targets set out in the draft plan. Total combined site area is 233 hectares. Plan states - 1000 houses by 2035 = 30 hectares; Employment land = 15 hectares; Total = 45 hectares Leaving - 188 hectares of allocated Garden Village land for what? Item 3. At what point would this be included as it needs to specified time line to ensure that it meets your requirements. Item 4. Employment is indeed key to creating a sustainable community, however does the site for the Bevercotes garden village not already have the required planning for the uses proposed for the 15 hectares of employment land the focus of which is now proposed to switch to the Gamston Airfield Site? Therefor how is Bevercotes site being classed as a garden village as it doesn't meet the government requirements . If the demand for industrial site at Beverotes has not been demonstrated to date it would suggest that there are other factors that are deterring investors in this	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>sector and I would be gravely concerned if the proposed Garden Villages were being used to extract monies from developers for highways improvements that can't be afforded through other means. Item 5 As item 3 no timeline or at what point would this be included to ensure the plan is being delivered as it needs to specified time line to ensure that it meets your requirements. Item 6 Why Eaton and Elkesley not to Ollerton? No mention of the improvements to the surrounding roads and specifically river crossings in Gamston, Eaton and Ordsall or the A1 junction. Also, section 19 page 127 - 130 refers to the - Community Infrastructure Levy CIL which the proceeds of the levy will be spent on infrastructure across the District rather than ring fenced to ensure that the infrastructure required in the nearby area directly relating to improvements required to cope with the increase in traffic and people .</p>	
DBLP315	987680	<p>Do not support Gamston proposal. Gamston Airfield is a credit to our region, it provides a service to the community beyond just light aircraft coming and going. In a time where these facilities that support the national infrastructure are under threat, we should as a community do everything to retain them. Once lost, they will never be replaced.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP316	987785	<p>No support for Gamston. There are other sites that can be used without destroying a thriving airfield, leading to job losses and business closures. This proposal clearly does not safeguard the transport infrastructure as it will destroy an airfield which is part of that infrastructure. Aviation is part of our heritage. It provides jobs, trading for prospective pilots who can have careers in the aviation industry. Airfields are vital parts of any areas infrastructure and should not be seen as an easy option for developments.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP317	987880	Support for the 2 new villages. I think it's a good idea, they will have easy access to the A1. They will take the pressure off Ordsall and Retford as the roads are already far to busy at certain times of the day. If you build at Gamston and Bevercoat's will there be shop's, Doctor's, maybe a school?	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP318	987892	Support. I would like to say that the two proposed villages are a good idea. They will take the traffic away from the roads in Retford. They both have access to the A1.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP319	987959	No support for Gamston. You need to contact the APG for General Aviation as the value of small airports and airfields has been realised. This is a large group of MPs within all parties involved. It is chaired by Grant Chapps.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP320	988034	No support for Gamston. I do not agree with the destruction of Retford Gamston airport for houses - there is plenty of land around the area which could be used that will not destroy businesses and increase unemployment. I do not support the proposal because the land being chosen provides employment already to a large number of people	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP322	988044	No support for the Gamston proposal. Proposed site of village to replace Gamston airport is unnecessary. Alternative brown field sites are available. Retford also has new housing developments being constructed already without the need to threaten the businesses and flying training at Gamston. You will destroy existing successful and highly skilled engineering jobs at Gamston to create low quality jobs in this proposal. Removing a successful local airport is not a clever transport plan. Limiting transport arrangements to hub airports further afield is shortsighted.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP324	988050	Oppose Gamston Airport proposal. You're taking away land that is already used as an airport which provides highly skilled employment and services for local and national people. You're planning on taking away a key transport hub to build houses. I don't see how that is a good policy to deliver and safeguard infrastructure.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP325	988054	Object/No support for the loss of Gamston. The loss of Gamston Airport will have a significant impact on regional and national flying, flying training, and airport infrastructure, which is already severely lacking. There are significantly better places that can be used other than Gamston Airport. I understand there is a need for new homes but there are better places than a thriving airport.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP326	988057	Do not support Gamston. Gamston is a thriving GA airfield with recreation and training for future pilots. There is employment and enjoyment and it should be kept open. We also need business and we need to train future pilots for the airlines.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
			Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP328	988061	Object/do not support. I object to the proposals to create a new village at the Gamston airport location. This will have a detrimental effect on both the local and wider community. The airport has excellent facilities and is used frequently. For a local airport it has a long runway and can accommodate private jets & vintage aircraft, it has facilities to refuel all aircraft and is used frequently by the medical helicopters. The airport has a very good restaurant and employs many staff in the restaurant as well as the fire brigade, control tower, auxiliary facilities and flight school. The airport acts as a focal point for the surrounding villages and has in the past also hosted charity events, and private vintage car rallies. The proposal will remove a large area of open space and have detrimental effect on the landscape.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP329	988063	Amazing airport ! Local and a home from home For many ! Not only is it an active GA AirField but it also keep for us locals a sense of pride being a disused war time RAF base ! Not only does it serve as an alternate safety back up for flights into Doncaster and surrounding airfields ! Gamston offers so much more than just a job or a hobby it's a community of its own and should be kept exactly the way it is !! There is simply no need for the housing ! It's taking open green land away and replacing it with a hardcore housing estate !! And to consider doing so among the airport is just ludicrous !! Taking hundreds of people's hard earnt time and effort away to replace with a housing estate ! Simply baffling ! This is just a small time promise to give jobs and transport etc ! We don't need that in	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		this area ! We have the transport we need also the jobs and more than that AN AIRPORT !!!	
DBLP330	988064	No support for Gamston. It will replace an airport that generates employment and education. Support for housing if it didn't impact on Gamston Airfield.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP331	988083	This survey is deliberately worded to skew results and will not be representative of public feeling. The use of Gamston airfield is vital to me and my business in the area. Fly into Gamston Airfield once a month for business meetings with my fellow directors. Employ around 100 people in the area. Do not have time to spend driving or using commercial flights to any airport in the region. It is VITAL that you use other land for housing and keep this vital strategic amenity for local businesses.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP332	988087	The All-Party Parliamentary Group on General Aviation have secured agreement with the Housing Minister and Director of Planning that changes are required to ensure investment and growth in airfields. Retford Airport should be protected from development that would restrict its operation so that the Council is in compliance with the coming changes to the planning law.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP336	988172	No support for Gamston. As a regular user of Gamston airport it would impact on myself and it would be a loss of some valuable skilled workers on site in the different businesses	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP339	988184	Support the proposal for the village near Bevercotes not the plans for the village on the existing airport.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP342	988214	No support for Gamston. The plan includes destroying an existing transport link, i.e. Gamston / Retford Airport. This is a well used facility providing skilled employment, and training future pilots, of which there is a shortage at the moment. Jobs will be lost if the airport was closed. As a private pilot, I often visit Gamston Airport, bringing business both to the airport and cafe facilities. It can be developed as a regional airport having excellent runway and navigation facilities. It is also well placed for access being near the A1 road	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP346	988247	No support for the new villages. Definitely NO and the agricultural land around is paramount to the economy and the environment and the airport already delivers an employment hub and businesses there are thriving - and as known with large housing development more concrete surface more flooding its not rocket science. leave the airport free to carry on working - the businesses there are already thriving, there must be pockets of totally unused/ derelict land already to be used and enhance the environment.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP348	988323	No support for Gamston. Do not close Gamston Airport.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP349	988325	No support. Retford airport is a vital local resource that shouldn't be closed for some new houses.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP350	988344	No support. You are destroying a well used local airfield.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP351	988346	No support. The introduction of a new garden village at Gamston airport is not a suitable 'brownfield' site. It is an active airfield supporting General Aviation users and local business. Whilst it may be convenient to shut an airport down and free up a large space there are other Brownfields sites that are not in very active use. It is not just the loss of local employment that would result but a location where the local community that enjoys flying as a pastime or simply to visit and watch and learn about aeronautical skills and activities that reside at Gamston airfield. Closing this airfield is just another 'nail in the coffin' for the wider GA community with the expansion of airspace around major airfields and increasing operating costs the closure of Gamston will prevent air users in visiting the area as associated costs at Doncaster airport would be prohibitive. There is a strategic imperative to maintain a network of airports for GA throughout the UK. Gamston is a	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		key aspect of this and attracts a multitude of aircraft movements from throughout Europe enabling business users to bring wealth into the region. The direct loss of highly skilled technical and STEM jobs at the airport site and throughout the region, including flight training, engineering, support services contradicts strategic objectives 4 and 6 (economic development) stated elsewhere in the local plan document. I do not believe the housing demand for this volume of new builds is required in the Retford area	
DBLP351	988346	What about the Air Ambulance operations? Gamston is an ideal site	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP352	988350	No support for Gamston. This would be an extension of the Gamston village - construction of new housing would not be in keeping with the village and could possibly heavily disrupt the local wildlife.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP353	988357	No support for Gamston proposal. Gamston airport is a thriving and buzzing place which brings business to the local area. It provides a home for many local flying schools that feed pilots to then later become commercial pilots. It is home to the children's air ambulance which is essential for children in need. If Gamston airport were to be closed we would lose yet another training base for pilots in a time of a pilot shortage. The negatives of closing the airport vastly outweigh the positives.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP354	988363	Gamston (Retford) airport is not on brownfield ground. It is a thriving airport providing jobs and personal security for scores of people. To just walk in and tear up not only a historic (WW2) airfield but several firms livelihood is nothing short of profiteering by those whose only outlook is lining their own pockets. Please stop this plan and find somewhere else for the homes.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP355	988394	No support for Gamston. "under use of a brown field site" is a misunderstanding of services available at Gamston Airport. The infrastructure of the area is out of context for this monstrous development. Over 100 jobs are provided for local people on the airport with another 100 or so at other establishments offering other types of aircraft engineering. Attitude to the jobs is appalling and is abhorrent - a couple of hundred jobs - don't count. Housing development can be built almost anywhere in Bassetlaw, so don't destroy this valuable asset, for once it has gone can never be replaced .Does not provide jobs for the people of Bassetlaw it is just a pipe dream Provide the jobs before building the houses! Should get behind the airport, promote it and see the real benefit it can(or already has done) bring to the area	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP356	988409	<p>No support for the Gamston proposal. Gamston Airport should not be closed to make way for housing. Other suitable brownfield land is available for housing development in the local area. Partial-development of the site would also be possible to capitalise on existing aviation and technology sector strengths whilst retaining an active airport that will provide more skilled jobs for local residents. The plan references the airport site as 'brownfield' however planning legislation requires this to be suitable or redundant brownfield land, which the active airport is clearly not. Other airports across the region are unable to adequately accommodate the business and aviation activity that would be displaced by the proposed 'garden village' including 10 independent businesses and over 50 based aircraft including business jets, helicopters and light aircraft. The airport also currently provides a home for a Children's Air Ambulance helicopter. The direct loss of highly skilled technical and STEM jobs at the airport site and throughout the region, including flight training, engineering, support services contradicts strategic objectives 4 and 6 (economic development) stated elsewhere in the local plan document. The closure of Gamston Airport will not have an impact on climate change significant enough to warrant the loss of skilled employment. STEM jobs and training provided by the likes of the businesses based at the airfield are exactly the type of jobs and training that develop the people and technologies that we need to tackle climate change. Therefore, your proposed policy is in fact counterproductive in this area. With regards to the planned closure of Gamston Airport, It does not take into account the requirement to maintain a strategic network of airfields as outlined in paragraph 104f of the most recent iteration of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The planners also do not appear to have considered 'the importance of maintaining business, leisure,</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>training and emergency service needs'. Paragraph 10.3 disregards the locally and nationally significant transport infrastructure provided by the airport. The aims for development at the airport also contradict paragraph 10.5 which seeks to support opportunities to retain and create. It is vital that Gamston Airport is not closed for the sake of housing development. It is an important part of local history. Of course I understand that nostalgia cannot save everything, but add the sites historical importance to the fact that General and Business aviation contributes between £2 and 3 billion to the UK economy and relies upon a strategic network of airfields, this has recently been recognised in the latest iteration of UK planning policy (but is not referenced in the Bassetlaw Local Plan). Many hundreds of aircraft from around the UK and the rest of Europe regularly visit the airport because it provides vital transport links for businesses in Retford, Nottingham, Lincoln and the Sheffield City Region. In addition military aircraft primarily helicopters, occasionally use the airport facilities and royal helicopter flights frequently refuel at the airport. Retford-Gamston it is able to accommodate traffic that would not realistically be able to gain access to larger facilities, for example, Doncaster-Sheffield Airport. Following the closure of Sheffield City Airport, Retford-Gamston is now one of the only airports of its size in our region, serving the needs of the business aviation and flying training sectors. That the thought of closing the airport even made it into the proposal is an abomination!</p>	
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)	<p>Items 5 & 6, Infrastructure. These MUST develop as the housing develops. There are too many historical examples where the houses are built with no matching infrastructure (No Doctors, No Buses, No Schools, No etc.) until much later.</p> <p>Gamston Airport: because Gamston Airport is present commercial aircraft have to fly at a higher level on their</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		approach to DSA, so as not to cause issue by or with Gamston Airport on their landing approach. Consequently, with no Gamston Airport restrictions will the flightpath to DSA be lowered thereby causing an increased noise / pollution level to the villages to the north of Bassetlaw that are on the existing flightpath. This needs to be investigated / taken into account in the detailed plan phase.	Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)	Support. But we are not in that place and cannot really comment on the effect. But please also see note attached re. flightpath restrictions and the effect on the northern most villages.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP358	988458	No support for Gamston. Retford Gamston is an active airfield and NOT a brownfield site that satisfies the current planning legislation criteria of being either appropriate or redundant land. Airfields of Gamston's size can never be replaced and the airfield provides a significant and skilled workforce with employment.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP360	988474	<p>Against closing Gamston Retford airport and building a 'garden village' on the current site. Will destroy nationally important aviation infrastructure, risk the loss of approximately 100 highly skilled jobs and force the closure or relocation of businesses providing Science, Technology, Engineering and Pilot Training services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It does not take into account the requirement to maintain a strategic network of airfields as outlined in paragraph 104f of the most recent iteration of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The planners also do not appear to have considered 'the importance of maintaining business, leisure, training and emergency service needs'. • Paragraph 10.3 disregards the locally and nationally significant transport infrastructure provided by the airport. The aims for development at the airport also contradict paragraph 10.5 which seeks to support opportunities to retain and create • Other suitable brownfield land is available for housing development in the local area. Partial-development of the site would also be possible to capitalise on existing aviation and technology sector strengths whilst retaining an active airport that will provide more skilled jobs for local residents. The plan references the airport site as 'brownfield' however planning legislation requires this to be suitable or redundant brownfield land, which the active airport is clearly not. • Other airports across the region are unable to adequately accommodate the business and aviation activity that would be displaced by the proposed 'garden village' including 10 independent businesses and over 50 based aircraft including business jets, helicopters and light aircraft. The airport also currently provides a home for a Children's Air Ambulance helicopter. • The direct loss of highly skilled technical and STEM jobs at the airport site and throughout the region, including flight training, engineering, support services contradicts strategic objectives 4 and 6 (economic development) stated elsewhere in the local plan 	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>document. •The draft local plan makes a case for local housing need in Worksop (9.7) but does not provide the same level of evidence for Retford. Indeed, the plan states that Retford has already experienced significant housing growth in recent years since 2011, this being without the need to destroy existing infrastructure.</p>	
DBLP359	988461	<p>Am a flight student at Gamston Airport and live 1 hour away. This is the closest airport which offers affordable flight training, as this proposal will completely ruin my chances of becoming my future commercial pilot career, my flying will be ruined. Have to travel as far as London to fly all due to a housing estate that is being built just for profit. The negative effects completely outweigh the positives.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan– Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP361	988480	Do not support. I do not agree with the closure of Gamston Airport. This is not a good strategy to destroy one and create another. General Aviation is continually being squeezed out of a large number of areas across the country. Please rethink this approach.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP362	988481	No support for Gamston. Its not the amount of land you allocate it is the quality /amount of jobs created by closing the airport you will remove approx. 100 highly skilled jobs to be replaced by a far lower skill set. By building on gamston airport you are destroying an unreplaceable asset to the uk. Once lost this marvellous amenity ,business, and increasingly vital airport infrastructure can never be replaced. It is against government policy to replace high grade jobs such as aeroplane mechanics ,flight instructors etc with lower paid gardeners ,caretakers , receptionists such as the jobs offered by the proposed redevelopment. by closing the airport you are removing a vital transport link ,providing landing refuel emergency services etc etc. the airport is a great asset to education. The airport provides a open space with added interest...health provision is provided by the emergency services based there ,and a vital refuel stop for air ambulance, police helicopters and the military.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP363	988482	No support. Keep Gamston Airport active.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP364	988487	Do not support. The airport is externally useful for the local community and aviation community. Loosing it would be to much of a loss not to mention the loss of hundreds of jobs and a unique piece of infrastructure	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP366	988491	No support for Gamston. We, having been using Gamston Airport for the last 20 years, would not want to see this facility replaced by houses. This is a valued site for existing businesses and an excellent airport facility that should be lost	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP367	988492	No support for Gamston. The airport is very important and if this goes through 100 jobs will be gone. I use the airport a lot and find the total idea ridiculous!	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP368	988494	Building on Gamston airport would be terrible. This airport has provided training for many people including myself who is still going through training. The airport is well known throughout Yorkshire for being a very good place to get your PPL. It has become my main hobby and the people and facilities there are the best and it would be heart breaking to see it go for housing. I myself work in construction and do not object to construction work, however destroying a well known airfield is just an awful idea.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP369	988496	No support for Gamston. Sorry day when air field goes	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP370	988499	No support for Gamston. Gamston airport is not a brownfield site. It is a serviceable and much needed facility. Repurposing existing infrastructure in this way is out of line with the requirement to maintain a strategic network of airfields as in the most recent iteration of the National Planning Policy	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		Framework. This is tantamount to purposefully closing a hospital or a school in order that it can become a 'brownfield site' available for development.	to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP371	988500	Don't think the question can be answered with a yes or no. Overall, apart from the size of the "villages" which aren't really village sized, I can see the need for these developments. My worry is mainly for my own village which is Eaton, Retford. It is a very small village with an excellent community, it is largely unspoilt with many old buildings and a lovely church. My worry is that with 2 large housing estates close by that our little village will become a rat run for people driving between Ollerton Road and Great North Road as indeed they do now. The village only has a small length of footpath at the East end of the village and it is already quite unsafe to walk on the road due to the amount and speed of the traffic already passing through, this traffic has become much worse since Ordsall bridge was closed for alterations as people had to use Eaton and seem to have continued to do so unfortunately. The bridge in Eaton is very narrow and has already been badly damaged by a large vehicle and people do not heed the 30mph speed limit thus creating a dangerous situation when trying to cross the bridge, either in a vehicle or on foot, quite often large lorries can be seen crossing the bridge despite the weight restriction and I feel personally that this will become much worse with extra housing and industrial buildings. We also have a real problem with litter thrown from cars passing through to the point that villagers are out litter picking the verges most weekends, this problem would increase greatly with an increase in the number of cars passing through. I would hope that perhaps a village access only could be introduced and perhaps a new road completely avoiding the village made	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan– Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>available, London Road and Ollerton Road are also not equipped to take any more traffic, Ollerton Road is full of parked cars with a school and 20mph limit and London Road is always heavy with traffic particularly at school and work times and more of a worry is that when there is any incident on the A1, the traffic backs up from Retford as far as Eaton...more reason for people to use the village as a cut through road. Worry that a very special little village that we chose to come and live in will become dangerous if the roads remain as they are. With 4,000 new homes on the doorstep, we are looking at probably another 8,000 cars in the area and this village certainly can't cope with anymore, on the contrary, we could do with less already.</p>	
DBLP372	988501	<p>No support for the 2 new villages. As we live in the "village" of Eaton we fear our lives will be impacted in a very negative way. It's not so much the houses themselves it's all that goes with it, extra vehicles, extra people and extra litter on our grass verges. I do think a great deal of care needs to be taken when planning the road infrastructure around these developments, as we in Eaton have already seen a significant increase in traffic since Ordsall bridge was closed last year. Some form of restricted access to Eaton will be necessary for the safety of residents and the protection of the environment.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP373	988503	Do not support. Wholeheartedly disagree with the plan to build homes on the site of Retford Gamston Airport,	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP375	988527	Do not support any attempt to use Gamston airport for this project . Its a fact that councils seem to be driven to target airfields to build so called garden village developments. Gamston provides many skilled jobs and has fantastic facilities. Fly there and cannot understand the policy of destroying uk aviation so there is nothing left but international airports . This is bad for the general aviation which has taken a hammering with airfields being compulsory purchased by short sighted councils . Build them somewhere else that's not being used .	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP376	988557	Agree to the proposal for development at Bevercoates but disagree with the proposal for Gamston. Gamston airfield provides employment in skilled sectors which will be lost. Also, small airfields are declining rapidly throughout the country which is slowly destroying the aviation training and hobby industry.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan– Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP377	988599	Strongly oppose the Gamston Airfield, garden village plan. I do not support homes in place of an active General Aviation airfield. The council must embrace the historic importance of RAF Gamston.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP378	988625	No support. The proposal to erase gamston airport from the map is typical of socialist momentum lobby that see all general aviation pilots as millionaires this is not true i have been landing regularly at gamston since it was reopened nearly 30 years ago it provides a great environment for training pilots , creates specialist employment and will be a useful asset when we will be fighting for trade with a new basis eu the proposal is a class war proposal.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP379	988630	No support. Theres a working airfield bringing vital revenue into the area. How do you justify losing jobs while throwing up more soulless houses?	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP380	988631	No support. The airfield is regularly used and destroying it will mean many people lose their jobs, hobbies, a place to train for their future career. There are 5 training schools- no other airport in the area can accommodate this amount of training. The next closest to me is rutland and their availability is a 6 month wait.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP383	Individual	Oppose policy. This must STOP. Stop destroying UK aviation by closing valuable airfields for the sake of a cheap housing development option. Soon there will be no airfields to land/operate from, ruining the future of a huge aviation business infrastructure and economy not to mention the future supply of airline pilots. Airfields provide a myriad of benefits to local communities not least assisting the maintenance of green fields assisting nature and 'Green and pleasant land'! Insist on the wealthy developers ONLY being granted planning permission on previously used 'Brown Field' sites, not Green Field areas. Know they are only interested in profits and green is a lot cheaper to develop. Not our problem! Less profit and more common sense is essential to maintain the environment we know, need and live so much.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP381	988686	Oppose the closure of Retford (Gamston) airport in order to build houses upon it. There is plenty of other land in the vicinity. It would remove an important transport and communications facility which supports business to the local area.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP384	988726	Support for policy, in particular Bevercotes. Concerned about the scale of development proposed for Gamston. We wonder whether the employment to the south of the site should be expanded.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP385	988746	Oppose. Why destroy the livelihood of highly skilled workers (aircraft engineers) etc to low paid jobs. Once these skills have been lost or moved out of the area, they are lost forever. Aircraft owners and associates bring their wealth and business to the area, if lost will lead to the demise of the area. There are more suitable areas for housing developments other than destroying historic, thriving businesses	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP386	988747	Oppose. I support the need for much greater housing development in the area. However, I do not believe that the creation of two garden villages is the best way to create sustainable communities in a rural area. I believe that one new village should be built, preferable the one at Bevercotes which makes use of an essentially brownfield site. I do not think that the Gamston site should also be developed. I believe that additional houses should be existing villages so that they can grow and become long term sustainable communities rather than what they are now, ie dormitory villages	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP387	988748	No support. General and Business aviation provides closely tailored, flexible, door-to-door transportation for individuals, enterprises, and local communities, increasing mobility of people, productivity of businesses and regional cohesion. Why	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>are you seeking to kill this off? See: https://ec.europa.eu/transport/modes/air/internal_market/general_aviation_en In 2005 there were about 100,000 airport/aerodrome pairs in Europe served by General and Business aviation traffic (as opposed to about 30,000 linked by scheduled airline connections). Only 5% of them had a scheduled alternative (at least one scheduled flight per working day). The same pattern remains when we look at the city-pairs. In 2005 General and Business aviation in Europe served over 80,000 city pairs. Vast majority of this traffic was between city-pairs that had only very limited scheduled alternative (less than one scheduled flight per working day). UK aerial work companies provide high-value, specialised services, both in the Community and third countries. These range from map charting, off-shore services and construction works, pipeline patrolling and conservation, agricultural flights and environment surveillance to weather research, fire-fighting, TV-Live reporting, traffic surveillance and other. Recreational and sport aviation is one of the big sources of qualified aviation staff for airlines and supporting services. Many of the trainee pilots and engineers, after building the number of their hours in the air or in the hangar, subsequently move to work in the airline industry. Aeroclubs and air sports organisations promote individual's qualities, technical knowledge and aeronautical skills - especially amongst the young citizens of the UK, raising their interest in the highly demanding and motivating air sports and future careers in commercial aviation or aeronautical research and development</p>	<p>deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP388	988749	No support. Should be more housing built in that already exist not building new ones on dangerous bits of road like the A1.	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
			to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP389	988774	No support. The proposal to build on Retford / Gamston airport is lazy planning and unnecessary. Of course I recognise that housing is needed but to build on an airport which is part of the nation's transport infrastructure, a base for STEM jobs and a place where young people are encouraged and inspired to enter such jobs is short-sighted and detrimental. Other sites are available to accommodate houses.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP391	988813	Support 2 villages in principle but not on Gamston. Why is it acceptable to build on an airfield? If it was farmland it wouldn't be. Planning law shouldn't permit this.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP392	988889	No support for 2 new villages. They are towns not villages.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP393	989007	<p>No support. Planning of all new housing and or industrial development should firstly consider suitable 'brown sites' in the area without disturbing the green belt or natural recreation areas. There are areas around Worksop that can be allocated for housing without disturbing the aviation assets at Gamston. Firstly the airport is on the wrong side of the busy A1 highway artery meaning that with a predominantly southwesterly wind the noise levels from the ever increasing traffic will be intolerable for residents. The Bevercotes mine site on the other hand is on the opposite side of the A1 road and will be less affected by noise.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP394	989023	<p>No support. With regard to future use of Retford Gamston Airfield under your Local Plan, I urge that due consideration is given to the latest position of the All Party Parliamentary Group on General Aviation's Airfields Working Group (APPG GA AWG) on UK airfields. As of February 2019 it is my understanding that the Group are strongly of the belief that destroying the country's regional general aviation airfields (in order, for example, to facilitate the building of houses) is in the long term likely to do more harm than good to the United Kingdom's strategic infrastructure. A link to their website, and in particular an excerpt of the APPG GA AWG is copied below:</p> <p>http://www.generalaviationappg.uk/airfields/ "...The Airfields Working Group is therefore of the view that a strategically important part of our national transport infrastructure is fighting for its survival. The group, and the APPG more widely, fully supports the Government's stated policy of making the UK the best country in the world for General Aviation. The group will therefore be urging Government to introduce immediate changes to the NPPF, and encourage departments across Whitehall to work together to protect the critical network of General Aviation airfields."</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP396	989197	No support. This will encroach on open spaces that will have negative impact on recreation facilities e.g. walking. Using the current airfield as a potential development is a retrograde step as it will take away crucial jobs and business opportunities. In addition the airfield is a historical site with vivid memories from WW2.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP397	989207	No support. I'm currently undergoing training at one of the many flying school at the Gamston airfield. The lost of this important and local airfield would be a big hit to Bassetlaw and Nottinghamshire. I've know people who have traveled as far away as Manchester to do training at Gamston. The airfield is an assets to the area and an important source of local income for many people and is important to the local economy.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP398	989569	The proposed Gamston Garden Village does not take into account the requirement to maintain a strategic network of airfields as outlined in paragraph 104f of the NPPF. The proposal also does not appear to have considered 'the importance of maintaining business, leisure, training and emergency service needs'. Paragraph 10.3 disregards the locally and nationally significant transport infrastructure provided by the airport. The aims for development at the airport also contradict paragraph 10.5 which seeks to support opportunities to retain and create jobs. Question the assertion that the airfield site is, predominantly brownfield in nature. My understanding is that Planning Guidance is still that only 'previously developed parts' of an airfield should be regarded as 'brownfield' by default, not its whole curtilage. Other suitable brownfield land is available for housing development in the local area. Partial-development of the site would also be possible to capitalise on existing aviation and technology sector	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>strengths whilst retaining an active airport that will provide more skilled jobs for local residents. The Retford area urgently needs high value jobs of this kind to balance its reliance on retail and public sector employment. Other airports across the region are unable to adequately accommodate the business and aviation activity that would be displaced by the proposed 'garden village' including 10 independent businesses and over 50 based aircraft including business jets, helicopters and light aircraft. The airport also currently provides a home for a Children's Air Ambulance helicopter. The direct loss of highly skilled technical and STEM jobs at the airport site and throughout the region, including flight training, engineering, support services contradicts strategic objectives 4 and 6 (economic development) stated elsewhere in the local plan document. It may also be exacerbated by investment decisions taken by Airbus and their impact on employment in Retford based aero engineering at Northern Rubber. The draft local plan makes a case for local housing need in Worksop (9.7) but does not provide the same level of evidence for Retford. Indeed, the plan states that Retford has already experienced significant housing growth in recent years since 2011, this being without the need to destroy existing infrastructure. Housing development needs to be balanced with appropriate economic development. This proposed garden village will boost housing at the same time as reducing employment opportunities. Its location on the A1 corridor will encourage occupancy by car borne commuters contributing little to the Retford area economy.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP398	989658	No support. The roads cannot support the extra traffic. Local schools do not have enough places and plans to build new schools will not happen at the beginning of the development so where would any children go until then? The character of the area would be compromised and the local villages particularly Gamston would be swallowed up. Jobs would be lost at the airfield. Medical facilities would be insufficient. Roads are not suitable for more cars, Lorries etc (eg extensive damage again to Eaton Bridge from traffic)	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP399	989741	Support for 2 villages but not on Gamston Airport. Building new homes is essential but needs to be done in a place that does not threaten the facility of Gamston Airport and the jobs of people who work there.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP400	Nottinghamshire County Council - Minerals and Waste	These sites are within the MSA/MCA for brick clay (Plan Four: Minerals Safeguarding and associated Minerals Infrastructure (Draft Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan July 2018). The sites are approx 7km north of the active brick clay works and quarry at Kirton which is operated by Forterra. As per National Planning Policy (para. 204), the draft Minerals Local Plan contains a policy (SP8) concerning the safeguarding and consultation areas for minerals and associated infrastructure. Although the plan is not yet adopted, its provisions should be given weight as a material consideration. Policy SP8 requires developments within the minerals safeguarding area to demonstrate it will not needlessly sterilise minerals and where this cannot be demonstrated, and there is a clear need for non-mineral development, prior extraction will be sought where practical. Whilst prior extraction at Bevercotes site is unlikely	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>due to its previous use, there is potential for prior extraction for brick clay at Gamston. Prior extraction would address policy SP8, and National Policy, and prevent sterilisation of the mineral and may benefit in terms of land preparation, if applicable. Considering the size of the development proposed and the close proximity of Kirton Brickworks and the active brick clay quarry, it is strongly recommended that the council discuss the development with the operator Forterra. If an application is submitted for development at this location, the applicant should demonstrate they have discussed the development with the operator and that prior extraction has been considered. The applicant would be required to demonstrate that the feasibility of extracting brick clay prior to development has been considered and demonstrate, if found to be not practical nor viable, why this is the case.</p>	
DBLP400	Nottinghamshire County Council - Highways	<p>These sites are required to deliver associated community facilities and services, a range of local employment opportunities and supporting infrastructure. These new village communities we are told will be truly sustainable and not simply large housing estates. At the closest point however these villages are 1,700m apart and they will need a mix of facilities and employment opportunities across both sites to improve their sustainability credentials as a whole. The policy covers the village hub but it would appear that the employment focus and secondary education will be at the Gamston Airfield village site. NCC is concerned that the sustainable transport requirements may not be fully met and that one, other, or both of these communities functions as a dormitory settlement with a large proportion of out migration and commuting by car to neighbouring towns and cities. There is a concern that one village may get built and not the other or the pace at which they are built-out does not align such that we do not get the required mix of facilities to create a</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		sustainable location. In which case it is strongly recommended that Policy 12 ought to state that the two villages will be brought forward in phases but as one entity. Comprehensive master planning will be essential if the new Garden villages are to be exemplars of transport sustainability. 6 Infrastructure: transport promotes and recommends cycling and walking facilities between the two villages and to communities further afield. Given the distances between the two villages and the vagaries of the British weather it is anticipated the majority of travel between the new Garden villages will be by car, but hopefully with no need to travel much further afield if the facilities and local employment opportunities are provided very early in the development process.	
DBLP401	990029	No support. This airport is a first rate example of a general aviation facility that provides much local and specialist employment and it is a vital part of the UK's aviation infrastructure, a system that is a major contributor to our country's economy. Space does not permit me to fully explain why this is so, but do please recall that last time you flew on a business or holiday trip and do consider that the pilots of that large transport aircraft no doubt began their flying careers a place just like Retford/Gamston Airport. Environmentally, although you no doubt classify the airport as a "brown field" site, it is fact, a wide open green space that supports much wildlife and to obliterate this under hundreds of houses would be a tragedy when there are no doubt sites that are truly "brown field."	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP401	990029	No support for Gamston.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
			Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP402	990030	Support but doubt deliverability. The reliance, albeit limited, on two new villages is debatable and has to be treated with caution. New villages inevitably prove contentious and, if approved, will require substantial infrastructure and other establishment costs. This can prove a deterrent to delivery - an issue that will likely prove to be intractable for two new settlements so close to one another where they will predate upon the same housing market.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP403	990043	Support. Great idea, seen it in other areas - Witham St Hughes, Lincoln and Costessey, Norwich. Implicit in the planning needs to be amenities, school, park, shops, surgeries etc.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP404	990059	Support. Having lived and worked in the area my whole life I have been worried about where my children would find locally to both live and work, the area in general seems to have been left behind while investment has gone on in many other places for employment and living. The idea of the villages really is fantastic news for the area with the facilities it will bring, the jobs it will create and actually having something built for the 21st century from scratch instead of more houses being crammed into 19th/20th century infrastructure. The close proximity of the A1 and what will hopefully be improved public transport links in the area will be of huge benefit to the local villages and also in bringing more business into the local town. A good service to the train station would be good for the area also	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP405	990062	<p>Do not support. The airfield is a viable business and supports employment directly and indirectly. It is also a unique asset for Bassetlaw and should be supported for the potential benefits it could bring. Elkesley will become a poor relation between the 2 garden villages with all investment being directed to the new estates and the village will become forgotten and isolated.</p> <p>Bevercotes sites needs developing but this will necessitate significant improvements to the A1 (3 lane?), the Twyford Bridge junction, the road serving Bevercotes should become a dual carriageway considering there will be an increase of around 6000 vehicle movements. There will be an increased pressure on Ollerton island and the A614 which regularly struggles, especially when farm traffic uses it. Elkesley already has plans to increase its housing stock by 20% (the figure allocated), these garden villages, whilst not strictly in Elkesley are suitably close to make it feel that the increase has been around 750%. Town centres are struggling to survive and people need to be encouraged to use them. Housing on the land off north road for example would be better located to encourage town centre shopping. The A1 is so close to the garden villages that people will be encouraged to drive to places like Newark, Lincoln, and to the north Doncaster & Sheffield - all outside of Bassetlaw and so taking the financial spend to other areas.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP407	990068	<p>No support. The area can only just serve the community now without the extra strain .</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan– Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP408	990070	Don't support. It will cause extra traffic ,litter , light pollution And bring extra dangers of speeding traffic in our village Eaton. The airport is a benefit to the local community.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP409	990071	Do not support Gamston.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP410	990076	Do not support. There is far to much housing going off as it is. The infrastructure just can't cope! All the council seems to want is housing & supermarkets.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP411	990079	No support. The road system to the proposed new villages is totally inadequate and it will put pressure on the surrounding rural villages . Particularly the close proximity of the village of Eaton which has a totally inadequate narrow road that I feel will become a thoroughfare. The village does not have the capacity to provide a safe traffic calming system over its narrow bridge that already has been the scene of multiple accidents.Also the village of Bothamsall has a similar narrow village road which will be similarly used. I think that an even	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		distribution of housing throughout Bassetlaw would be more effective . Thereby not causing concentrated pressures on all infrastructures such as roads, schools,as well as the necessary services. If Retford cannot sustain a sixth form centre why does it need to add another comprehensive school. Adding more local debt. In addition I think the local,area will be losing the advantages that a local airfield brings both for employment and recreation aspect. It has been said that airfields are only able to be earmarked for development accidentally. What a pity the so called experts can't do their jobs properly.	
DBLP413	990083	No support for the 2 villages. You haven't followed NPPF section 104f.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP415	990150	Do not support. We do not support the proposal for two new villages if the housing provision is to be set at 6630 dwellings. New settlements can be notoriously slow to take off and deliver housing and generally necessitate substantial advance infrastructure provision before homes can be delivered. The allocation of some 1000 dwellings through to 2035 equates to 15% of the overall housing provision yet over 25% of the residual housing requirement once current commitments and made Neighbourhood Plan allocations are deducted. In the probable scenario of delay with one or more of the new villages coming forward there become increased pressure on the housing market through supply shortages. With the housing provision set at 6630 dwellings, there are sufficient site opportunities around the main urban centres and particularly Redford to accommodate additional development	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>in sustainable locations where infrastructure cost are lower and sites are more likely to be able to viably deliver affordable housing than the new settlement options. Moreover, by selective enlargement of existing rural villages above the 20% growth cap there is potential scope to provide or expand existing community and education facilities that will serve the village and its immediate hinterland. If the Council were to promote a higher housing growth figure such as the 417 dwellings per annum required to support an economic growth target as indicated in paragraph 6.10 of the draft plan then the additional 450 dwellings above the current proposed provision could be allocated for delivery within the new settlements within the plan period to 2035. This would be a more realistic and achievable target for a scheme, that in the respondents opinion, is only deliverable in a stronger economic climate.</p>	
DBLP416	990240	<p>No support. This Draft Plan has not fully considered the effects of the extra traffic that would be created by Housing Development on these sites in such close proximity to each other. The proposed so called benefits are not all under the control of Bassetlaw District Council and would, in all likelihood, not come to fruition. The suggestion that Retford and Worksop can provide the facilities for the proposed new residents is not sustainable as travel into either of these two Towns, and other local areas, is already oversubscribed on the existing road network. Improvements to these roads are not in the remit of Bassetlaw Council. If development is staged over a number of years the CIL charges will not be in sufficient volume to pay for infrastructure changes. Additionally it is clearly stated that these CIL Payments will not be 'ring fenced' for this area but will more than likely spent elsewhere. Hardly a fair treatment for the area that will suffer the most from these developments. Better use of the development land would be Commercial/Industrial use as the vehicle movements would be</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>less and the Commercial Traffic can be directed to use the A1 Routes to and from the sites. Gamston Airfield is not a Brownfield Site. The definition of Brownfield land is any previously developed land that is not currently in use, whether contaminated or not. It is also used to describe land previously used for industrial or commercial purposes with known or suspected pollution including soil contamination due to hazardous waste. The Gamston Airfield currently supports some 10 Companies with high-value employment of around 100 persons. It provides useful facilities for Commercial Flight/Maintenance, Pleasure, Training, and, very importantly, as support for The Children's Air Ambulance. The Plan states that it is the intention to improve the employment opportunities and assist current employment to be expanded. Here, at one fell stroke, some 10 Employers would be forced to seek alternative sites (these needing, by the very nature of their businesses, to be based on Airfields) and the effect on the 100 or so Employees. All of these housing developments should be directed to be closer to the Town Centres that the Plan wishes to enhance the vitality and viability of, where local public transport or walking can enable these to be accessed, not to by putting more traffic on our already inadequate road system.</p>	
DBLP418	990387	<p>Support. These plans, if successful, could well help to enhance the village communities for other villages in these areas.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP419	990400	No support. PLEASE DO NOT DESTROY GAMSTON RETFORD AIRPORT. IT IS A HISTORIC SITE WITH MANY ASPIRING PILOTS USING GAMSTON AS THEIR BASE.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP420	990465	Don't support. I completely understand and agree with the current more housing being built to support the demand in the local area. What I do not agree with, is the proposal to build upon Retford, Gamston Airport. General aviation is a huge sector in the UK that is under-funded, under-appreciated and poorly represented across the country. It has such a large influence on not just free movement in the UK, but the entire airline industry. It's becoming harder and harder to find pilots these days, and with the demand for more and more flights (let alone cheaper flights), the grassroots process to allow people to train in their relatively 'local' area is getting harder and harder. I come from a low wealth family and have had very little support in terms of funding to achieve my lifelong dream of becoming a pilot. As more and more airports shut down, prices and distances to an airport where I can learn to fly increase. As demand for airline pilots increase, the demand for instructors increases. As the demand for instructors increases, the demand for general aviation airports increases. With the supply of general aviation airports decreasing and the number of instructors decreasing, the price of learning to fly increases. As a result, less people (particularly people from an under-privileged background) can learn to fly - hence the harder it is for people like myself to achieve the job that I dream to do, not because of my competence or skill, but because airports like	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		Retford, Gamston Airport are being forced to close as they are poorly represented and under-recognised for the impact they have the UK economy and local areas.	
DBLP421	990489	Don't support. I do not understand why at this time of increase environmental awareness Bassetlaw would chose to build homes in an area where people will have to use their car to access anything. I do NOT believe that the developers will build the necessary services especially as the sites are due to be developed over such a long period. They will as usual site financial viability as a get out clause.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP422	990506	Don't support. Strongly opposed to a busy, viable, important General Aviation airfield such as Gamston being built over. The all-party Parliamentary group on general aviation understand that this is a retrograde strategy.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP423	990541	Don't support Gamston	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
			deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP424	990549	Don't support. The conversion of an airfield into a village is an unnecessary loss of a potential asset to the area. Light aircraft, police and air ambulances and private charters have few options for access to large international airports. Instead of converting the airfield to a village why not invest with the airport owners in developing it as an asset bringing people and money to the area and preserving the jobs which are associated with it.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP425	990570	Don't support. Just because Gordon Brown made airfields Brownfield sites doesn't mean councils can't have a bit more vision! Rather than closing existing important infrastructure to the detriment to the local employment which offers an opportunity in future proofing of an area's ability to adapt to business needs. Look a bit further afield and perhaps allow localised development adjacent to existing villages.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP426	990571	Don't support. I think it's crazy taking away another airfield. Gamston airfield is a great place to visit and supports various business and a superb cafe/ restaurant. If we keep taking away all of these small airfields where are aircraft going to land? We are not far off getting flying cars. Where are you proposing they take off from? Down the M1??	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP427	990577	Don't support. We don't need to spread out, we need to build upwards. Stop building on green open spaces and places like Gamston Airport and build in preexisting urban spaces.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
			to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP428	990594	Don't support. Loss of vital aviation site that is beneficial to the local economy. There needs to be more housing I agree however not on the site proposed.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP429	990613	Don't support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP430	990614	Support	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP431	990633	Don't support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
			to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP434	990659	Don't support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP435	990666	Don't support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP436	990682	Don't support. It is sad that short term gain is being planned in a myopic fashion. The inclusion of Gamston Airfield in this proposal is counter intuitive with overall government aims of encouraging the UK to be the hub of pilot training. Gamston is one such airfields which is the lifeblood of not only small business but also the source of burgeoning professional pilots where there is a widely predicted shortage over the coming years. It is also contrary to the preservation of wildlife, which is sadly rapidly diminishing as it is well known that Local airfields, such as this, provide a necessary sanctuary for a huge variety of plants, insects and animals .	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP437	990704	Don't support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
			process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP438	990717	Don't support. Destroying a working airfield, which is part of the UK network of small airfields and important to businesses of all sizes, will not create employment. This airfield already employs around 100 highly skilled people. A new village on this site will increase traffic, noise and pollution in the area far out weighing its present use. At a time when we are all subject to the negative effects of the 'de-greening' of our countryside, losing a large area of open space cannot be justified. Vast built up areas are a major loss to our flora and fauna and ultimately, to us.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP439	990719	Don't support. If this ensures no houses will go up in the villages then maybe i would support this only to protect the rural villages. BUT as we know the new villages will destroy land and wildlife and clearly will increase traffic through the villages - so its a no win situation! Shouldnt investment be made in the highest wards of deprivation and bring jobs into those areas especially since they have the infrastructure already there.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP440	990764	Don't support	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP441	990783	<p>Support. We wish to support the proposal for two new settlements. The advantages of new settlements are that road and sewerage infrastructure, surface drainage, and schools can be organised at an early stage. We do not support further large-scale expansion of the existing villages and towns because we do not believe that existing road and sewerage infrastructure can cope and constructing new infrastructure will be very difficult and disruptive. Indeed the proposed two new settlements are both near to primary roads and have plentiful sites for new sewerage works and schools. Most of the existing villages and towns lack large-scale employment possibilities and the major future sources of employment for people living in this area are likely to be in the nearby cities. Therefore building new houses near to primary roads is essential for commuting. The residents of these new settlements will have excellent access to nearby countryside such as Clumber Park and Rufford. Residents of the new settlements will also have easy access to out-of-town and edge-of-town facilities in the existing towns. The existing towns will perhaps see some loss of facilities in their centres, but that loss is inevitable and has indeed already been underway for many years.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP442	990799	<p>Don't support. These are not villages but small towns imposed in a rural agricultural area, at present highly productive and environmentally friendly landscape. Pollution will be increased.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP443	990800	<p>Do not support</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
			process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP444	990802	<p>Do not support. My natural reaction to the Garden Villages proposal which is tantamount to being a new Town development as it concentrates most of Bassetlaw's housing target in two places and does not need a lot of infill in the existing Retford villages. It therefore achieves the current Government's requirements. However by looking at a 30+ year projection there seems to be no consideration that Government policies will change over the years and that it may be that there are two part-finished villages with insufficient facilities because there have been local, national and even international political changes. It is a garden village idea presentationally but realistically it is urbanisation of a rural and attractive area. The 'Garden' Village concept seems inappropriate when houses will be 'dumped/deposited' onto an area and as most new houses nowadays seem to be placed on site locations with postage stamp gardens! If this plan is more or less a 'fait accompli' (and from feedback at local consultation sessions it appears to be the case from what BDC staff and consultants have said) I would therefore propose that one Garden Village is built – preferably on the available site of Bevercotes and that if appropriate this model is then used for another site at a later stage. The report produced last year into assessing the suitability of three sites (Carlton, Bevercotes & Gamston) the Carlton site is more conducive to such development as it is close to an urban area such as Worksop and not far from a major city such as Sheffield. It is also much closer to existing services such as leading regional and local hospital facilities and a greater concentration of existing and</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>potential industries and employment opportunities. The two villages will be one community but am sure that each village would form its own identity and would not wish to be a single community with the A1 separating them. Take on board that these areas are mostly Brownfield sites and are ripe for development. However I feel that their proximity to each other is not a valid consideration because each one will have its own identity and will be separated by the A1 intersection even if road upgrading takes place. It appears that as yet there is a lack of information relating to the service providers in these villages and how they will tie in with current pressurised services, facilities and lack of qualified staffing. Recruitment in many of these public and private services and enterprises in this area is already very difficult. 1000 houses satisfies Government targets more easily than spreading across the edges of Retford and in existing villages but does not take into account the economic development and nature of potential employment. Increasing the population does not necessarily guarantee any economic growth or even the population investing in their locality. These villages could become dormitory settlements where employees and employers commute to the cities as this already seems to happen increasingly in the Retford area. Initially there could be a lack of facilities and qualified staff for such a large expected population. According to BDC staff at the consultation it is not proposed to supply new school places until several years into the house building and perhaps not until the end of the first 15 year phase. New Schools are mentioned but wonder if house builders will be prepared to build them in the early stages of the new houses' development.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP444	990802	<p>Reconsiders the 3 areas which were previously considered for garden villages. Carlton still needs consideration because of its proximity to economic and social opportunities in Worksop and Sheffield. Reassess the need for new residential development on the Bevercotes and Gamston sites by looking at building around Retford and existing large villages where the concentration of population would be close to retail and leisure facilities. These facilities may need some enhancement but not new builds. Investigate the move of current industrial and employment opportunities onto the Bevercotes (already been designated as industrial land) and Gamston sites from such areas in and around Retford and use the industrial sites for new housing as they would be close to the A1 network, mitigate environmental issues and the usage of local roads.</p> <p>However as planned when the Bevercotes site was designated as a Warehouse site some years ago the A1 access slip roads and the bridge over the A1 do need investment and attention. Further liaison with Notts County Council and regional authorities to ascertain the best way forward. Why were NCC representatives from highways, education, fire and other NCC services not present at the Consultative sessions?? PLEASE LOOK AT PROVIDING QUALITY RATHER THAN QUANTITY and not so much focus on ticking Government boxes!</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP445	990806	Do not support	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP446	990814	<p>Do not support. Without more detailed proposals it is very difficult to give an opinion. The road infrastructure in this area is very poor and will need a massive upgrade to accommodate this number of houses.</p> <p>Bevercotes Colliery site, however is an obvious choice for new development.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP447	990818	Do not support	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP448	990826	<p>Do not support. I do not support the proposal two have 2 new villages at Bevercotes & Gamston Airfield. The roads in the area, except for the A1, are rural roads & struggle to cope with the current volume of traffic. Building two new villages so close would create additional transport & the current road layouts would not be able to cope.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP449	990829	Do not support. Villages not needed. Keep Gamston as an airport.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP450	990836	Do not support. I fully support the use of derelict land, however Gamston airport is a going concern that offers employment in STEM sectors. There are only so many sandwich makers required in Worksop... a corner shop in the new village will not replace the lost employment opportunities.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP451	990837	Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP452	990841	Do not support. Definitely not at Gamston. If this proposal is to satisfy some central government directive then I suggest you look only at the colliery site. Gamston airport is too valuable in terms of everything it offers. To lose it would be disastrous	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP453	990842	Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP454	990843	Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP455	990845	Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP456	990846	Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP457	990847	Do not support. Specifically the Gamston Aerodrome site; there was no information around improvements to the B6387 or the A1 slip roads, would serve both the proposed village sites. The B6387 is arguably already not fit for purpose with common RTAs and the A1 bridge being down to a single lane long term. The existing industrial estate being cited as providing employment for the new village is not viable as there are few businesses left on there currently and any businesses moving on to the estate would have to make massive investment as most of the site is out dated and not fit for purpose. There seems to be no mention of the viable businesses that do exist on the airfield, so this proposed site will in fact remove business and employment from the area.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP458	990848	Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP459	990849	Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP460	990850	Support	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP461	990852	Do not support. Gamston Airport should remain. The plan ignores the benefits of having a local airport with the facilities of Gamston. The airport is an easy target and other land should be found. I strongly object to the plan to close Gamston airport.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP462	990854	Do not support. If going to do it leave the airport out of it.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP463	990855	Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP464	990856	Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP465	990859	Do not support. Need Gamston airport for the local community. Partner has a private pilots licence he learnt to fly at Gamston. Keep our plane at Gamston. Know lots of people who businesses at Gamston and rely on it for their livelihood. Do not build houses on this valuable facility	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP466	990862	Do not support. The proposal has not considered 'the importance of maintaining business, leisure, training and emergency service needs. Hundreds of jobs will be lost at Gamston, people will have to move away, it will ruin homes.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP467	990865	Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP468	990869	Do not support. I object to the destruction of Gamston airport. It is a valuable part of the National transport infrastructure and source of quality engineering and scientific jobs.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP469	990882	Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP470	990884	Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP471	990885	Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP472	990886	Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP473	990889	Do not support. One of the choices of land is Retford Gamston Aiport. This is not only my location of employment but also location of history to myself and many others. I gained my licence, flew my grandpa who is no longer with us and is also the location of multiple other business and aircraft owners. The site is a place of public interest and wildlife.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP474	990891	Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP475	990893	Do not support. Not if they threaten Gamston airfield's status, there is plenty of other land that could be used instead.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP476	990895	<p>Do not support. The construction of two new villages on Gamston Airfield and the former Bevercotes Colliery appears from this document as if it has been added at a late stage. In relation to Rural Bassetlaw, these proposed new villages are not, as stated: ‘proportionate growth through a careful mix of planned and managed organic development’. They and risk severely damaging the local environment while blighting nearby rural communities. Both proposals to build new towns on Gamston Airfield and the open space of the former Bevercotes Colliery are inappropriate for the locations. The Draft Plan itself recognises this in various sections of the report that these proposals would jeopardise existing business; destroy open landscapes; threaten recently restored open habitat and; create excessive local traffic. The Draft Plan is therefore contradictory and confused; e.g. Section 12.15; “The former Bevercotes Colliery is enclosed within dense woodland, while Gamston Airfield is nestled in the gentle undulations of lush, green farmland.” Section 12.17 How can a new housing development on a. a currently open, green airfield, and b. in a wooded site, be considered ‘inherently rural in nature’? With these factors in mind, it is considered that neither site is suited to housing development without significant detrimental impacts to the surrounding environment. Gamston Airfield Less experienced local planners may not be aware that in 2003 an ‘administrative oversight’ led to the deletion of a footnote in PPG3, noting that airfields and hospital grounds should not be considered as appropriate brownfield sites. Current definitions of previously developed land make no reference to airfields or flying sites. As a result, developers and local planning authorities are increasingly and inappropriately treating airfields as brownfield sites for land redevelopment, leading both to the loss of an important part of national transport infrastructure and the destruction of significant areas of</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>natural habitat within airfield boundaries. Gamston Airfield is a busy, popular general aviation airfield, with a vital history. It is in open countryside, and supports thriving commercial businesses. In the Draft Plan, Gamston Airfield is repeatedly stated to be 'brownfield land', despite considerable confusion and continued debate on the classification of open areas within active airfields. It is recommended that the proposal to build a new town on Gamston is withdrawn and Bassetlaw Council work more closely with the All-Party Parliamentary Group on General Aviation (APPG-GA) to discuss new planning guidelines aimed at further protecting airfields. There are likely to be significant commercial opportunities to further develop the site as a vital asset, without adversely impacting the local environment. Seek advice from Stratford-upon-Avon District Council, who are committed to keeping the thriving, yet similarly threatened Wellesbourne Airfield open as an strategic asset to the local and national economy.</p>	
DBLP476	990895	<p>Do not support. Bevercotes Section 8. Figure (table?) 7. Bevercotes is listed as a settlement where growth is not supported. The Draft Plan is contradictory. Bevercotes is in fact a rural, isolated area, and is therefore best suited to reversion or re-wilding. Bevercotes is better suited to habitat gain and biodiversity offsetting funded through S106 agreements from other development around the Bassetlaw area. Section 13.10 – 13.13 Flood Risk Bevercotes Colliery could be used as a Flood Detention area, reducing, (instead of potentially increasing) flood risk to downstream areas while providing synergistic habitat and environmental gains. Potentially this could be funded from a Developer Contribution or Section 106 agreement from any future downstream developments. In the</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		event that Gamston Airfield continues to operate, and Bevercotes is built on, what measures will be taken to ensure that any proposed development at Bevercotes does not impact lawful flying? In particular, any development should recognise recent planning policy which ensures that it will be up to developers building new properties nearby to identify and tackle noise problems. Under the new guidance, the onus will fall on the developers who build the houses to soundproof the properties. Gamston is an active airfield with a flying approach over the proposed Bevercotes housing development. What measures will be put in place to ensure there is no impact to lawful aircraft movements?	
DBLP477	990901	Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP478	990904	Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP479	990910	<p>Do not support. The location of the proposed Garden Village on the site of the current Gamston Airport is suggested to be good use of a brown field site. I find the suggestion that the site is currently underused and the land use is ineffective wholly false. The airport supports on average 16 flights per day, is home to a flying school and employs many highly skilled local residents. In addition to this the classification as a brown field site in its entirety is a little misleading as the airport only utilises approximately 25% of the proposed site with the rest being laid to productive farm land producing arable crops.</p> <p>Building in two phases a total of 2500 homes would lead to the loss of this facility, the highly skilled employment opportunities and productive farmland.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP480	990912	<p>Do not support. It does not take into account the requirement to maintain a strategic network of airfields as outlined in paragraph 104f of the most recent iteration of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The planners also do not appear to have considered 'the importance of maintaining business, leisure, training and emergency service needs'.</p> <p>Paragraph 10.3 disregards the locally and nationally significant transport infrastructure provided by the airport. The aims for development at the airport also contradict paragraph 10.5 which seeks to support opportunities to retain and create Other suitable brownfield land is available for housing development in the local area. Partial-development of the site would also be possible to capitalise on existing aviation and technology sector strengths whilst retaining an active airport that will provide more skilled jobs for local residents. The plan references the airport site as 'brownfield' however planning legislation requires this to be suitable or redundant brownfield land, which the active airport is clearly not. Other airports across the region are unable to adequately accommodate the business and aviation activity that would be displaced by the</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		proposed 'garden village' including 10 independent businesses and over 50 based aircraft including business jets, helicopters and light aircraft. The airport also currently provides a home for a Children's Air Ambulance helicopter. The direct loss of highly skilled technical and STEM jobs at the airport site and throughout the region, including flight training, engineering, support services contradicts strategic objectives 4 and 6 (economic development) stated in the local plan. The draft local plan makes a case for local housing need in Worksop (9.7) but does not provide the same level of evidence for Retford. Indeed, the plan states that Retford has already experienced significant housing growth in recent years since 2011, this being without the need to destroy existing infrastructure.	
DBLP481	990913	Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP482	990914	Do not support. Very short sighted to destroy a thriving airfield (Gamston) that supports the local economy by providing valuable transport links and numerous jobs.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP483	990915	Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
			deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP484	990916	Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP485	990917	Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP486	990918	Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP487	990919	Do not support. Keep your hands off your only airport. I often visit the airport and wish to carry on thank you.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP488	990921	Do not support. Creating a new village entirely is in a sense hypocrisy because I believe the location of this to be ideal for commuters, and that would be the plan for unaffordable housing for the many. In such you would then be creating a dwelling spot for those who can afford to pay, and thus not create a village, no, recreational or social involvement, as many villages have with sports teams, pubs etc	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP489	990922	Do not support. Other airports across the region are unable to adequately accommodate the business and aviation activity that would be displaced by the proposed 'garden village' including 10 independent businesses and over 50 based aircraft including business jets, helicopters and light aircraft. The airport also currently provides a home for a Children's Air Ambulance helicopter. The local plan will destroy nationally important aviation infrastructure leading to the loss of advanced technology and engineering businesses and pilot training. It will also leave the Children's Air Ambulance without a base in the Retford area and will result in the loss of approximately 100 highly skilled jobs.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP490	990926	Do not support. No it is too much and will destroy our beautiful area.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
			deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP491	990928	Do not support. Other suitable brownfield land is available for housing development in the local area. Partial-development of the site would also be possible to capitalise on existing aviation and technology sector strengths whilst retaining an active airport that will provide more skilled jobs for local residents. The plan references the airport site as 'brownfield' however planning legislation requires this to be suitable or redundant brownfield land, which the active airport is clearly not. Other airports across the region are unable to adequately accommodate the business and aviation activity that would be displaced by the proposed 'garden village' including 10 independent businesses and over 50 based aircraft including business jets, helicopters and light aircraft. The airport also currently provides a home for a Children's Air Ambulance helicopter. The direct loss of highly skilled technical and STEM jobs at the airport site and throughout the region, including flight training, engineering, support services contradicts strategic objectives 4 and 6 (economic development) stated elsewhere in the local plan document.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP492	990930	<p>It does not take into account the requirement to maintain a strategic network of airfields as outlined in NPPF paragraph 104f. The planners also do not appear to have considered 'the importance of maintaining business, leisure, training and emergency service needs'. Paragraph 10.3 disregards the locally and nationally significant transport infrastructure provided by the airport. The aims for development at the airport also contradict paragraph 10.5 which seeks to support opportunities to retain and create. Other suitable brownfield land is available for housing development in the local area.</p> <p>Partial-development of the site would also be possible to capitalise on existing aviation and technology sector strengths whilst retaining an active airport that will provide more skilled jobs for local residents. The plan references the airport site as 'brownfield' however planning legislation requires this to be suitable or redundant brownfield land, which the active airport is clearly not. Other airports across the region are unable to adequately accommodate the business and aviation activity that would be displaced by the proposed 'garden village' including 10 independent businesses and over 50 based aircraft including business jets, helicopters and light aircraft. The airport also currently provides a home for a Children's Air Ambulance helicopter. The direct loss of highly skilled technical and STEM jobs at the airport site and throughout the region, including flight training, engineering, support services contradicts strategic objectives 4 and 6 (economic development) stated elsewhere in the local plan document.</p> <p>The draft local plan makes a case for local housing need in Worksop (9.7) but does not provide the same level of evidence for Retford. Indeed, the plan states that Retford has already experienced significant housing growth in recent years since 2011, this being without the need to destroy existing infrastructure.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP493	990933	Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP494	990934	Do not support. Closing Retford gamston airport will be a huge loss to the aviation community, both general aviation but the training of next generation pilots from the region, losing the 100 so jobs from the airport will negatively impact the industry greatly as airports such as east mids and Doncaster push more and more commercial traffic	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP495	990936	Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP496	990937	Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP497	990938	Do not support. No, why destroy a highly used air field for housing? Why not build at shire oaks where there is loads of land and you're not bothering as many residents	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP498	990940	Do not support. Using an ex-colliery site for the proposal does make sense, however using a thriving local airport containing numerous successful businesses as a site to build a new village makes very little sense to me. Airports in their nature are spacious and whilst on paper it is down as being brownfield, you only have to visit Gamston Airport to realise how 'Green' this brownfield site is. The draft proposal says it itself. "nestled in lush farmland". There are far more deserving brownfield sites in the area that are of no use other than redevelopment.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP499	990942	Do not support. Not if they involve the destruction of the Airport. This is one of the best small airports in the country, I visit regularly both by air and as a stopping point on a journey from London. It has several thriving businesses that need the facilities provided. You will have thousands of houses, you only have one airport.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP500	990943	Do not support. It does not take into account the requirement to maintain a strategic network of airfields as outlined in paragraph 104f of the most recent iteration of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The planners also do not appear to have considered 'the importance of maintaining business, leisure, training and emergency service needs'. -	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>Paragraph 10.3 disregards the locally and nationally significant transport infrastructure provided by the airport. The aims for development at the airport also contradict paragraph 10.5 which seeks to support opportunities to retain and create - Other suitable brownfield land is available for housing development in the local area. Partial-development of the site would also be possible to capitalise on existing aviation and technology sector strengths whilst retaining an active airport that will provide more skilled jobs for local residents. - The plan references the airport site as 'brownfield' however planning legislation requires this to be suitable or redundant brownfield land, which the active airport is clearly not. Other airports across the region are unable to adequately accommodate the business and aviation activity that would be displaced by the proposed 'garden village' including 10 independent businesses and over 50 based aircraft including business jets, helicopters and light aircraft. The airport also currently provides a home for a Children's Air Ambulance helicopter. The direct loss of highly skilled technical and STEM jobs at the airport site and throughout the region, including flight training, engineering, support services contradicts strategic objectives 4 and 6 (economic development) stated elsewhere in the local plan document. The draft local plan makes a case for local housing need in Worksop (9.7) but does not provide the same level of evidence for Retford. Indeed, the plan states that Retford has already experienced significant housing growth in recent years since 2011, this being without the need to destroy existing infrastructure. - the plan totally disregards the governments wish to maintain and grow STEM jobs through aviation. Small plane aviation (GA) contributes £3bn NET to the UK economy, the plan ignores this and treats the bs at Gamston airport as availabe anywhere, when they are not and are unique to this site. - the plan ignores golf courses in the</p>	<p>Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		surrounding area that are environmentally damaging, cater to a small number of people, whose numbers are dwindling, and countrywide contribute only £2bn to the UK economy but occupy over 2% of the UK landmass, versus 1.8% occupied by housing, and less than .2% occupied by aviation transport infrastructure, ie airport! Thus golf course would be better suited for this type of housing. To build on Gamston airport would be a travesty and breach several national and local guidelines.	
DBLP501	990944	Do not support. There is more than enough urban space suitable for development without using the valuable asset of a local airfield and arable land. In a modern, forward thinking community, the development of an asset like Gamston Airfield into a valuable link to Europe and the rest of the country, to provide jobs and trade for the local area, would be far better use of the resource.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP502	990946	Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP503	Individual	<p>Do not support. The Draft Local Plan fails to provide evidence for the scale of development or the viability of the development at Retford Gamston Airport, or Bevercotes. It is also not backed up with a viable economic argument that would generate the needed employment in the area. The plan references the airport site as 'brownfield' however planning legislation requires this to be suitable or redundant brownfield land, which as an active airport this is clearly not. Other suitable brownfield land is available for housing development in the local area. From the local consultation meetings, it was stated that other airports, such as Scampton, could replace Gamston. This is a simple fallacy as the closure of other airfields is already causing pressure on the few other local airfields. Netherthorpe is too small, Scampton is unlikely to open to General Aviation, and Doncaster is unsuitable due to its scale and Public Transport role.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP503	Individual	<p>Lived in Worksop for 13 years, and now live in East Markham. Office is in Sheffield however I travel a lot, including to London. I have an aircraft at Retford Gamston Airport. I have chosen to live here, and hope to retire here, because of the quality of life I can achieve and proximity to rail, road and airport(s). If the airport closes and I cannot find another suitable local airport (and there isn't one, including Netherthorpe) then I will move away from Bassetlaw.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP504	990949	<p>Do not support. There are plenty of space in village in and around Retford and Worksop just take a look people need shops and pubs not live middle of no where.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP505	Individual	Do not support. There is not the infra structure in place to support the two proposed villages if they were located at the Bevercotes site and Gamston airfield.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP506	990952	Do not support. By all means utilise Bevercotes land but to take them into the beautiful areas of Eaton and Gamston will be an eyesore.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP507	990954	Support. Reading it, it sounds an excellent idea for the local community and future prosperity.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP508	990955	Do not support. Absolutely not. Building new housing estates does not build a community! The idea in theory is lovely, but as soon as you put it in to practice, you end up with the same anonymous boxed developments as you see up and down the country.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP509	990959	Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP510	990961	Do not support. I strongly object to remove a thriving airport and its associated businesses to be replaced for housing.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP511	990962	Do not support. There are sites in Worksop which could easily accomodate this requirement. Gamston Airport is a valuable asset to the area and most certainly should not be considered for housing.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP512	990964	Do not support. Gamston Airport should not be turned into a garden village or any other kind of housing development. New housing developments should also not be located under the established air traffic patterns of aircraft arriving/departing Gamston Airport.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP513	990965	<p>Support. If there is the need for these houses, then I can't think of 2 sites that could be any better for them, but I can can think of plenty that would be worse. Both sites would have minimal impact on existing houses if the project is carried out correctly. I have heard more positive comments from other locals than negative with many looking forward to the extra opportunities in housing, employment and facilities that should come. The negativity that I have heard amounts to little more than people who feel they shouldn't have others living and travelling near their homes while happily driving their kids across the village passed everyone else's houses just to get to the school that is in walking distance - hypocrites. Seeing the airfield go will be a shame, but the reality is, few young people are taking up private flying and no doubt it will soon become unviable. I'm sure the housing building and employment area will have a huge net increase on the number of jobs.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP514	990980	<p>Do not support. MOST DEFINITELY NOT. You will create two "ghettos" of people with few job opportunities and inadequate local transport links, whilst destroying an airport which is a vital part of the regional transport infrastructure. LEARN FROM GAINSBOROUGH - where a large estate was built out of town to house an overspill of people from elsewhere whilst the two main employers in the town had gone out of business - the resulting huge social problems of that area will be repeated in your two villages and Retford will be inundated with unemployed people.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP514	990980	<p>The Bassetlaw Draft Plan seeks to establish two “Garden Villages” without providing indication of where there might be employment for their thousands of inhabitants who are of working age. Creation of one of these villages incurs the destruction of an active airfield which provides transport links for local businesses and many other activities, all of which provide employment for up to 100 skilled personnel. General and Business aviation contributes between £2 and 3 billion to the UK economy and relies upon a strategic network of airfields, this has recently been recognised in the latest iteration of UK planning policy (but is not referenced in the Bassetlaw Local Plan). Many hundreds of aircraft from around the UK and the rest of Europe regularly visit the airport because it provides vital transport links for businesses in Retford, Nottingham, Lincoln and the Sheffield City Region. In addition military aircraft primarily helicopters, occasionally use the airport facilities and royal helicopter flights frequently refuel at the airport. The airfield is equipped with a range of modern facilities that are not routinely available at similarly sized airports including pilot controlled lighting and a co-located navigation aids. The runways at Retford-Gamston are also long enough to accommodate light jet aircraft for business, charter operations and medical evacuation flights in addition to private flying and helicopter operations. Retford-Gamston is able to accommodate traffic that would not realistically be able to gain access to larger facilities, for example, Doncaster-Sheffield Airport. Following the closure of Sheffield City Airport, Retford-Gamston is now one of the only airports of its size in our region, serving the needs of the business aviation and flying training sectors. Five thriving flying schools are now based at the site, continuing a long tradition of flying training to this day, each flying school provides training</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		to standards required by the UK Civil Aviation Authority and the European Aviation Safety Agency.	
DBLP514	990980	<p>Arguments against the Plan's proposal to destroy Retford Airport are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It does not take into account the requirement to maintain a strategic network of airfields as outlined in paragraph 104f of the NPPF. The planners also do not appear to have considered 'the importance of maintaining business, leisure, training and emergency service needs'. • Paragraph 10.3 disregards the locally and nationally significant transport infrastructure provided by the airport. The aims for redevelopment of the airport also contradict paragraph 10.5 which seeks to "support opportunities to retain and create new community and transport infrastructure, facilities and services, and ensure that impacts on them are appropriately mitigated" • Other suitable brownfield land is available for housing development in the local area. Partial-development of the site would also be possible to capitalise on existing aviation and technology sector strengths whilst retaining an active airport that will provide more skilled jobs for local residents. The plan references the airport site as 'brownfield' however planning legislation requires this to be suitable or redundant brownfield land, which the active airport is clearly not. Arguments against the Plan's proposal to destroy Retford Airport are as follows: 	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>It does not take into account the requirement to maintain a strategic network of airfields as outlined in paragraph 104f of the NPPF. The planners also do not appear to have considered ‘the importance of maintaining business, leisure, training and emergency service needs’.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 10.3 disregards the locally and nationally significant transport infrastructure provided by the airport. The aims for redevelopment of the airport also contradict paragraph 10.5 which seeks to “support opportunities to retain and create new community and transport infrastructure, facilities and services, and ensure that impacts on them are appropriately mitigated” • Other suitable brownfield land is available for housing development in the local area. Partial-development of the site would also be possible to capitalise on existing aviation and technology sector strengths whilst retaining an active airport that will provide more skilled jobs for local residents. The plan references the airport site as ‘brownfield’ however planning legislation requires this to be suitable or redundant brownfield land, which the active airport is clearly not. - Other airports across the region are unable to adequately accommodate the business and aviation activity that would be displaced by the proposed ‘garden village’ including 10 independent businesses and over 50 based aircraft including business jets, helicopters and light aircraft. The airport also currently provides a home for a Children’s Air Ambulance helicopter. • The direct loss of highly skilled technical and STEM jobs at the airport site and throughout the region, including flight training, engineering, support services contradicts strategic objectives 4 and 6 (economic development) stated elsewhere in the local plan document. • The draft local plan makes a case for local housing need in Worksop (9.7) but does not provide the same level of evidence for Retford. Indeed, the plan states that Retford has already experienced significant housing growth in recent years 	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		since 2011, this being without the need to destroy existing infrastructure.	
DBLP514	990980	The following list has been compiled from publically available data to describe some of the service, engineering, pilot training and technology sector businesses based at Retford airport, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A provider of full service airborne sensing solutions that operates a fleet of 10 ‘special mission’ equipped aircraft fulfilling UK government and European agency contracts for airborne intelligence, surveillance & reconnaissance and aerial survey work. • The European headquarters of a multinational company who have a reputation as world leaders in providing flight inspection, navigation, communication and calibration services for air transportation. They work with navigational aids, airfield lighting and communications equipment for civilian and military use and provide real time passenger information for public transport operators. • Aircraft continuing airworthiness management, sales & contract maintenance. • Ground handling services for visiting business aircraft, passengers and pilots. • The UK & Eire distributor for aircraft manufactured by Diamond Aircraft Industries of Austria. • Five separate businesses are engaged in pilot training to European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) and Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) standards, aircraft rental and trial flying 	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>lessons for local people.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An excellent café and restaurant often visited as much by local residents as aircraft operators. • A number of other local businesses, including providers of engineering and aviation services rely on the airport and visiting aircraft as a source of work. Nottinghamshire Police use the site (between 12 and 15 times per annum) to deliver advanced driver training in tactical pursuit and containment. • Aircraft owners and the Retford-Gamston based flying schools demonstrate a socially responsible approach to engaging with the wider community to improve knowledge of STEM subjects. For example, a recent children's charity day involving educational activities and a flying experience for local children. 	
DBLP515	991045	<p>Do not support. I object to the housing estate at Retford Airport. The old pit site nearby is a more suitable place to build a housing estate because it is a true brownfield site (your plans at the airport rely on a technicality of planning law and local people can see that).</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP516	991153	<p>Do not support. It is vitally important that Bassetlaw District Council ensures that Gamston Airfield is retained as a general and business aviation airfield in its plans. This is an airfield with an important history being involved in the second world war. It is now an important airfield in the area serving both general aviation pilots as well as business flights. There are also a number of businesses on the airfield that are providing local employment.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP517	991157	<p>Do not support. The area between Bevercotes and Gamston is not so many miles apart. There would be a huge impact on that area in all aspects.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
			process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP518	991172	Do not support. I believe all the options have not been explored properly. BDC says it doesn't want the drawbacks of coalescence (tagging a village onto the end of an existing village) which in essence this plan does. I believe smaller developments spread more evenly throughout the area would provide a better option, without destroying the existing villages. This plan has also not shown any predictions on air quality in the district. Spreading the developments would hopefully spread the emissions more evenly as well.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP519	991173	Do not support. Spoiling ru rally outlook plus expected traffic problems.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP520	991174	Do not support. I believe all the options have not been explored properly. BDC says it doesn't want the drawbacks of coalescence (tagging a village onto the end of an existing village) which in essence this plan does. I believe smaller developments spread more evenly throughout the area would provide a better option, without destroying the existing villages. This plan has also not shown any predictions on air quality in the district. Spreading the developments would hopefully spread the emissions more evenly as well.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP521	991176	<p>Do not support. Absolutely not. The surrounding road network would not be able to accommodate the extra traffic leading to increased pollution. Traffic is already bad enough in the surrounding villages. If Gamston airport closes there will be a loss of employment and air traffic from Robin Hood airport will increase/fly lower over the area. There would be a substantial loss of wildlife habitat. Who is going to want to live in these villages? Older people won't and younger people prefer to live in towns/cities.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP522	991178	<p>Do not support. I would hardly call the proposals villages they are certainly urban extensions . I can see up to a point the Bevercotes pit site as it is more compact and you could maybe see a local community , Gamston Airfield however is far too big and seems to tag on to an already existing village . There are already areas identified in Retford and the surrounding areas so why not have smaller quantities of housing spread over a larger area , where it will have less of an impact . Also the sites at Shireoakes and Harworth where there are good road and rail links already in place and are within beasy reach of Sheffield ,Doncaster and Rotherham The council discusses using existing Brownfield sites ? while this maybe true of Bevercotes , Gamston Airfield is predominately a green field site comprising of mainly good quality Agricultural land growing a wide range of crops Also what will happen to the jobs and business already established here ?</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP523	991181	Do not support. My objections solely relate to the proposed closing of Gamston Airport. It would be a travesty to allow the airfield to be given over to building development and to permanently lose such a great local asset. Gamston Airport is an award winning facility and one of the best General Aviation Airports in the UK. Far from considering using the airfield for building land, Bassetlaw DC should be defending and supporting Gamston Airports future.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP524	991184	Do not support. Bassetlaw Council has evidenced no positive action, as part of this draft plan, as to how it intends to attract business investment into the area in order to create the jobs necessary to sustain and support such major housing developments. Without businesses and the jobs they create then all that these housing developments will become are commuter enclaves to add to the 17,000 people you already acknowledge are travelling out of Bassetlaw on a daily basis for work.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP524	991184	Reconsider all of the impacts upon businesses and resultant loss of jobs along with all the benefits to local economy, the loss of a strategic resource to the Bassetlaw area that should be used to help attract business investment to the area. And instead of closing Retford Gamston Airport concentrate its efforts on redeveloping the otherwise derelict former Bevercotes Colliery site.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP525	991186	Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
			Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP526	991188	Do not support the closure of Gamston Airport. This plan significantly under estimates the scope and type of employment at Gamston Airport. The plan refers to Gamston airport as a brownfield site. Such sites are redundant, former industrial areas, which is definitely not the case with Gamston Airport.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP527	991190	Support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP528	991208	Do not support. I think just one should be created at Bircotes but that Gamston should be left as it is with a mixture of agricultural land (which is of sufficient size to still be commercially farmed) and the airport which has been a successful business and created jobs in the area. I think instead there should be more building in the villages particularly East Markham which has a lot of unusable fields going to waste as they cannot be farmed commercially due to their small size.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP529	991209	Support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP530	991219	Do not support. The scale of the two new villages is far too big for the area. You will take away the 'village' and replace it with a town. Retford is a market town with the villages surrounding it and it should remain that way. The sheer amount of traffic these new villages would create would be colossal for the area. The road that is Muttonshire Hill is already a very busy road by commuters in and out of Retford. If you imagine 4000 houses for both sites, potentially all with 2 cars minimum per house, that is 8000 more vehicles each day. The noise would dramatically increase as would the pollution. If there is a need to close the A1 the traffic is diverted through the villages and Retford causing mayhem and gridlock. Even more vehicles in the area would only add to the strain on the roads. If the airport closes jobs will be lost, peoples hobbies will cease and we will also lose seeing the small planes in the area. Which is such a shame as on a summers day our children love seeing the planes come in. There is a wood that borders the runway. On the plan it shows that this will be left alone. But will it? There are lots of wildlife that live in that small wood. We were only just looking at 5 deer in the field at the back of our house yesterday (9/3/19) which then went into the woods. There are also some buzzards and owls that live in there too. They will no longer remain there once building starts. The bridge at the bottom of Muttonshire Hill will not take the amount of traffic.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan– Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>It is a very tight bend and vehicles do not slow down enough. There have been 5 vehicles crash through the bridge since Christmas! When we return home in our car we have to wait on Muttonshire Hill for our gate to open. Vehicles do not slow down enough to stop if there are oncoming vehicles, how they have not hit our cars I do not know but it will only be a matter of time with more traffic on the road. Whilst there aren't any plans for houses to be built directly at the back of our house (that we are aware of) we do not want there to be any. We moved out of the town to be able to look out onto fields and have paid a premium for this. The whole idea of a village is that it is rural and quiet. All of these new houses will take the village feel away. If I wanted to live in a town I would but I don't, I want to live in a quiet village. We have concerns about sewerage and drainage, where will it go? In Gamston we use heating oil. Will these new estates also use the same fuel or will gas be installed? If the airport is sold and knocked down, does that mean we will then be on the flight path for Doncaster airport? Whilst we enjoy the small aircraft flying around we don't want to see massive planes over our house. What about Policing in the area? The local police stations are already stretched and working on low staffing levels as it is. The quiet nature reserves in the area will no longer exist. Where are commuters from these estates going to park their cars if using the trains from Retford? The parking near the train station is a nightmare as it stands. What about the amount social housing? How much of these estates will be dished out for them? Apparently more farmland is going to be sold off in future. These two plans are only the start of it. Where does it end? Where are all these house buyers coming from and where are they going to be working?</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP531	991221	<p>Do not support. as a resident of Gamston, I am concerned at the idea of 2 new villages both next to Gamston no rural area inbetween. The rural infrastructure is not upto this expansion. I believe the Bevercotes site and the Elkesley end of the Gamston site would be better suited to commercial / industrial use due to easy access to the A1. Residential housing would be better placed near existing large scale housing sites, Harworth and Shireoaks would lend to extending, having facilities in place and better access to the road links to the M1and A1. They are both on the north side of the district close to the Bassetlaw Hospital / Worksop and within easy reach of Sheffield, Rotherham and Doncaster. Building on the Gamston Site would see the loss of skilled jobs over 100 on the aerodrome.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP532	Individual	<p>The village of Gamston has NO local amenities; there is no shop or health facilities. Our roads are already under-funded and dangerous – 2 cars have been pulled out of the river in the past 6 months alone. Our walk to school includes crossing the main road where vehicles regularly speed past my 8 and 9 year old at 60mph. This is already dangerous and an accident waiting to happen. The quiet village road past Gamston Church will also have increased traffic as it already is a cut through - there is no way to expand this road. A significant number of new homes within a 2.2km radius will only increase the traffic and the likelihood of severe injury or death to local residents. The main road connecting these 2 new villages to each other and the A1 is in desperate need of repair. The bridge has been reduced to single lane traffic with no intention to repair in sight. As I am aware this is a Highways and Nottinghamshire County Council issue. With that in mind how can the plan suggest it is the developer's responsibility to correct and maintain the infrastructure? Please see further notes from personal experiences. We have limited public transport services through</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>our village and these will only decrease with lack of funding rather than increase. This leaves no choice for residents (old and new) but to drive. § Our village school (and other local schools) are only a few places off full capacity. To have such a massive increase in families locally will only stretch educational resources further in an area that is working hard to achieve high standards. Our nearest health facilities, shops etc are in Retford, Ordsall, Tuxford – we have moved into the area knowing this and are happy to NOT have these facilities close to home. We enjoy spending time and money supporting local shop owners in Retford Town Centre , we value their contribution to the community in an age where town centres are dying due to out of town retail and housing. The vitality and future prosperity of the town centre is something that needs addressing NOW and not left to diminish in the future. The environmental impact on our village, its residents and visitors will be huge. Aside from a huge increase in traffic, lacking road systems and general expenses for the maintenance of a heavily used road network valuable farmland will be developed into a concrete jungle for homes. This will impact on waste, flooding, wildlife (hares, stags, partridges, buzzards, hawks are all present in this land) and ALL residents quality of life and that is before discussing the pollution from additional cars, homes, lights etc. We are fortunate to have the Gamston Airport site within our village. As you are aware it has been on its current site for many years and predates many of the residents who live or have moved to the village. It states in the Bassetlaw Plan that one positive outcome of new housings developments on the site will be to reduce aircraft noise. I would like to make it known that there is currently very limited 'noise' from the airfield. If we lose this valuable local asset the air-space</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		restrictions will be lifted and we will get INCREASED noise from lower flying larger commercial aircraft out of Doncaster.	
DBLP532	Individual	<p>The current suggestion of 2 garden villages so close to each other is ludicrous and does not constitute a 'balanced growth' or 'spreading the population' throughout Bassetlaw as has been identified in the Plan. When you look at Map on Page 33 of the Plan it clearly shows towns and villages occupy both the northern and southern half of the region with area to the south and east of Worksop and to the east Retford being underdeveloped. Whilst I support the proposal of residential dwellings on the old Bevercoates Pit site due to its previous use. I do not support the Garden Village proposal at Gamston Airport. We are fortunate to have a growing industry and a highly skilled workforce present at the airfield in our community. We should be encouraging children and students to strive for such employment opportunities so Bassetlaw can 'lead the way' encouraging and supporting viable businesses for the benefit and future growth of our local economy (as implied in the Plan). We should not be instrumental in closing such specialist businesses and in turn diminishing current and future employment opportunities for residents. Why should residents of Bassetlaw only aspire to be employed in low skilled/ low paid roles that are so common today? I am aware there is space around the airfield currently that can be used for light industrial operations and truly believe that with the existing infrastructure to the A1 and HGV's not needing to come through the village, this would be the better option. The Bassetlaw Plan does not plan for the future, specialist highly skilled industry needs to be encouraged and taken advantage of, as does the expansion of viable businesses (as stated in the Plan) that already occupy the Gamston Airfield site.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP532	Individual	<p>Having previously lived in a 'Garden Village' I have first-hand experience of the planning and on-going development issues such villages bring. For ease I have put comments under specific headings below to highlight issues I believe will also become a problem with the Gamston Garden Village site - The layout of dwellings and the design of road networks were ill thought through, 90 degree sharp bends, a maze of through-roads and cul-de-sacs. Steep inclines making winter mornings lethal (no council grit service) if you could get off the estate at all. With minimal parking provided and garages build to 70's regulations (which means modern cars don't fit in them) means cars, vans, motorhomes, caravans are all forced to park on the narrow roads. This in turn made estate roads single lane traffic. Parking - mildly concerning in the early years of the development (as above) but as the children born on the estate mature the number of cars per household increase, coupled with children living at home for longer (due to cost of University and the majority of work locally being low skill/low pay so unable to afford their own homes) often meant those '2.4 households with 6 journeys per day' ended having at least 4 cars with 18 journeys per day (as no public transport links) and that was before they have visitors! Our neighbours in a 5 bed house actually had 7 cars, 5 of which parked on the road! Facilities promised in original plans – shop/pub/community centre/nursery/ play-parks/ Doctor etc (as the local council had instructed to be part and parcel of the development opportunity) never materialised. Even to this day some 10+ years after we moved onto the estate residents are still fighting for a basic play-park to be erected. This is due to developers arguing that it isn't their responsibility even though it was in initial planning documentation. Please do not be so naïve to believe the plans BDC put in will not be changed at a later date by an uprising of new residents. Light industrial units were</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>scrapped in favour of more housing and amenities (which still haven't materialised). Residents use health services in neighbouring villages (which are already full). The promised improved education also did not materialise with locals instead travelling between 2 and 15 miles in a car to other provisions. Some 15+ years after phase 1 of the afore mentioned garden village development the local parish council continues to address the below issues- The roads in the new development appear to be too narrow and of unsuitable layout (90° bends) to allow for safe access of emergency services and utilities. No bus stops are planned. The nearest bus stop on First Avenue is a ten minute walk away and requires crossing the busy Cavendish Road. The whole of Cavendish Estate still only has one access route. Emergency services may not be able to reach the estate. Still no amenities such as shops, schools etc have been added to the plans. The open space with play park needs better access. The access should face the direction of the main anticipated traffic flow of potential users. There should be four exits in total to keep children safe and allow safe exit routes in case of bullying incidents or similar. A pavement all around the open space should allow for safe access to the park. The plans show several properties with only one car parking space. Without suitable connection to public transport residents are likely to be relying on more than one car per household. Any surplus vehicles would be parked on the road adding to car parking and emergency access problems.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP532	Individual	<p>For 3 years we battled to get a broadband provider as local telephone exchanges were at capacity. This meant our exchange was some miles away from the estate. This in turn meant broadband speeds under 0.5mbps which under current legislation meant no one would provide to us. It took complaints to Communications Ombudsman to start the ball rolling – additional stress which we didn't need especially as I ran my own business from home. Ambulance and Fire services struggle to get onto the estate partially due to lay out and partially due to parked cars. There is only one entry/exit point meaning it can effectively be cut off. Due to the intrinsic nature of the development locals felt truly pushed out as their prime leisure and dog walking areas were built upon. Green spaces incorporated into the design are affectively used for dog fouling. There is still very much an 'US and THEM' feel and the development lacked any community feel. Many people didn't know neighbours as it was and still is a commuter village (town). Immediate local economy provides a high proportion of low skilled low paid work and so prices the 'locals' out. Due to most households commuting many residents choose to spend their money in areas nearer their work place (for example food/ leisure shopping). You only need to look at the severe decline of Mansfield Town centre to acknowledge this. Such a large percentage of households commuting has left the area like a 'ghost town' for the majority of the day (7am-7pm), a race track from 5pm onwards and a car park at the evenings and weekends. This makes it unsafe for children to 'play out'. Leisure time is also more diverse, using local country parks to dog-walk but spending money on days out further afield – Sheffield, Birmingham, Nottingham, Chesterfield etc.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP532	Individual	Moved to this village to escape the 'Garden Village' (Town) we previously resided in. To allow our children to grow up in a rural location, a place where they can play out without fear of fast cars, parked cars and dangerous roads. An area that is cleaner with reduced pollution, which is part of a community where neighbours look out for each other. We now spend more time together as a family(not less as the plan states) exploring local footpaths and star-gazing - as there is CURRENTLY limited light pollution. Would like my children to grow and be part of our active community where opportunities for education, employment and lifestyle are expected to an exemplary standard. Where Bassetlaw defies national trends for low paid/low skilled roles and strives for highly skilled highly paid employment which in turn seeks to bring prosperity to all who reside and are employed here.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP533	991230	Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP534	991231	Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP535	991234	Support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP536	991235	Do not support. To describe the proposal as 'garden villages' is misleading, as is the New Settlement Study which is alarmingly incorrect in many areas. Why build a town in the middle of the Nottinghamshire countryside? It makes no sense at all. We should be preserving our rural heritage, not turning it into a large urban development. The infrastructure will need to be massively enhanced to cope with this. This includes the roads and other services such as hospitals and the policing of it all which cannot possibly cope with the extra burden.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP537	991237	Do not support. The scale of increase in properties in these locations will destroy the actual villages in the vicinity. Gamston, Eaton, Rockley, West Drayton and East Markham will have their population essentially increased from a few hundred to several thousand. Completely contradictory to the 20% maximum that is stated in the plan. The road infrastructure in these locations, which currently can't cope with the existing volume of traffic, will be dangerous areas to live. Eaton currently has damage to the bridge after a road accident, the bridge was also closed in 2017 due to a vehicle colliding with the bridge. There have been a number of road traffic accidents and vehicles have knocked down street lights when the bridge at Ordsall was temporary closed. The road through Eaton is unable to cope with the current volume of traffic and the speeds that people drive at. With any increase in this the chance of a fatality on this road is only a matter of time. Eaton	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>also has limited pavements, with the gate to our property opening straight on to the road with vehicles regularly passing at 40-50 MPH in a 30 MPH zone. This will only get worse and more dangerous with any increase in traffic in the locality. Current traffic volumes are around 100 vehicles per hour... Mon 4/3/19 - 8-9am - 113 vehicles Mon 4/3/19 - 4-5pm - 118 vehicles Fri 8/3/19 - 8-9am - 113 vehicles Fri 8/3/19 - 4-5pm - 117 vehicles With these volumes there are multiple accidents a month, near misses and hourly incidents of people driving at significantly over the speed limit. Increasing properties in close proximity to Eaton from around 100 to nearly 6000 would have to result in access through Eaton being stopped.</p>	
DBLP538	991240	<p>Do not support. A consequence of meeting targets and budgets will mean that this will be one of the first areas of the new development which will be decreased. I also wonder about the demand, there are a number of existing sites which remain empty and unused, we should aim to fill these first surely? Would the Tuxford based industries not benefit more from being relocated to the proposed sites for the 2 New villages as this would put them closer to major road networks and remove the need for HGVs to be routed through Tuxford? Also, new homes being built on the industrial site in Tuxford (once businesses had been relocated). Would mean that the additional traffic, people, demand on local resources would be more equally distributed between Retford and Tuxford.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan– Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP539	991241	<p>Do not support. Why would viable businesses and the airport employment of specialist worker be destroyed. No risk assessments on rural road have taken place. 6 additional journeys per household every day on unsuitable roads. Insufficient public transport and the garden villages can not access railways easily. No air quality assessment has taken place. The area has insufficient health service for ever the stage 1. The plan should be protecting rural locations ! Also the Airport development would be directly tagging on to Muttonshire Hill which is not recommended.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP540	991243	<p>Do not support. As above the loss of Gamston Airport is too much for me to agree to this. I live nearby, I access Gamston Airport frequently and I can not see why you're willing to throw local aviation away so easily.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP541	991264	<p>Support. But not at the expense of an existing employment and business location. New developments are meant to add to facilities and not to merely replace one existing and active facility with housing just to avoid any perception of planning issues.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP542	991336	Support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP543	991990	Do not support. This airfield is a VITAL part of the flying training infrastructure of the UK. The council should be leading the fight to PROTECT it from development.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP544	992014	Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP545	992366	Support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP546	992635	Do not support. The plan will destroy nationally important aviation infrastructure leading to the loss of advanced technology and engineering businesses and pilot training. It will also leave the Children's Air Ambulance without a base in the Retford area and will result in the loss of approximately 100 highly skilled jobs.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP547	993337	Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP548	993387	Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation: Policies 13-16			

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP2	Individual	Supports the policies seeking to address climate change. Will there be renewable energy	There will be a renewable energy policy within the Local Plan which will be informed by responses to the consultation and the site allocations assessment.
DBLP16	Individual	Supports the policies seeking to address climate change.	Support for policy welcomed.
DBLP24	Individual	Supports the policies seeking to address climate change.	Support for policy welcomed.
DBLP31	BDC Councillor	Does not support the policies seeking to address climate change.	Support for policy welcomed.
DBLP32	Individual	Supports the policies seeking to address climate change.	Support for policy welcomed.
DBLP37	Marine Management Organisation	The East Marine Plan contains a number of policies that are relevant to policies highlighted in the Draft Bassetlaw Plan. The following east plan policies may be relevant to policies 14, 15, 17, 19, 21 and 24 within the Draft Bassetlaw Plan: CC1, CC2, SOC2, SOC3, BIO1, BIO2, ECO1, GOV1. Recommend you consult East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans and Marine Information System for further information.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council will ensure that East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans and Marine Information System are consulted as the plan progresses.
DBLP37	Marine Management Organisation	The East Marine Plan contains a number of policies that are relevant to policies highlighted in the Draft Bassetlaw Plan. The following east plan policies may be relevant to policies 14, 15, 17, 19, 21 and 24 within the Draft Bassetlaw Plan: CC1, CC2, SOC2, SOC3, BIO1, BIO2, ECO1, GOV1. Recommend you consult East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans and Marine Information System for further information.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council will ensure that East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans and Marine Information System are consulted as the plan progresses.
DBLP60	Nottinghamshire Fire & Rescue Service	Will the potential planned more efficient use of domestic water in the new garden village developments, affect the supply, size of mains, flow and pressure?	It shouldn't affect the supply, size of mains or water pressure but it is likely to affect the flow of water.
DBLP135	Individual	Why in hell are you destroying a business and recreational asset in the community when you have a dozen brown field sites surrounding this complex. There are building projects on disused pit sites at Cotgrave and Gedling that would better suit this area. There is legislation in Parliament at this time aimed at stopping the destruction of our airfields that are a national	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make amendments where necessary.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		assett. If you are hell bent on choosing an airfield why not choose a disused one such as Ossington near by.	
DBLP138	Bothamsall Parish Council	Supports the policies seeking to address climate change.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP144	Individual	Support the proposed polices that seek to address climate change.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP150	Individual	All new houses built in Bassetlaw and any major house extensions should have to incorporate solar panels in their designs and be built to the highest standard of thermal insulation. My solar installation is a modest under 4kw system, but have generated 24000kwh over the last 7 years. If the 6630 houses required 2018-2035 all did this, that would generate 22 million kwh per year. No builder will volunteer to do this we need a strategy that makes them to do it for the sake of future generations	The Local Plan has policies to support the generation of small scale and local renewable energy generation.
DBLP170	East Markham Parish Council	Does not take into account surface water runoff from a number of small developments in rural areas. BDC should work with developers irrespective of size to ensure installation of SuDS. This will ensure that the drainage systems in no area of Bassetlaw will be overwhelmed in times of heavy rainfall.	Cumulative impact is taken into consideration. It is a requirement of national policy (paragraph 156, NPPF).
DBLP182	Severn Trent Water Ltd	Support. In particular the requirement to include SuDS, ensure that they have an appropriate management and maintenance arrangements and do not discharge surface water into the sewerage system. Welcome the inclusion of SuDS in green infrastructure with the aim of providing wider biodiversity and amenity benefits along with flood storage volumes. Expect surface water to be managed in line with the Government's Water Strategy, Future Water. The strategy sets out a vision for more effective management of surface water to deal with the dual pressures of climate change and housing development. Surface water needs to be managed sustainably. For new	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council will continue to liaise with infrastructure providers to ensure the policies in the Plan are appropriate and compliant with national policy and guidance.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>developments would not expect surface water to be conveyed to our foul or combined sewage system and, where practicable, support the removal of surface water already connected to foul or combined sewer. Greater emphasis needs to be paid to consequences of extreme rainfall. In the past, even outside of the flood plain, some properties have been built in natural drainage paths. Request that developers providing sewers on new developments should safely accommodate floods which exceed the design capacity of the sewers. To encourage developers to consider sustainable drainage, Severn Trent currently offer a 100% discount on the sewerage infrastructure charge if there is no surface water connection and a 75% discount if there is a surface water connection via a sustainable drainage system.</p>	
DBLP183	Environment Agency	<p>Fully support this Policy and consider it sound. Particularly supportive of the recognition that new development must not increase flood risk to either the development and future occupants themselves, or third parties. Support the statement that 'less vulnerable' and 'more vulnerable' development will not be supported in areas of Flood Zone 3b which is defined as functional floodplain. Recognise that there are no significant proposals to regenerate areas in the functional floodplain, which is a positive with regards to flood risk. Recommend that additional wording should be added to the supporting text, perhaps as a new paragraph '13.14'. Like to the Plan to encourage applicants and developers to approach the Environment Agency directly, for pre application advice, when development is being proposed in high flood risk areas. Anecdotal evidence shows that this ultimately results in less delays at the formal planning application stage. Applicants are strongly encouraged to approach us via email at planning.trentside@environment-agency.gov.uk.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. Propose to include the following text in the Plan: "Applicants and developers may wish to approach the Environment Agency directly for pre application advice when development is being proposed in high flood risk areas."</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP184	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Section 4. SuDS states proposals should: g) Where appropriate, provide natural flood management and mitigation through improvement or creation of green infrastructure. Wish to point out the potential biodiversity value of SuDS (Chapter 6 of Ciria Suds Manual) and would expect to see reference to the existence of this guidance and the potential biodiversity value of SuDS in the supporting text.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. Guidance often becomes out of date or update so it is not considered appropriate to make reference to the Circa SuDS Manual. It is proposed that the text will make reference to the benefits that SuDS provide for biodiversity.
DBLP182	Severn Trent Water Ltd	Welcome the use of the optional Lower water consumption targets (110 Litres/person/day) outlined within Part G of the Building Regulations.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP182	Severn Trent Water Ltd	Support para 13.23 and the need to protect watercourse and groundwater from pollution. Generally supportive of Policy 16 the inclusion of the optional water efficiency target and water reuse. Question if the policy needs to include the 'optional' element of the statement in favour of a stronger statement, given para 2.8 of Building Regulations Part G (2015 edition with 2016 amendments) states: "The optional requirement only applies where a condition that the dwelling should meet the optional requirement is imposed as part of the process of granting planning permission. Where it applies, the estimated consumption of wholesome water calculated in accordance with the methodology in the water efficiency calculator, should not exceed 110 litres/person/day." Support the water quality section, it is particularly important because for development to be carried out sustainably in line with the principle objectives of NPPF, it is essential that the water resources and systems in the local area are protected to deliver housing growth and maintain current standards of living for future generations. Development should not be permitted where it could cause a detriment to water quality, particularly within Source Protection Zones (SPZ) as deterioration of water quality in these areas presents a risk to water supply capacity. Good quality river water and groundwater is vital for provision of	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		good quality drinking water. The Environment Agency's Source Protection Zone (SPZ) and Safe Guarding Zone policy should provide guidance on development. Any proposals should take into account the principles of the Water Framework Directive and River Basin Management Plan for the Severn River basin unit.	
DBLP183	Environment Agency	In terms of Part A, fully support the intention to incorporate the tighter water efficiency measures. For the avoidance of doubt, fully prepared to support BDC at the subsequent EiP to defend the inclusion of this measure. It is absolutely necessary, and whilst the supporting text does an excellent job of setting this out, have further evidence which could assist if necessary. A previous government report clearly states that these tighter water efficiency measures can be incorporated by developers at a rough cost of £9 per dwelling; it is not within our remit to comment on matters of viability, do not consider that a showstopper by any means. In terms of Part B, support the opening paragraph which makes reference to the WFD, it would be good for the Policy to include a reference to ongoing projects which are looking to enhance rivers for WFD. Suggest the following could be added to the end of the paragraph: 'In line with the objectives of the Water Framework Directive, development must not result in any waterbody failing to meet the element and overall class status set out in the Humber River Basin Management Plan. Where possible, development should actively contribute to enhancing the status of the waterbody through positive actions or ongoing projects'. Whilst improving water quality is one of the most important elements to the WFD, there are also physical modifications to watercourses which have the potential to impact on WFD status. For example, culverting, straightening, desilting etc. Would like to see this referenced in this section as it is all part of the WFD process. Suggest the following wording added to	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		bullet point '1': '1. Development will be permitted where proposals will not have a negative impact on water quality directly through pollution of surface or ground water. Development will not be permitted where it includes the physical modification of a waterbody such that it impacts upon the WFD status of that waterbody and causes a deterioration in status.'	
DBLP186	Natural England	Welcome the inclusion in this policy of the preference for SuDS which were possible will provide multifunctional benefits, this could include more specific reference to SuDS contributing to the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity. Plans should positively contribute to reducing flood risk by working with natural processes and where possible use Green Infrastructure policies and the provision of SUDs to achieve this.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. It is proposed that the text will make reference to the benefits that SuDS provide for biodiversity.
DBLP186	Natural England	Supports Policy 16 part B which will ensure development must not result in any waterbody failing to meet the element and overall class status set out in the Humber River Basin Management Plan. Welcome the inclusion of the Humber River Basin Management Plan to inform the development proposed in the Local Plan. Support the inclusion of not permitting development where the drainage of surface water could adversely affect areas important for biodiversity. Welcome an extension of this policy to include protecting habitats from water related impacts and where appropriate seeking enhancement. Priority for enhancements should be focussed on European Sites, SSSIs and local sites which contribute to a wider ecological network.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP191	National Trust	Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP191	National Trust	Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP194	Emery Planning on behalf of J G Pears Property Ltd	<p>Policies 13 and 14 focus on energy efficiency in construction and development of new low carbon and energy schemes.</p> <p>Support the aims and objectives of these policies. The Plan fails to take opportunities offered by existing energy efficient locations, such as High Marnham which as they already exist offer the most sustainable opportunities to power future development. The Former High Marnham Power Station site provides an excellent opportunity to positively and actively meet the aims of this Section of the Plan with its accessibility to the national Grid connection and critically potential for reuse of excess power, heat and hot water from J G Pears Low Marnham CHP. This unique opportunity should be grasped by the LPA and, accordingly the Policies should be combined or expanded to include a presumption in favour of reuse of existing energy efficient sites which already provide opportunities for decentralised energy. In consideration of Part 2 of the Local Plan significant weight should be attached to this benefit and this site should be allocated for employment or other uses.</p>	
DBLP221	Gladman Developments	<p>Do not consider that the requirement for the higher water efficiency standard to be appropriate. The Written Ministerial Statement (25th March 2015) makes clear that the optional technical standards should only be required if there is a clearly evidenced based need for them, and where their impact on viability has been considered. Paragraph 13.18 confirms that the areas in Bassetlaw covered by Severn Trent Water (within which some sites are located) are not classed as water stressed areas. As such, the policy is not soundly based as it is not supported by appropriate evidence for all site locations. B3 duplicates some of the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991, which places a statutory requirement on water companies. Developments pay a connection charge and yearly charges for foul but the water treatment is for the Water</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council has evidence to support this approach. This will be clarified in the Plan.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		Authority statutory duties and via their EA licencing. Suggest this paragraph is reworded to avoid passing the statutory requirements onto developers and housebuilders. It is not apparent from B4 the circumstances that the Council are seeking to address and no adverse affects at all is a very high bar. Needs more explanation and flexibility otherwise it could be imposing far more onerous requirement than development sites achieving an overall net gain in biodiversity.	
DBLP229	Individual	Supports the policies seeking to address climate change.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP232	Elkesley Parish Council	Surprised that very little alternative sources of green energy are included. The plan highlights Solar energy fields will be supported and housing should be designed with good “solar access”. There is no mention of any other alternatives like Air Source heat pumps or ground source heat pumps, which could be done at the building stage, and would provide a significant saving to reduce the reliance on fossil fuels, mitigating climate change. Would like to see a comprehensive policy regarding the use of all alternative energy sources and not just solar within the building process not just for housing but any development within the area. BDC can set these markers higher than the stated norm, and would like to see that done to encourage excellent buildings being built within the district, encouraging people to want to live here. There is no mention of electric vehicle charging points in local towns and villages apart from those proposed in the North Nottingham Garden Villages. There is no point supplying charging points in development unless additional charging areas are available district wide. Would like to see a comprehensive policy for the support of electric vehicles.	
DBLP262	Anglian Water Services Ltd	Anglian Water is supportive of the requirement to incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems as part of the design of new	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		developments which will help to address sewer flooding and surface water flooding.	
DBLP255	Home Builders Federation	<p>All new dwellings achieve a mandatory level of water efficiency of 125 litres per day per person under Building Regulations which is higher than that achieved by much of the existing housing stock. The WMS 25th March 2015 confirmed that “the optional new national technical standards should only be required through any new Local Plan policies if they address a clearly evidenced need, and where their impact on viability has been considered, in accordance with the NPPG”. The Council should justify the requirement for the higher water efficiency standard in accordance with the criteria set out in the NPPG (ID 56-013 to 56-017). The Housing Standards Review was explicit that reduced water consumption was solely applicable to water stressed areas. The Council’s evidence states that areas in Bassetlaw covered by Severn Trent Water are not classed as water stressed. The Council should also clarify if Bassetlaw District is totally or only partially in the area covered by Anglian Water which is classed as an area of serious water stress. This policy requirement should be modified before the publication of the pre-submission Local Plan consultation.</p>	<p>Whilst the Housing Standards Review may have indicated that reduced water consumption was solely applicable to water stressed areas, the PPG indicates (Paragraph: 015 Reference ID: 56-015-20150327) that:</p> <p>‘It will be for a local planning authority to establish a clear need based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • existing sources of evidence. • consultations with the local water and sewerage company, the Environment Agency and catchment partnerships. See paragraph 003 of the water supply guidance • consideration of the impact on viability and housing supply of such a requirement.’ <p>The Environment Agency, Severn Trent Water, and Anglian Water fully support this policy and consider that it is necessary. The Council has evidence to demonstrate that it is required in Bassetlaw.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP262	Anglian Water Services Ltd	<p>A. Maximising Water Efficiency: Anglian Water is supportive of Policy 16 as it states that all new residential development in the District should achieve the optional technical standard in terms of water efficiency of 110 litres/person/day. The Environment Agency has identified the Anglian Water region as an area of serious water stress, and support the adoption of the higher standard of water efficiency. Government research (The Housing Standards Review Cost Impact report, 2014) has shown that the cost of the optional higher water efficiency standard and associated cost can be as low as £6-9 per dwelling. The optional higher water efficiency standard has also been successfully adopted in a number of local plans in Anglian Water company area. Consider that this does not make the Plan, or individual development proposals, unviable. Local Planning Authorities are able to adopt the higher optional standard for water efficiency where there is clear 'local need' as identified in the NPPG. Policy 16 refers to this standard and the water efficiency standard which would apply by default. To ensure the policy is effective suggest removing the reference to default standard for water efficiency (125 litres/per person/per day) as the policy suggests that both water efficiency standards would apply. Suggest that the reference to water efficiency/re-use measures be included in Policy 16 to encourage residential development to improve upon the optional higher water efficiency standard. It is proposed that paragraph 'a' of Policy 16 be amended as follows: 'To promote water efficiency, new developments will be required to minimise water consumption by meeting the tighter Building Regulations optional requirement of 110 litres/person/day (in addition to the 125 litres/person/day mandatory standard) Water recycling, rainwater and stormwater harvesting should also be incorporated wherever feasible to reduce demand on mains water supply.'</p> <p>B. Promoting Water Quality: Anglian Water is</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. Agree with amendment to remove the reference to 125 litres per person per day from the policy.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		supportive of Policy 16 as it requires that development proposals must be served by an adequate supply of water, sewerage infrastructure and sufficient sewage treatment capacity.	
DBLP270	Individual	The relevant NPPF policy is not identified and in an area of low viability, new build delivery beyond Building Regs is unlikely	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP271	Individual	Supported. These new builds should include solar panels, not just water meters.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP270	Individual	15.2a will allow Marina Development to occur because it is “water compatible”	Thank you for your comments which are noted. This is not considered necessary because Policy 15, 2a identifies 'water compatible' development as being appropriate.
DBLP270	Individual	Pusto Hill aquifer is located within Everton Parish with the adjacent water pumping/treatment plant ensuring that the water is distributed to a range of settlements in Bassetlaw. Everton Parish is making this important natural resource available to settlements being awarded excessive growth potential (see later). To class Everton as suffering from “serious water stress” is incorrect when this hitherto Rural Service Centre possesses surplus water supply. Meeting tighter building regulations should not be necessary here. The local validation checklist for Bassetlaw states the following: For applications other than minor extensions Core Strategy Policy DM12: Flood risk, sewerage and drainage requires applicants to	Thank you for your comments which are noted. Everton is served by Anglian Water. Areas covered by Anglian Water are classed as in water stress (as identified by the EA). The approach taken is considered to be appropriate.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		demonstrate that development will not exacerbate existing land drainage and sewerage problems in: • Beckingham • Clarborough and Hayton • East Drayton • East Markham • Harworth Bircotes • North Leverton • North Wheatley • Misterton • South Wheatley • Sturton-le-Steeple • Welham • Walkeringham Yet all of these settlements are proposed to receive the same level (or more) growth than Everton. Beyond the 30 small settlements deemed inappropriate for growth, the draft Bassetlaw Local Plan 2019, fails to distinguish BETWEEN the 73 Rural Settlements identified as appropriate for growth. This is regardless of sewerage capacity, water provision, school provision etc etc etc.....The draft Bassetlaw Plan must acknowledge that differing levels of growth will be required between the 73 Rural Settlements.	
DBLP273	Friends of Woodlands and Coachwood Green Ltd	Shireoaks is liable to flooding from the River Ryton and all developments should attempt to minimise the impact on drainage and sewerage networks to increase the resilience to climate change.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The policies in the plan seek to address surface water drainage. No amendment required.
DBLP273	Friends of Woodlands and Coachwood Green Ltd	Woodlands Country Park (WCP) is a designated wildlife site at the heart of Shireoaks and is evolving as a health and wellbeing asset for Bassetlaw. WCP has unique natural environment properties as well as a wealth of history and heritage assets. Critical to maintaining and enhancing the biodiversity of WCP is the protection of the wildlife corridors from nearby Sites of Special Scientific Interest; to feed the developing wildlife in its unusual mosaic of habitats. These corridors should adhere to the specifications advised by Notts Wildlife Trust.	
DBLP273	Friends of Woodlands and Coachwood Green Ltd	The boundary of the conservation area in Shireoaks should be expanded to include Woodlands and Coachwood Green which should be designated as Local Green Spaces. Protection of these green spaces including the ancient allotments should be protected from residential development.	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP301	977042	Support for policies which address climate change. There should be no fracking and more recycling.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP296	975737	Support for policies which address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP297	975757	Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP303	978627	Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP304	986292	Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP308	986480	Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP311	986993	Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP314	987642	Support for policies which seek to address climate change. Although this is an area that will need to be reviewed every five years not 15. appreciate it may be a more time consuming and challenging process to identify how the government housing targets may be met solely by opportunities the existing town centres and villages, and in turn prove more challenging to impose levies on developers in order to provide key infrastructure requirements. I believe by focusing on the communities we already have the overall benefit would be to improve and enhance what Bassetlaw already has rather than attempting to create garden villages with the potential to leave the communities, old and new with more diluted, less focuses services and facilities. By focusing on the communities we already have the overall benefit would be to improve and enhance what Bassetlaw already has rather than attempting to create garden villages with the potential to leave the communities, old and new with more diluted, less focuses services and facilities. If this is a consultation why is this being said ? see photo attached	The Council is strongly embracing the national green agenda and has recently updated its Council Plan. The Local Plan is also strongly supporting the low carbon economy within its policies and will form a central part to its objectives.
DBLP315	987680	Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP317	987880	Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP318	987892	Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP319	987959	Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP321	988036	Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP323	988047	Only support policy which seeks to address climate change.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP330	988064	Support for policies which seek to address climate change provided it wouldn't result in the loss of Gamston Airfield.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP336	988172	Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP344	988235	Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP345	988237	Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP349	988325	Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP350	988344	Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP351	988346	Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP352	988350	Only support policies addressing climate change and delivering and safeguarding infrastructure.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)	This policy can have a major effect on some smaller settlement's ability to deliver housing and meet their 10_20% requirements.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council has worked closely with infrastructure providers to ensure that the plan will deliver any necessary infrastructure improvements associated with development.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)	Overall this policy is welcomed, but this policy takes no account of the existing woefully weak water / sewerage systems in the smaller more rural settlements.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council has worked closely with infrastructure providers to ensure that the plan will deliver any necessary infrastructure improvements associated with development.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)	Support for climate change policies. But will have an effect on the deliverability of the housing requirement.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP362	988481	Support for climate change policies. But will have an effect on the deliverability of the housing requirement.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP363	988482	Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP364	988487	Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP371	988500	Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP372	988501	Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP373	988503	Support for policies which seek to address climate change. Making new homes more eco-friendly is an excellent plan. Making new homes where there is already an airfield does not make sense in my mind.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP375	988527	Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP376	988557	Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP379	988630	Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP384	988726	We are supportive of any reasonable policies to support the issue of climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP386	988747	Support climate change policies. I believe in addressing climate change and there should be development by the Council in sustainable energy eg solar farms , again these could be sited on vacant poor quality agricultural land. There should also be development in transport infrastructure and perhaps for old railway stations eg Tuxford to be reopened so that more sustainable commuting is possible and road traffic reduced.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP387	988748	No support for climate change policies. Building new house with limited road infrastructure will increase emissions from construction and later on traffic congestion caused by poor design and too many vehicles using the site compare to present airfield activity.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council has worked closely with infrastructure providers to ensure that the plan will deliver any necessary infrastructure improvements associated with development.
DBLP388	988749	Support for policies which seek to address climate change. But should go further.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The policy is currently being reviewed to determine if it can seek higher standards.
DBLP391	988813	Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP392	988889	No support for climate change policies. Climate change is addresses through incentives to decarbon existing infrastructure not penalise those who have little choice or ability or knowledge to change their current situation	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council has worked closely with infrastructure providers to ensure that the plan will deliver any necessary infrastructure improvements associated with development.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP393	989007	Support for climate change policies. Every new house built should have solar panels as a building requirement. Lets start with some regulations that will actually contribute and mean something.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council has worked closely with infrastructure providers to ensure that the plan will deliver any necessary infrastructure improvements associated with development.
DBLP394	989023	Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP398	989658	Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP399	989741	Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP402	990030	No support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP403	990043	Support for policies which seek to address climate change. This is difficult as central government is muddy over this issue	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP404	990059	Support for policies which seek to address climate change. This is difficult as central government is muddy over this issue	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP405	990062	Support for policies which seek to address climate change. The objectives of policy 13 are commendable but there is little detail or substance in explaining in reality how this will actually be achieved. Bassetlaw and Nottinghamshire are amongst the worst authorities in the country for things such as re-cycling which has an impact on climate change. As an example, solar panels should be installed as energy efficient sound barriers at the side of Elkesley.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. In every area is different and there are a number of mitigation solutions to address climate change. The suggestion of installing solar panels, whilst laudable, is too prescriptive. A more nuanced approach is considered appropriate in this respect.
DBLP407	990068	Support for policies which seek to address climate change.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP408	990070	Don't support climate change policies. The volumes of housing outweighs suggested plan.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. In terms of achieving sustainable development, the planning system has three overarching objectives: to deliver the social infrastructure to meet the needs of communities, to contribute towards the protection of the natural environment, and to promote a strong economy. Housing provides for the social needs of the community. The plan seeks to ensure that it is designed in such a way as to address the effects of climate change. It also has a positive effect on the local economy by providing jobs and supporting local services.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP410	990076	Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP411	990079	Support for policies which seek to address climate change. The policies are fine but the way they are proposing the implementation I do not support. Decimating the countryside is NOT environmentally friendly .	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP415	990150	The respondent supports the approach to Policies 13, 14 and 15. As a major landowner in the District they welcome support for appropriately located and unobtrusive low carbon and renewable energy schemes where they will not result in unacceptable impacts on environmental amenity or the character of the built and natural environment.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP416	990240	Support for policies which seek to address climate change. This is a "no-brainer". All Authorities and Individuals should be concerned and be taking action to 'address Climate Change'. With this in mind, it is difficult to understand why Rural Villages are being compelled to accommodate more housing when this then creates more vehicle journeys (stated as per 6 per household per day). With regards to Bothamsall, under the Current Plan it is a Village that cannot sustain further development. With the wave of a 'magic wand' Bothamsall IS now able to sustain further development having 'lost' the facilities of a Shop, Post Office and useful Bus Service. I do not believe that the addition of a few houses will bring these back to Bothamsall. These extra vehicles will create even more pollution and thus be effective in the acceleration of Climate Change. The wide use of Electric Cars is still a long way off, and it is interesting to note that when such vehicles are 'championed' there is not any mention of where or how all of this additional Electricity is to be generated.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. Development in Bothamsall could help to sustain services in other nearby villages, such as Walesby. This approach is advocated by national planning policy (Paragraph 78, NPPF).
DBLP418	990387	Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP419	990400	Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP420	990465	Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP421	990489	Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP422	990506	Don't support policies which seek to address climate change	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP423	990541	Don't support climate change policies. There are many policies, so I would need to know which ones are referred to in this instance.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP425	990570	Don't support. I'm saying this because the council station ends in two days and I don't have much time but based on the bit that I have read I assume the rest of it is not very well thought through.	Comments noted.
DBLP424	990549	Support policies which seek to address climate change	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP426	990571	Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP427	990577	Support. Building on new greenfield sites and Gamston Airport is incompatible with green intentions. More roads, more vehicles and less green space. Urban sprawl.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP428	990594	Don't support. as stated this development is in the wrong area.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP429	990613	Support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP430	990614	Support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP431	990633	Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP434	990659	Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP435	990666	Support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP436	990682	Support. However. Your proposals are incompatible with you aims in utilization and airfield which is a haven for our rapidly diminishing wildlife.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. Nature conservation is taken into consideration in planning decisions on development. Any adverse affects would need to be addressed where necessary.
DBLP437	990704	Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP438	990717	Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP439	990719	Don't support. protect what we have not growth of cement citys!	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP440	990764	Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP441	990783	Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP442	990799	Support. Yes, if Gamston village is not constructed.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP443	990800	<p>Support. On the whole FCC support the policies that seek to conserve and enhance the natural and built environment.</p> <p>Policy 19: Protecting Biodiversity and Geodiversity, confirms that development likely to result in the loss, deterioration or harm to habitats or species of importance to biodiversity or geological conversation interests, either directly or indirectly, will not be permitted unless certain criteria are met. FCC support this policy as it acknowledges that the need for, and benefits of the development can outweigh the adverse effect in relation to biodiversity providing appropriate mitigation can be provided. This is in accordance with the NPPF which states at Paragraph 170 that planning policies should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan).</p> <p>Policy 22: Design is also supported as it acknowledges that the Council will support development of a good quality design which positively contributes to the appearance of the area. The Policy goes on to set out a list of criteria which development proposals are required to adhere to in order to achieve good quality design. The development of FCC's site at Carlton Forest will be well designed in order to respond to the semi-rural character of the area.</p>	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP444	990802	<p>Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment. One of the Strategic Objectives relates to the 'protection of the intrinsic character of the countryside'. I do not consider that it will be protected with 1000 houses concentrated in a rural area over 15 years and subsequently a further 3000 houses over the next 15 or so years. The proposed areas are close to local and regional popular leisure, heritage and historical tourist area with such attractions as the Dukeries, Clumber Park and Sherwood</p>	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		Forest. I consider that these housing developments will spoil the attraction to these unique places and locally will urbanise an area known for its rolling green farmland and beautiful landscapes.	
DBLP445	990806	Do not support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP446	990814	Support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP446	990814	Do not support. Para 13.12 directly associates flooding of rivers in the down to climate change. This is a crass statement jumping on the bandwagon without any forethought. Rivers have flooded in this area for many years even before the term climate change has become the catch all for any natural phenomena.	Whilst it is acknowledged that flooding has historically occurred, there is growing evidence that climate change is resulting in more frequent flooding events. Paragraph 4.4 of the Bassetlaw SFRA identifies that climate change is expected to increase the frequency, extent and impact of flooding, reflected in peak river flows. Wetter winters and more intense rainfall may increase fluvial flooding and surface water runoff and there may be increased storm intensity in summer. Increased river levels may also increase flood risk.
DBLP447	990818	Do not support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP448	990826	Support. Any policies that seek to improve the environment are welcome.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP449	990829	Do not support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP450	990836	Do not support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP451	990837	Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP452	990841	Do not support. Construction of these 2 towns would completely ruin the look and feel of the area. It would destroy the rural nature that exists presently.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP450	990836	Do not support. The policy to create housing that will necessitate the use of personal transport to reach facilities is as far from addressing climate change as you can get.	The Plan is seeking to ensure development is located in areas of need within the District. Locating development in rural areas will support local services and reduce the need to travel to access services elsewhere.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP452	990841	Do not support. Whatever we do in this country to affect climate change is insignificant and almost completely irrelevant. If the entire UK disappeared under the waves the difference to the world's CO2 emissions would be 0.04%	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP453	990842	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP454	990843	support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP455	990845	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP456	990846	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP457	990847	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP458	990848	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP459	990849	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP460	990850	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP461	990852	Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP462	990854	Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP463	990855	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP464	990856	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP465	990859	Do not support. I cant support policies that ran we lose and important facility such as Gamston airport.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP466	990862	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP467	990865	Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP468	990869	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP469	990882	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP470	990884	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP471	990885	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP472	990886	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP473	990889	Do not support. I fail to see how current farm land. Which turned in to a housing estate is a method to enhance natural environment.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP474	990891	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP475	990893	Do not support. No because they do not include conserving Gamston airfield as an airfield and green space.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP476	990895	Support. Contradicted by proposals to build two new towns at Gamston and Bevercotes. Both are rural, open countryside with considerable restoration woodland. While Gamston Airfield should be preserved as open green space and a viable airfield, Bevercotes is better suited to deliver biodiversity gains via offsetting and Section 106 agreements.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP477	990901	Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP478	990904	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP479	990910	Do not support. The draft plan for Bassetlaw suggests that that council wishes to protect rural settlements and the natural environment. In doing so it needs to consider the best way of doing this in that services in rural communities are continuing to demise with little focus on economic opportunities and when investment is seen as essential to the continued success of rural communities this is not forthcoming.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP480	990912	Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP481	990913	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP482	990914	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP483	990915	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP484	990916	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP485	990917	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP486	990918	Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP487	990919	Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP488	990921	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP489	990922	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP490	990926	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP491	990928	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP492	990930	Do not support. Destroying the airfield will take significant energy and a natural habit, not over farmed. Building on greenfield would use less energy.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP493	990933	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP494	990934	Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP495	990936	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP496	990937	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP497	990938	Support. Again, not seen any information regarding this.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP498	990940	Support. The use of increasing amounts of renewable energy I agree with. However the rest of the plan seems to be centred around the building of increasingly energy efficient buildings.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP499	990942	Do not support. As part of these include a dividend for closing the airport which will not happen, this will simply move to other, more aviation friendly areas, Selby would welcome such facilities.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Beercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP500	990943	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP501	990944	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP502	990946	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP503	Individual	Do not support. The draft plan fails to provide evidence how it will compel builders to build sustainable homes that do not in themselves further exacerbate climate change.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP504	990949	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP505	Individual	Support. Any proposal to improve the environment is welcome .It should not have to depend on 2 new villages being built.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP506	990952	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP507	990954	Support. The idea of the garden villages sounds excellent.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP508	990955	Do not support. No, see above!	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP509	990959	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP510	990961	Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP516	991153	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP517	991157	Support. Yes any policies that work to protect the climate.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP518	991172	Do not support. Because I do not feel they have gone far enough. I believe BDC should be aiming higher and expecting developers reach passive rate housing alongside ground source and air source heat pumps run via solar. I also believe any plan needs to be district wide, so when you discuss electrical charging facilities it should not just be on new developments it needs to be throughout the district.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP519	991173	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP520	991174	Do not support. I do not feel the other policies have gone far enough. I believe BDC should be aiming higher and expecting developers reach passive rate housing alongside ground source and air source heat pumps run via solar, etc. I also believe any plan needs to be district wide, so when you discuss electrical charging facilities it should not just be on new developments it needs to be throughout the district.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP521	991176	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP522	991178	Support any policy that promotes energy efficiency , new builds where possible should use materials to address the use of renewable energy such as solar incorporated within the roofs , air and ground source heat pumps and provision to accommodate the future use of electric cars although these charging points need to be county and country wide for it to be successful.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP523	991181	Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP524	991184	Do not support. Your proposals to build so many houses but without any supporting action plan for extensive growth in businesses and employment will actually contribute to exactly the opposite of addressing climate change issues. The building of such a large volume of houses will increase traffic congestion on major routes in and out of Bassetlaw with an increased number of people needing to commute for work beyond the 17,000 that you have already identified. That will add to both traffic and noise pollution and so will actually have a totally detrimental effect on climate change issues.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP525	991186	Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP526	991188	Do not support. I have no comment on this.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP527	991190	Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP528	991208	Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP529	991209	Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP530	991219	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP531	991221	Do not support. build the housing near existing regions with good rail links.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP532	Individual	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP533	991230	Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP534	991231	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP535	991234	Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP536	991235	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP537	991237	Support. Whilst the policies may be sound the reality of the sites delivered by the house builders is completely different. I do not believe that Bassetlaw will hold the developers to account in regards to the environmental impact of these sites or the green areas etc in these areas.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP538	991240	Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP539	991241	Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP540	991243	Do not support. At the risk of repeating myself if this new plan incorporates the loss of Gamston Airport then I can not agree to any part of it.	
DBLP541	991264	Do not support. These don't. The increase in vehicle traffic far exceeds the climate consequences of loss of aviation activity. The flood impacts of replacing large grass areas on an airfield with a network of paved and tarmac surfaces will increase the probability and frequency of surface runoff and thus increase the impact of climate change.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP542	991336	Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP543	991990	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP544	992014	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP545	992366	Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP546	992635	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP547	993337	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP548	993387	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
Landscape, Green Infrastructure , Historic and			

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
Built Environment: Policies 17-22			
DBLP2	Individual	Supports the policies seeking to conserve and enhance the natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP16	Individual	Supports the policies seeking to conserve and enhance the natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP24	Individual	Supports the policies seeking to conserve and enhance the natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP31	BDC Councillor	There weren't any	Policies 17-22 address the built and natural environment.
DBLP32	Individual	Supports the policies seeking to conserve and enhance the natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP37	Marine Management Organisation	The East Marine Plan contains a number of policies that are relevant to policies highlighted in the Draft Bassetlaw Plan. The following east plan policies may be relevant to policies 14, 15, 17, 19, 21 and 24 within the Draft Bassetlaw Plan: CC1, CC2, SOC2, SOC3, BIO1, BIO2, ECO1, GOV1. Recommend you consult East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans and Marine Information System for further information.	To ensure consistency with the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans and Marine Information System these documents will be referred to appropriately.
DBLP51	Canal & River Trust	Our towpaths provide public access to the green infrastructure network which can promote active lifestyles and benefits to wellbeing. Welcome part 2 of the policy which requires major development to demonstrate consideration of how the proposal will integrate with green infrastructure. This could improve public access to our network which could benefit the wellbeing of new communities. Important to recognise that significant new developments in the vicinity of the canal network place extra liabilities and burdens upon the waterway infrastructure as open space and as a sustainable transport route. There are often increased maintenance costs and liabilities such as the removal of litter and maintenance of the towpath. The Trust maintains its towpaths - it is essential that appropriate contributions are secured from developers to	The impact of new development upon open space and/or green infrastructure, particularly relating to maintenance of spaces and the developer contributions that could be secured to help mitigate such adverse impacts are best addressed through Policy 24. Impacts upon green space and future maintenance are referred to in Policy 24 ci.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		mitigate the impact on the network. Promote an expansion to the policy to require development that would likely result in a deterioration or harm to the green infrastructure network to incorporate measures through planning conditions or legal agreements to avoid, mitigate or compensate for the adverse effects likely to result from the development upon the network. Note that Policy 19 includes measures to allow mitigation against impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity this would not include impacts upon the wider green infrastructure network which can best be achieved through expansion of policy 18.	
DBLP37	Marine Management Organisation	The East Marine Plan contains a number of policies that are relevant to policies highlighted in the Draft Bassetlaw Plan. The following east plan policies may be relevant to policies 14, 15, 17, 19, 21 and 24 within the Draft Bassetlaw Plan: CC1, CC2, SOC2, SOC3, BIO1, BIO2, ECO1, GOV1. Recommend you consult East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans and Marine Information System for further information.	To ensure consistency with the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans and Marine Information System these documents will be referred to appropriately.
DBLP37	Marine Management Organisation	The East Marine Plan contains a number of policies that are relevant to policies highlighted in the Draft Bassetlaw Plan. The following east plan policies may be relevant to policies 14, 15, 17, 19, 21 and 24 within the Draft Bassetlaw Plan: CC1, CC2, SOC2, SOC3, BIO1, BIO2, ECO1, GOV1. Recommend you consult East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans and Marine Information System for further information.	To ensure consistency with the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans and Marine Information System these documents will be referred to appropriately.
DBLP51	Canal & River Trust	Welcome para 16.5 that the 18th century Chesterfield Canal and associated structures are considered to play a major part in creating local character and distinctiveness. This inclusion should make policy 21 more effective and make it clear to decision makers that the canal is a heritage asset that should be conserved/enhanced.	Support for Para 16.5 and Policy 21 welcome.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP51	Canal & River Trust	<p>Acknowledge that Policy 22 seeks to promote development quality and sustainability especially in relation to the design and layout of new development. As the Chesterfield Canal forms a key component of the natural and built environment including within the key urban areas of the District recommend the inclusion of a separate policy which addresses issues associated with waterside development especially if the policy wording of policies 9 and 10 are not expanded as proposed e.g. policy SP31 in the Rotherham Sites and Policies Document, June 2018 states that 'subject to satisfying other relevant planning policy, development adjacent to canals will be expected to: a. Be of a high quality design that integrates the canal into the development proposal in a way that treats the waterway as an area of usable space; b integrate the waterway, towing path and canal environment into the public realm in terms of the design and management of the development; c. Improve access to, along and from the waterway and improve the environmental quality of the waterway corridor; d. Optimise views of the water and generate natural surveillance of water space through the siting, configuration and orientation of buildings, recognising that appropriate boundary treatment and access issues may differ between the towing path and offside of the canal; and e. Improve the amenity of the canal. Development that would have an adverse impact on the amenity of the canal by virtue of noise, odour or visual impact will not be supported.'</p> <p>Inclusion would make the Plan more effective in making decision makers aware of key priorities in promoting positive waterside development.</p>	<p>Policy 22 is a generic policy - whereas the issue of waterside development is specific to Worksop and Retford. This issue would be better addressed in Policies 9 and 10.</p>
DBLP74	Sport England	<p>Sport England, in conjunction with Public Health England, has produced 'Active Design' (October 2015), to planning new developments that create the right environment to help people get more active, more often in the interests of health and</p>	<p>The Local Plan promotes the health and wellbeing of communities. As such Active Design is an important tool for helping to achieve this aim. Reference to Active Design will be added to Policy 22.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>wellbeing. It sets out ten key principles for ensuring new developments incorporate opportunities for people to take part in sport and physical activity. Active Design contribute to the Government's desire for the planning system to promote healthy communities through good urban design. Sport England would commend its use in master planning for new residential developments. The document can be downloaded via the following link: http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/active-design/ A reference to active design could be added to policy 22.</p>	
DBLP101	William Davis Ltd	<p>In requesting that new homes meet or exceed the national space standards the Policy is making assumptions against the viability of projects without offering clear evidence or justification of need in the District. Given land and house values in the District are just over half the National average, applying a minimum space and access standard for homes and across housing developments could lead to proposals being unviable, and not in accordance with NPPF para 57.</p>	<p>The Interim Whole Plan and CIL Viability Assessment considers the impact of the national space standards on viability. An update to the Interim Whole Plan Viability is being undertaken which will reconsider the national space standards against other policy requirements in the Local Plan as well as CIL and developer contributions.</p>
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	<p>Support the requirement for development proposals to demonstrate how they have regard to landscape character areas and support the inclusion of mitigation measures. Policy 17 should be amended to ensure that it is the mitigation of harm that is required from any development that is required. For the avoidance of doubt, not all characteristics of the landscape will necessarily be positive and it is not necessarily the case that all change will be negative.</p>	<p>It is accepted that not all landscape characteristics are positive. Policy 17 will be amended to better reflect the principles and approach within the Landscape Character Assessment.</p>
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	<p>Part 1 of the policy is considered to be too vague as to what the proposed trigger for and requirements for open space provision are for development. Those two considerations are vital to understand the effect of the Local Plan on space standards, site design and viability and are essential to the soundness of the Local Plan. This information should be</p>	<p>The Bassetlaw Open Space Assessment is being prepared and will inform the development of this policy. Any cost implications will inform the update to the Whole Plan and CIL Viability Assessment.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		provided and we reserve the right to comment further. The policy should make an allowance for, and provide flexibility to schemes where it is not practical to provide on-site open space.	
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	The proposed policy approach should be amended to better reflect the framework for the consideration of heritage assets set out within the NPPF. In its current wording and format the approach reads difficulty when read alongside the NPPF and unnecessarily confuses the policy approach which should properly be applied to the determination of development proposals which may have an effect on the significance of heritage assets.	The heritage policy has been amended in consultation with the Council's Conservation Officer and the responses received.
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Agree with the approach to design in general and consider that it reflects the provisions of the NPPF. The Council's policy objective should be amended to seek to achieve the highest 'practicable' standards of achievable design. The Local Plan notes the clear difficulties that the District has in relation to viability and consider it is necessary to see the design of new housing in the context of all sustainable planning aims including, for example, provision of physical and community infrastructure and affordable homes. Decision makers should be afforded the flexibility to focus on design to the extent that it does not undermine the ability of the Local Plan to achieve those other aims.	The Interim Whole Plan and CIL Viability Assessment considers the impact of the design policy on viability. An update to the Interim Whole Plan Viability is being undertaken which will re-consider the design policy against other policy requirements in the Local Plan as well as CIL and developer contributions to ensure viable development can be achieved.
DBLP138	Bothamsall Parish Council	Supports the policies seeking to conserve and enhance the natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP144	Individual	Support the proposed polices that seek to conserve / enhance the natural and build environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP143	Persimmon Homes & Charles Church	Bullet Point (h) requires that dwellings meet or exceed the NDSS for new homes. Can only do this in accordance with the framework para 127f & footnote 46 which states a council must justify why internal space standards are required. Do not	The Council will prepare evidence to justify the requirement for the national space standards in new development.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		consider suitable evidence is given to justify this policy position.	
DBLP170	East Markham Parish Council	Protection of trees and hedges is not given sufficient weight in this policy. In East Markham a number of hedges and trees have disappeared in recent developments. Needs to ensure in future trees and hedgerows are protected by strict conditions at the planning stage and are strictly enforced.	Policy 19 states that development likely to result in the loss, deterioration or harm to habitats or species of importance to biodiversity or geological conservation interests will not be permitted unless....Protected trees and hedgerows are identified by Policy 19 as a habitat or species of importance, as are aged and veteran trees and hedgerows. This is considered to give appropriate weight to the loss or harm of trees and hedgerows.
DBLP170	East Markham Parish Council	Would prefer that all developments contribute to open space irrespective of size, and that a minimum contribution to open space be per dwelling. Concerned about the loss of green areas over the past years.	National planning policy states that developer contributions are generally only to be sought from major housing developments. It is therefore inappropriate to secure open space from all dwellings. Additionally, it is likely that the cost of securing open space from a single dwelling would adversely affect the viability of development which is contrary to national policy. However CIL contributions which can be secured from most new development could be used to provide for open space as long as it is on the Council's Regulation 123 List.
DBLP170	East Markham Parish Council	1 (f) encourage rigorous enforcement of this policy particularly ensuring that siting, design, layout and materials are appropriate. This will hopefully prevent the urbanisation of many of our historic villages.	Comments noted.
DBLP170	East Markham Parish Council	Does not subscribe to the view expressed on Page 123 para 17.3 that the adoption of the residential design SPD has improved the quality of development. Too many oversized properties are still being built on minuscule plots. At the planning stage too little attention is given to the provision of easy movement for walking, cycling and users of public transport.	Comments noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP172	dha planning on behalf of Laing O'Rourke	No objection to the aims and objectives of this policy, in recognition that large industrial buildings may not always be able to achieve every one of the “requirements” suggest that the opening line of part 1 of the policy is amended: “To achieve good quality design, where practicable, development proposals are required to:...”	Policy 22 identifies the principles of good design. These should be able to be achieved through the design of all new development. However, if there are reasons why a large industrial building is unable to meet the requirements of Policy 22 this would need to be explained within the Design and Access Statement accompanying a planning application.
DBLP182	Severn Trent Water Ltd	Supportive of Policies 18: and 19:. Recognise the importance of nature and natural processes in catchments and the need to ensure that developments do not adversely impact these features. Support the principles behind blue-green corridors, as this recommends the retention of existing watercourses, ditches and land drainage, and located these features in open space. This is vital to delivering a sustainable water system that can support and enable growth and future generations. Effective blue green planning allows both space for water and provides biodiversity benefits, by retaining the existing open watercourses future development has the potential to connect to the natural network avoiding the connection of surface water to manmade systems with limited capacity. As watercourses are often at the low points in a site the corridors can often be utilised to incorporate some SuDS features, either at source or site control level integrating the space for water in the site design, by encouraging green spaces and planting in this area an attractive space that provides additional amenity can also be created and the introduction of footpaths and cycle routes for alternative transport created providing links through the new development for users of the existing settlement and the new development. It is important that these are included as new developments are proposed and planned. Recommend that watercourses as defined by the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 are included in the list in Policy 19 or the inclusion of text in the policy to safeguard existing Land Drainage and Ditches for development to ensure sustainable	Support for policy approach welcome. Watercourses will be added to the list in Policy 19

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		surface water outfalls are not lost for future growth and that the delivery of the principles behind the drainage hierarchy are taken forward.	
DBLP183	Environment Agency	Support this section feel it would really benefit from the replacement of all references to “Green Infrastructure” with “Blue Green Infrastructure”. This would help highlight the importance of the river, stream, pond and ditch networks as an important habitat and corridor for connecting and supporting wildlife. This recommendation also goes for the rest of the document, wherever Green Infrastructure is currently referenced. This change would really help increase the effectiveness of the supporting text and the Policies in particular. Para 15.9: strongly recommend the addition of the Environment Agency as a key partner for developers to engage with, particularly when looking at the river network. Keen to help advise, plan and also help fund improvement schemes around rivers in particular.	Where appropriate more references to blue-green infrastructure will be added to the Local Plan. However, it may not be practicable to replace all green infrastructure references. The Environment Agency will be added as a partner in paragraph 15.9.
DBLP183	Environment Agency	Recommend the addition of a new bullet point, ‘5’, which states the following: The potential impact of development on any watercourses and ditches must be considered, and where possible enhancements should be included during the construction phase of any proposals.’	To ensure the importance of the river, stream, pond and ditch networks are appropriately protected and recognised as part of the blue-green infrastructure network the potential impact of new development upon watercourses and ditches wil be referenced in Policy 18.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP183	Environment Agency	<p>Bullet point 1: more significance should be given to NPPF Section 15, Paragraph 170 which states that net gain should be sought. Strongly recommend rewording to ensure that the Plan is proactively assisting in delivering the aims of the NPPF: ‘1. New development in the district that leads to a net gain in biodiversity through conserving, creating, restoring or enhancing biodiversity and geodiversity will be supported, subject to other planning policy considerations’. Strongly recommend that bullet point 2c should be altered, with the following text added (set out in italics): ‘measures can be provided (secured through planning conditions or legal agreements), that would avoid, mitigate against or, as a last resort, compensate for the adverse effects likely to result from development, provided they also lead to a demonstrable net gain in biodiversity.’ Do not see how it could be demonstrated that Policy 19 complies with the NPPF unless these changes, or similar, are incorporated.</p>	<p>Accept that Policy 19 should better reflect the principles of net gain in the NPPF. Policy 19 will be amended accordingly.</p>
DBLP184	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	<p>Parts of the District are in the 5km buffer zone identified in Natural England’s Indicative core area & RSPB’s IBA boundary for those parts of Sherwood Forest which meet the primary criterion for designation as an SPA, by virtue of the population of nightjar and woodlark exceeding 1% of the national total. It is essential that the Council pay due attention to potential adverse effects on birds protected under Annex 1 of the Birds’ Directive and undertake a “risk-based” assessment of any development, as advised by NE in their guidance note dated March 2014 attached.</p>	<p>The Bassetlaw Habitats Regulations Assessment sets out the screening assessment of the Local Plan upon European sites. It identified that there is potential for likely significant effects upon the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. These impacts will require further assessment at the Appropriate Assessment stage to determine whether they would result in adverse effects on the integrity of the site either alone or in-combination. This will be undertaken as part of the development of the next version of the Local Plan, in consultation with Natural England.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP182	Severn Trent Water Ltd	<p>Recognise the importance of public open space and the benefits it can provide for / to communities. Whilst existing and new open space should be protected from inappropriate development, there are opportunities to provide wider benefits to community through flood alleviation projects that could utilise areas of open space to locate blue green infrastructure such as SuDS. Proposed schemes would also need to consider the current site usage / purpose and be designed to enhance as support this function where possible. Whilst any proposal to amend an area of open space would need to be assessed on its individual benefits and issues, the current policy does not adversely hinder flood alleviation projects. Request in policy 20 add: Development proposals for flood alleviation within defined areas of public open space will generally be supported unless a clear detriment to the functionality of the open space is present.</p>	<p>Acknowledge the benefits of multifunctional green infrastructure, including the use of green space for SuDS. However, the principle of creating multifunctional spaces sits better with the policy context of Policy 18, which will be amended accordingly.</p>
DBLP186	Natural England	<p>Welcome the approach that has been set out. Plans should set out the approach to delivering net gains for biodiversity. Net gain for biodiversity should be considered for all aspects of the plan and development types, including transport proposals, housing and community infrastructure.</p>	<p>Accept that Chapter 15 should better reflect the principles of net gain in the NPPF, and will be amended accordingly.</p>
DBLP186	Natural England	<p>Pleased to see a specific policy for green infrastructure, note that green infrastructure has been mentioned in other relevant policies in the draft plan such as biodiversity, design and flood risk. This policy can be further supported with an updated Bassetlaw Green Infrastructure Strategy which will evidence a strategic approach. Green infrastructure refers to the living network of green spaces, water and other environmental features in both urban and rural areas. It is often used in an urban context to provide multiple benefits including space for recreation, access to nature, flood storage and urban cooling to support climate change mitigation, food production, wildlife habitats and health & well-being improvements provided by</p>	<p>Elements of the Bassetlaw Green Infrastructure Strategy that are relevant and necessary to inform the Local Plan have/are being updated, such as the Bassetlaw Open Space Assessment and the Bassetlaw Playing Pitch Strategy. At this stage updating the Green Infrastructure Strategy is not considered to be essential to inform the production of the Local Plan.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		trees, rights of way, parks, gardens, road verges, allotments, cemeteries, woodlands, rivers and wetlands. Green infrastructure is relevant in a rural context, where it might additionally refer to the use of farmland, woodland, wetlands or other natural features to provide services such as flood protection, carbon storage or water purification.	
DBLP186	Natural England	<p>Welcome Policy 19 which sets out an approach to conserve, and where possible restore or enhance, biodiversity and geodiversity in NPPF para 170. Welcomes the list of habitats and species of importance to biodiversity and sites of geological interest, would like to see the Sherwood Forest possible potential Special Protection Area (ppSPA) referenced in this policy: as well as the designated sites advise that the plan considers the impact of the plan's policies on areas of Sherwood Forest that fall in the possible future classification as a Special Protection Area (SPA) for its breeding birds (nightjar and woodlark) interest. Been advised to take a risk based approach to spatial planning and development management, as an SPA classification would trigger the review of any live plans or approved but incomplete projects likely to significantly affect the SPA. Advice note attached. Note the inclusion of the Sherwood Forest ppSPA in the HRA, would like to see the ppSPA included in the Local Plan policies, specifically Policy 19 which refers to habitats and species of importance to biodiversity. The Plan should be underpinned by up to date environmental evidence. This should include an assessment of existing and potential components of local ecological networks. This should inform the Sustainability Appraisal, ensure that land of least environment value is chosen for development, and that the mitigation hierarchy is followed and inform opportunities for enhancement as well as development requirements for particular sites. Priority habitats and species</p>	<p>Reference to Sherwood Forest ppSPA will be added to Policy 19 to ensure the Local Plan takes a risk based approach to planning. The Bassetlaw Habitats Regulations Assessment sets out the screening assessment of the Local Plan upon European sites. It identified that there is potential for likely significant effects upon the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. These impacts will require further assessment at the Appropriate Assessment stage to determine whether they would result in adverse effects on the integrity of the site either alone or in-combination. This will be undertaken as part of the development of the next version of the Local Plan, in consultation with Natural England. The Council will ensure that the Local Plan and the Sustainability Appraisal is underpinned by up to date environmental evidence and that environmental quality is considered robustly through the site selection process.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>are those listed under S41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act, 2006 and UK Biodiversity Action Plan (UK BAP). Local Biodiversity Action Plans (LBAPs) identify the local action needed to deliver UK targets for habitats and species. They also identify targets for other habitats and species of local importance and can provide a useful blueprint for biodiversity enhancement in any particular area. Protected species are species protected under domestic or European law. Sites containing watercourses, old buildings, significant hedgerows and substantial trees are possible habitats for protected species. Ecological networks are coherent systems of natural habitats organised across whole landscapes so as to maintain ecological functions. A key principle is to maintain connectivity - to enable free movement and dispersal of wildlife e.g. badger routes, river corridors for the migration of fish and staging posts for migratory birds. Local ecological networks will form a key part of the wider Nature Recovery Network proposed in the 25 Year Environment Plan. Where development is proposed, opportunities should be explored to contribute to the enhancement of ecological networks. Planning positively for ecological networks will also contribute towards a strategic approach for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of green infrastructure, as identified in NPPF para 171. Where a plan area contains irreplaceable habitats, such as ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees, there should be appropriate policies to ensure their protection.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP186	Natural England	Welcomes this policy. Makes provision for an appropriate quality and quantity for open space, suggest Green Infrastructure could be brought in to enhance this policy. Refer you to the Accessible Natural Greenspace Guidance.	Support for Policy 20 welcome. Policy 18 covers the wider issue of green infrastructure, whereas Policy 20 covers open space and sports facilities and the impacts from new development. Policy 20 will be underpinned by the Bassetlaw Open Space Needs Assessment and the Bassetlaw Playing pitch Strategy which will set out standards and priorities for open space and sports facilities in the District. It is considered that these locally specific assessments better reflect the approach to be taken to open space accessibility than the standards identified in the Accessible Natural Greenspace Guidance.
DBLP186	Natural England	Support Policy 22 which aims to enhance the natural environment through design features. Support the addition of other biodiversity enhancing design features such as bird boxes and green or brown roofs.	'Green' design is an important feature of new development. The use of biodiversity enhancements could help achieve net gain on site and will be referred to in Policy 22 as a design option to be considered.
DBLP191	National Trust	Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP191	National Trust	Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP191	National Trust	Care should be taken to ensure that the provisions of the policy in relation to Sites of Special Scientific Interest comply with NPPF paragraph 175.b) and do not provide weaker protection. Concerned that the protection for ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees falls short of the 'wholly exceptional' reasons required by NPPF paragraph 175.c). Suggest that for the avoidance of doubt the word 'and' should be placed between criteria 2a and 2b. Policy 19 goes on to list habitats and species including: - Legally protected species; and - Priority habitats and species listed in the national and local Biodiversity Action Plans. This is now out of date as there is no National Biodiversity Action Plan. The policy should refer to species and habitats of principal importance for conservation as listed in the NERC Act S.41.	It is acknowledged that Policy 19 could better align with NPPF paragraph 175 b and c. Policy 19 will be amended to ensure appropriate protection of these features. Reference to the National Biodiversity Action Plan will be deleted. Species and habitats listed in the NERC Act are protected under national legislation - there is no need to repeat the national legislation in Policy 19. However reference to the Act will be made in the supporting text.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP187	Individual	<p>Include a defined Pathway for redundant historic buildings to achieve sustainable use. As the accidental owner of a grade 2* redundant church in Ragnall, one of the main challenges and risks to our historic environment is finding a sustainable use for redundant historic buildings, especially older churches. The net effect of the existing and proposed policy as you drive through Darlton and Dunham – unloved churches in a significant state of disrepair, becoming a blight on the community, and the reason is simple. Market forces do not work in finding a use for redundant historic buildings as the system is based on the presumption of "No Change". This is before the unique challenges of our redundant churches, ie They are old buildings requiring significant one-off maintenance spend; They require annual maintenance spend; They are often landlocked, with no access, parking or grounds. The only sustainable use for these churches is residential conversion. Talk about community uses, but there is no money to run the buildings, no parking, have plenty of village halls. What about commercial use? Many businesses fail, especially start-ups, so who would want the odds against success by setting up in a redundant church with higher energy and maintenance costs, no access or parking. Have a defined pathway that leads to a sustainable use, including residential development. The presumption from the outset that commercially viable development will be allowed will encourage developers and landowners to collaborate to create these viable schemes, including access and parking. Enabling developments could be considered for the really problematic buildings. If we do not specifically develop a solution for old churches, then who knows what condition Darlton, Dunham and the other redundant churches and buildings will be in 20 years time.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
DBLP191	National Trust	<p>Suggest that the list of major contributors to the character and distinctiveness of Bassetlaw ought to include 'the wooded and</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		more open landscapes of Sherwood Forest' as this is a landscape character area with a strong historic dimension.	
DBLP191	National Trust	Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP192	Johnson Mowat on behalf of Barratt Homes	Flexibility needs to be included in this policy. Concerned with part 'h' which requires nationally described space standards to be met or exceeded. Query the justification for this and note the detailed comments made by the HBF in this regard. No evidence has been provided by the Council to demonstrate a need for or the viability impact of including the standards in a local plan policy.	The Council will prepare evidence to justify the requirement for the national space standards in new development.
DBLP208	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	Do not support. It is never enough. I believe that we add this bit because we have to and we really want to believe it will be done. Then when the costs become clear the minimum is all that gets done.	Comments noted.
DBLP217	Axis ped on behalf of FCC Environment	Support this policy as it acknowledges that the need for, and benefits of the development can outweigh the adverse effect in relation to biodiversity providing appropriate mitigation can be provided. This is in accordance with the NPPF Paragraph 170 that planning policies should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan).	Support for Policy 19 welcome and noted.
DBLP219	Planning and Design Group on behalf of the Welbeck Estates Company Ltd	Bassetlaw has a rich history, and, has a diverse range of heritage assets. Welbeck forms part of this rich tapestry and accounts for a number of heritage assets and traditional buildings, this has been recognised in the Plan. As such Welbeck supports the aim to conserve such assets, it should be acknowledged that such buildings, particularly if they are vacant, that to secure their future a range of alternative uses, or bringing them back into use should be considered. Need to take a proactive approach to safeguarding heritage assets and that may be through innovative uses or adaptation. The	Comments noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>proposed policy is worded so that it is against development in the first instance, rather than encouraging creative, high quality and innovative development which would conserve and safeguard assets of heritage value which are key to the District's rich historic past. Any future policy should seek to encourage the re-use of underused or vacant buildings and the safeguarding of these buildings should not be unnecessarily burdened to promote creative and innovative development. This would help give greater certainty that assets can be safeguarded, in more instances their condition improved, and their value and function within the landscape and the community increased.</p>	
DBLP219	Planning and Design Group on behalf of the Welbeck Estates Company Ltd	<p>Agree there is a need to for the emerging Plan to enhance biodiversity and green infrastructure in the District, as it plays a key role in planning for community health and well-being. The Plan needs to assess existing green infrastructure for genuine biodiversity or geotechnical value. Consideration should be given to ensure existing sites of green space, which are of low biodiversity or geodiversity value or interest, are not protected purely on the basis it may conserve biodiversity or geodiversity. Sites have to be assessed on their merits and will be unique to one another; a District wide approach that categorises certain green spaces in the current way needs to be more responsive to this. Such an action could impact upon the objective to ensure that the District's housing needs are met. Suggest this information is translated into an update of Bassetlaw's Landscape Character Assessment (LCA), now 10 years old. Suggest at least a review of boundaries, to ensure that they are still relevant and not overly restrictive.</p>	<p>The Bassetlaw Open Space Needs Assessment takes a pragmatic approach to protecting and enhancing open space in the District based on quantity, quality, and value of spaces. This ensures that spaces are not protected just for their own sake. However, it is important to acknowledge that because a space is no longer considered to have value for a particular open space function that it could accommodate an alternative open space function. This is a different issue to that evidenced by the Landscape Character Assessment which is considered to remain appropriate to inform the development of the Local Plan.</p>
DBLP217	Axis ped on behalf of FCC Environment	<p>Support as it acknowledges that the Council will support development of a good quality design which positively contributes to the appearance of the area. The Policy sets out a list of criteria which development proposals are required to</p>	<p>Support for Policy 22 noted and welcome.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		adhere to in order to achieve good quality design. The development of FCC's site at Carlton Forest will be well designed in order to respond to the semi-rural character of the area.	
DBLP221	Gladman Developments	Support many of the principles concerned with the requirement that all dwellings must meet or exceed the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS). Refer to the Written Ministerial Statement 25th March 2015 which confirms that: "the optional new national technical standards should only be required through any new Local Plan policies if they address a clearly evidenced need, and where their impact on viability has been considered, in accordance with the NPPG". With particular reference to the NDSS the PPG confirms "where a need for internal space standards is identified, local planning authorities should provide justification for requiring internal space policies". If the Council wishes to adopt this standard it should be justified by meeting the criteria set out in the PPG including need, viability and impact on affordability. Similarly, to the accessibility standards, if it had been the Government's intention that all properties were built to these standards then the standards would have been made mandatory. Concerns relates to the additional cost and the implications on affordability. If a housebuilder builds a standard 2-bedroom unit at 72sqm the national space standards require dwellings to have certain dimensions which means that they can only be built at a minimum of 79sqm, this can add significantly to the cost of the property and in turn increase the cost of an entry level 2-bedroom house, exacerbating the affordability issues in the area not addressing the housing needs.	The Council will prepare evidence to justify the requirement for the national space standards in new development and will ensure that any proposed standards are considered through the updated Whole Plan Viability Assessment.
DBLP229	Individual	Supports the policies seeking to conserve and enhance the natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP245	Individual	In addition to s106 agreements for housing developments developers should make adequate provision for allotments to encourage residents to be self sufficient and to encourage environmental use of the local area.	Where a development is expected to have an adverse impact on allotment provision provision of space for allotments can be sought as part of new development.
DBLP259	Historic England	Support the approach to the historic environment in draft Policy 21. The preceding text in Chapter 16 is welcomed and sets out elements contributing to the local distinctiveness of the area and key contributors to the historic environment. It is considered that buried archaeology could be made more apparent in order to meet the requirements of the NPPF.	Buried archaeology will be better incorporated in Policy 21 to ensure consistency with the NPPF.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP255	Home Builders Federation	<p>Policy 22 (h) requires that dwellings meet or exceed the NDSS for new homes. If the Council wishes to adopt the optional NDSS then this should only be done in accordance with the 2019 NPPF (para 127f & Footnote 46). Footnote 46 states that policies may make use of the NDSS where the need for an internal space standard can be justified. Should gather evidence to determine whether there is a need for additional standards in their area and justify setting appropriate policies.</p> <p>The NPPG sets out that “Where a need for internal space standards is identified, LPAs should provide justification for requiring internal space policies. LPA should take account of the following areas need, viability and timing” (ID: 56-020). This should be considered before introducing the NDSS. It is incumbent on the Council to provide a local assessment evidencing the need for NDSS. If it had been the Government’s intention that generic statements justified adoption of the NDSS then the standards would be mandatory via the Building Regulations which the Government has not done. The NDSS should be introduced on a “need to have” rather than a “nice to have” basis. The identification of a need for the NDSS must be more than in some cases the standard has not been met - it should identify the harm caused or may be caused in the future and identify if there is a systemic problem to resolve. The impact on viability should be assessed to test the cumulative impact of policy burdens. The Council’s viability assessment is incorrect by only testing an averaged NDSS rather than the actual NDSS. If the Council introduces the NDSS as a policy requirement this involves minimum dimensions for bedroom sizes so it is inappropriate to use an average rather than the actual NDSS as an averaged sized unit may not comply with minimum bedroom sizes. There is a direct relationship between unit size, cost per square metre, selling price per metre and affordability. The Council cannot expect home</p>	<p>The Council will prepare evidence to justify the requirement for the national space standards in new development and will ensure that any proposed standards are considered through the updated Whole Plan Viability Assessment.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>buyers to absorb extra costs in a District where affordability pressures exist as evidenced by a worsening affordability ratio. The Council should assess potential impact on meeting demand for starter homes and first-time buyers as the impacts are significant on 2 and 3 bed dwellings. Where NDSS is to be adopted the impact on affordability should be assessed. At the same time as pushing additional families into affordable housing need because they can no longer afford to buy a NDSS compliant home, delivery of affordable housing may be undermined. The Council has provided no evidence of considering these impacts. The requirement for NDSS reduces the number of units per site - the amount of land needed to achieve the same number of units must be increased. The efficient use of land is less because development densities have been decreased. At the same time the infrastructure and regulatory burden falls on fewer units per site which intensifies the challenge of meeting residual / existing use plus land values which determines if land is released for development by a willing landowner especially in lower value areas and on brownfield sites. Should take into consideration any adverse effects on delivery rates of sites in the housing trajectory. The delivery rates will be predicated on market affordability at relevant price points of units and maximising absorption rates. An adverse impact on the affordability of starter home / first time buyer products may translate into reduced or slower delivery rates. The Council should put forward transitional arrangements. The land deals underpinning identified allocated sites will have been secured prior the introduction of NDSS. These sites should be allowed to proceed before any policy requirements are enforced. The NDSS should not be applied to any outline or detailed approval prior to the specified date and any reserved matters applications should not be subject to</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		NDSS. This policy requirement should be modified before publication of the pre-submission Local Plan consultation.	
DBLP270	Individual	<p>The preamble to Policy 17, particularly 14.1 and 14.2, is weak. Appreciate the human history significantly more than the landscape. The District is largely flat with Power Stations and their pylon power-lines meaning that many people travel to nearby Peak District, Lincolnshire Wolds or Yorkshire Dales for outdoor leisure. 14.1 is a prescriptive statement that cannot be evidenced and indeed, 14.2 confirms that Bassetlaw is without landscape designations. 14.2 puts forward that the</p>	<p>The supporting text to Policy 17 is designed to introduce the policy topic and provide context for that policy. It is acknowledged that the statements in paragraphs 14.1 and 14.2 could be strengthened by use of quotes for the Local Plan evidence base. The Landscape Character Assessment is considered to remain appropriate to inform the development of the Local Plan. The Everton Neighbourhood Plan is produced by the Neighbourhood Plan Group on behalf of the community and not the Council. The allocations identified are</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>highly valued landscapes make for “a very desirable location” but this is not born out by property prices or land values (which are low) and the Idle Valley Nature Reserve has taken to local press in a bid to generate more visitors. The phrase: “These circumstances generate significant pressure on the countryside to meet a range of demands and the Bassetlaw Plan therefore has an important role to play in ensuring that new development does not undermine these fundamental assets of the district” is pure spin and part of the strategy to limit allocations in rural settlements in favour of urban areas and the proposed 2 x garden villages. Indeed, it is only through excessive limitation of allocations/growth in Rural Service Centres, that the draft plan can conjure up the numbers required to make garden villages viable. The value of the Bassetlaw landscape is overstated added to which the Landscape Character Assessment for Everton contains misleading photographs (taken from outside the policy zone in Wiseton and showing the “back” of Pusto Hill, with Mattersey Priory in the foreground (?)) – and no evidence of Everton village). Just as misleading is the absence of reference to Everton carr-land, despite this “landscape” is far more prevalent in the Parish. Dated 2009, the Landscape Character Assessment is also written well before Brexit negotiations and the advent of growing veganism. Seeking to influence landscape policy so that farmers revert to grazing in order to conserve the landscape is not reasonable – particularly since the biggest farmer-losers in Brexit are livestock producers. The LPA is using an outdated evidence-base. Policy 17.2 is a pejorative statement that cannot be defined/implemented fairly. Objected to allocations in the Everton Neighbourhood Plan that are situated on higher topography, in conservation areas and in more visible locations than our own site and yet it is our site that has been excluded.</p>	<p>therefore selected and evidenced by the Group and consulted upon with the wider community before a decision is made. The Council has no influence over the site allocations in a Neighbourhood Plan.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP270	Individual	<p>Submitted riverbank land to the Call for Sites as a precursor to Marina delivery in Everton/the district. The land is opposite the village of Misson in the location of the historic ferry. Notts Wildlife Trust has identified the Idle Valley in Bassetlaw as important wildlife habitat – despite already retaining control of the Idle Valley Nature Reserve and despite the Idle Valley representing a location of nationally significant human history (Pilgrim Fathers/mothers escape and the precursor to the Chesterfield Canal). Do not feel confident that the wording of Policy 19 will assist us in the delivery of the Idle Valley Marina. 19.2b will be employed to deliver the Marina in a less historically accurate location: i: Because Notts Wildlife Trust will overstate the biodiversity credentials of the location ii: Because we are in the north of the district and leisure development here benefits Doncaster more than wider Bassetlaw</p>	<p>Local Wildlife Sites are designated according to nationally established criteria. The Local Wildlife Sites Review has recently been completed and the final sites will form part of the evidence base for the Local Plan. The NPPF requires that the Local Plan identify, map and safeguard local wildlife rich habitats and ecological networks including international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity, wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them. Policy 19, interprets this aspect of national policy at a local level. Without it the Local Plan would not be sound.</p>
DBLP270	Individual	<p>The current open space policy will not be improved by the wording in policy 20 which is too vague. Residential sites delivered in rural areas will often be surrounded by open countryside, footpaths, by-ways, bridleways or indeed as in the case of Everton, by 7000 acres of carr land offering public access. Ornamental gardens et al are not needed in a rural location where households have easy/extensive access to the countryside and indeed their own private gardens. On occasion, there may be a need for pocket parks for small children. Policy 20 needs to reflect the urban/rural split.</p>	<p>It is accepted that Policy 20 and its supporting text should include a definition of open space. In this context open space does not include countryside or ornamental gardens. Instead it includes parks, amenity greenspace, natural and semi natural greenspace, space for children and young people, allotments, cemeteries and civic spaces as defined by the Bassetlaw Open Space Needs Assessment.</p>
DBLP267	Sustrans Bassetlaw Rangers	<p>Strongly support Policy 22 – Design, paragraph 1 e: transport user hierarchy (although paragraph l: cycle parking facilities, needs development of minimum standards, which are currently inadequate, especially for high-density residential locations).</p>	<p>Support for Policy 22 1e is noted and welcome.</p>
DBLP271	Individual	<p>Supported. Will it include a children's play area and maybe a skate park. 7 - 11 year olds are sometimes forgotten when things are being built.</p>	<p>New open space is designed to meet the needs of new development. So it could include space for children and young people.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP270	Individual	<p>OBJECTION is made to the terms “URBAN GRAIN” and “BUILDING LINES”. Those terms are proxy for having to conform to “ribbon development”. Meaning that the LPA is then able to employ the term “backland development” as a negative descriptor – even where the scheme backs onto open countryside. Site Assessments for the Everton Neighbourhood Plan, Rural Solutions Hearing submission where those site assessments are questioned, Health Assessment for the Everton Neighbourhood Plan where Rosemary Kidd questioned the use of the term “ribbon development”, Hearing of the Everton Neighbourhood Plan where the Examiner questioned the use of the term “backland development” and exhorted the Parish Council to allocate our site NB: we have a transcript of the Hearing. Instead – the Bassetlaw LP and specifically this policy, should be aiming for efficient land use and “COMPACTION” as befitting of the SHMA desire for smaller properties. Where the new site is adjacent to large properties, massing requirements can be fulfilled via semi-detached or terraced properties. Unlike neighbouring authorities, Bassetlaw has never employed an Urban Designer. This means that the dept. is without a consistent approach to urban design and different design expectations depend upon th Case Officer. Invest in an urban designer so that Policy 22 can be delivered in a fair and equitable way. Had to submit 4 layouts to preapp 18/00035 (2/3/18) because the case officer could not tell us what he wanted (other than DIDN'T like the layout submitted at outline).</p>	<p>Policy 1a aims to ensure that the design of new development reflects the character of its locality. Backland development and efficient use of land will be considered through new policies contained within the next version of the Local Plan. The Everton Neighbourhood Plan is produced by the Neighbourhood Plan Group on behalf of the community and not the Council. The allocations identified are therefore selected and evidenced by the Group and consulted upon with the wider community before a decision is made. The Council has no influence over the site allocations in a Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
DBLP281	Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England	<p>Welcome Policy 17 especially “4. Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of or damage to the landscape, the prior condition of the landscape will be taken into account in the consideration of development proposals.”</p>	<p>Support for Policy 17 noted and welcome.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP281	Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England	Welcome the explicit inclusion of non-designated heritage assets and the fact that the policy also applies to them	Support for Policy 21 noted and welcome.
DBLP284	Doncaster Council	Would fully support Policy 21 which is in keeping with the significance led approach of the NPPF and particularly the requirement in part 2 that proposals affecting heritage assets or their setting be informed by a proportionate heritage statement. The requirement in part 1(l) for 'Ensuring that historic shopfronts are conserved or enhanced and new shopfronts in the historic environment are appropriately designed' seems a little incongruous and less 'strategic' in relation to the other requirements.	Support for Policy 21 noted and welcome. The approach taken to the design of shopfronts in the historic environment is a planning issue of importance and one which requires detailing in this policy.
DBLP281	Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England	Welcome the policy but there is a possible conflict between the transport user hierarchy and the ease of delivering public transport services. Winding streets are considered attractive for non-motorized traffic by some but make it difficult operationally and financially to deliver bus services (long journey times, the requirement to use more vehicles than straighter routes etc). The best option is to ensure permeability and legibility throughout as this helps those walking, public transport users and bus operators.	Policy 22 1e will be reworded to promote an inclusive, permeable and interconnected transport network attractive to all users.
DBLP284	Doncaster Council	Support the inclusion of the requirement for new dwellings to meet or exceed the optional Nationally Described Space Standards and feel the policy is appropriate to improve the quality of new homes within the region. For the policy to be compliant with the NPPG (NPPG para 020 Ref ID 56-020-20150327) a robust evidence base will need to be prepared in advance of the submission of the Local Plan.	The Council will prepare evidence to justify the requirement for the national space standards in new development and will ensure that any proposed standards are considered through the updated Whole Plan Viability Assessment.
DBLP296	Individual	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP301	977042	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP303	978627	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP304	986292	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP308	986480	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP314	987642	No support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment. These will be destroyed by the garden villages.	Should the garden villages proceed it is acknowledged that careful masterplanning will be required to ensure the built and natural environment is appropriately protected and enhanced.
DBLP315	987680	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment. The airfield at Gamston provides a secure environmental habitat for many animals and birds, the grounds are well maintained and provide an environment which is protected from hunting or illegal poaching activity. The airfield itself is of historic interest, a site used for training RAF bomber crews during the war, one of the few remaining sites that are still being uses as intended.	Should the garden villages proceed it is acknowledged that careful masterplanning will be required to ensure the built and natural environment is appropriately protected and enhanced.
DBLP317	987880	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP318	987892	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP319	987959	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP321	988036	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP323	988047	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP326	988057	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP328	988061	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP336	988172	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment. But not to flatten buildings to build more buildings and the existing buildings are environmentally good as they are	The Local Plan does promote the re-use of land and buildings as part of sustainable development. However, in some cases it is just not possible to do so. It is not always the case that existing buildings are as environmentally efficient as new buildings.
DBLP339	988184	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP343	988216	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP344	988235	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP345	988237	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP349	988325	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP350	988344	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP351	988346	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)	Have discussions taken place with Notts CC to enable their Mineral Plan and the Bassetlaw District Council local plan not to contradict each other, as in some cases they are vying for the same parcel of lands.	Nottinghamshire County Council are a statutory consultee for the Local Plan. Their comments will be taken into account in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)	Are wholeheartedly supported.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)	Conservation and enhancement of the Historic Environment. Residing and working in a historic location with significant international effect, Policy 21 is vital and must be mandatory.	Policy 21 would apply to all of the District's heritage assets.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)	Support for conservation and enhancement of built and natural environment policies. But will have an effect on the deliverability of the housing requirement.	There may be exceptional circumstances where the conservation and enhancement of the natural and built environment adversely impacts on the viability of a housing site. However, the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates that the housing requirement for the District can be achieved as part of a viable plan.
DBLP363	988482	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP364	988487	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP371	988500	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP372	988501	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP373	988503	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP375	988527	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP376	988557	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP379	988630	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP384	988726	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP386	988747	Support for conservation and enhancement of built and natural environment policies. I don't think Bassetlaw go far enough in protecting the natural environment eg they allow developers to rip out hawthorn hedging and natural wildlife habitats and do nothing to stop developers doing this when they do so without consent. They also allow large areas of non grass areas for gardens again something which means nature can no longer thrive.	Where the Council is aware of a developer contravening a planning permission and/or other relevant legislation, enforcement action will be taken. Planning permission is not needed if a new or replacement driveway of any size in a front garden uses permeable (or porous) surfacing which allows water to drain through, such as gravel, permeable concrete block paving or porous asphalt, or if the rainwater is directed to a lawn or border to drain naturally. If the surface to be covered is more than five square metres planning permission will be needed for laying traditional, impermeable driveways that do not provide for the water to run to a permeable area. Planning consent is not required for such works in rear gardens.
DBLP387	988748	Support. Only if existing businesses are not affected adversely.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP391	988813	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP392	988889	No support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment. They appear to directly contravene other proposed policies.	The Local Plan is intended to be used holistically and the developer will need to ensure that all relevant aspects are addressed in a planning application so that a balanced assessment of the proposal can be made.
DBLP393	989007	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP394	989023	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP398	989658	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP399	989741	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP402	990030	No support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP403	990043	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment. Bassetlaw is a beautiful area, but must develop or be left behind.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP404	990059	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment. Bassetlaw is a beautiful area, but must develop or be left behind.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP405	990062	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment. I do not think that it is easy to answer this. Good design can be very subjective and different in outcome whilst still meeting the requirements of the policy - would it all be permitted? I would like to see modern construction methods, new materials and non-traditional design should be considered - especially in areas where there is no characteristic style in the locality - but it never seems to happen in Bassetlaw. Be more forward thinking and looking and move away from the standard design we see everywhere	For a proposal to be acceptable in terms of design, in future it would need to comply with the criteria in Policy 22. Policy 22 1k promotes innovative buildings and modern construction standards.
DBLP407	990068	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP408	990070	Don't support conservation and enhancement of built and natural environment policies. We have a growing population of birds of prey , deer etc in the area , extra cars become a danger to them	Comments noted.
DBLP410	990076	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP411	990079	Don't support built and natural environment conservation and enhancement policies. No because the proposals will not enhance the environment as there are too few parameters and restrictions in place thereby giving developers Carte Blanche.	The policies are designed to operate within the parameters of international and national legislation and national planning guidance so the plan is as restrictive as it is able to be. However, it is not accepted that the Local Plan gives developers freedom to develop without restrictions.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP416	990240	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment. Another one that does not need much thinking about. All Authorities and Individuals should be concerned and be taking action to 'conserve and enhance the natural and built environment". However, with this in mind why are the Plans determined to take a large expanse of Agricultural Land, bordered by an existing Commercial Area, for housing ?? This latter part provides highly technical employment, which should be encouraged further to give more of this type of work in the Bassetlaw/Retford district.	Where possible the Local Plan makes best use of brownfield sites and buildings for new development. However, it is not possible to meet the housing requirement for the District only on brownfield land, some greenfield land will be required. A housing land availability assessment is being undertaken to inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. One consideration is the loss of high quality agricultural land and the loss of employment land.
DBLP418	990387	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.. It is important that the character of our villages and towns is maintained and that development fits in with the existing character of these places. There is a danger that our villages could become simply "suburbs" of nearby cities.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP419	990400	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP420	990465	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP421	990489	Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP422	990506	Don't support policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP423	990541	Which policies seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.?	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP424	990549	Don't support. Conserving and preserving the airfield should be important too - they offer a habitat which has been in use by ground living animals for decades and its loss will adversely affect them.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. Nature conservation is taken into consideration in planning decisions on development. Any adverse affects would need to be addressed where necessary.
DBLP425	990570	Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP426	990571	Don't support	Comments noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP427	990577	Support	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP428	990594	Don't support.	Comments noted.
DBLP429	990613	Support	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP430	990614	Don't support. The use of climate change as an argument is merely a way to help spin the closing of the airport.	Mitigating climate change relates to maximising energy efficiency, renewable energy, flood risk, water efficiency and making better use of resources, rather than air travel.
DBLP431	990633	Don't support.	Comments noted.
DBLP434	990659	Don't support.	Comments noted.
DBLP435	990666	Support	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP436	990682	Support. However your proposals are incompatible with these aims.	Comments noted.
DBLP437	990704	Don't support.	Comments noted.
DBLP438	990717	Don't support.	Comments noted.
DBLP439	990719	Don't support. I am lost for words on this one. building does not address climate change. Planting trees and encouraging wildlife. Farming etc all helps address this not thrown up concetre housing with tarmac driveways.	In the Local Plan mitigating climate change relates to maximising energy efficiency, renewable energy, flood risk, water efficiency and making better use of resources rather than relating to building new development.
DBLP440	990764	Don't support	Comments noted.
DBLP441	990783	Don't support	Comments noted.
DBLP442	990799	Don't support	Comments noted.
DBLP443	990800	No support for climate change policies.	Comments noted.
DBLP444	990802	Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP445	990806	Do not support	Comments noted.
DBLP447	990818	Do not support	Comments noted.
DBLP448	990826	Support. Any policies that seek to improve the environment are welcome.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP449	990829	Do not support	Comments noted.
DBLP451	990837	Do not support.	Comments noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP453	990842	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP454	990843	support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP455	990845	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP456	990846	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP457	990847	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP458	990848	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP459	990849	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP460	990850	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP461	990852	Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP463	990855	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP464	990856	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP465	990859	Support. Building hundreds of houses so close to a major road A1 will only add to the problems.	Comments noted.
DBLP466	990862	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP467	990865	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP468	990869	Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP469	990882	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP470	990884	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP471	990885	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP472	990886	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP473	990889	Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP474	990891	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP475	990893	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP476	990895	Support	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP477	990901	Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP478	990904	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP479	990910	Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP480	990912	Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP481	990913	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP482	990914	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP483	990915	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP484	990916	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP485	990917	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP486	990918	Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP487	990919	Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP488	990921	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP489	990922	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP490	990926	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP491	990928	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP492	990930	Do not support. Destroying the airfield will take significant energy and a natural habit, not over farmed. Building on greenfield would use less energy.	Comments noted.
DBLP493	990933	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP494	990934	Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP495	990936	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP496	990937	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP497	990938	Do not support. Again, not seen any information regarding this.	Comments noted.
DBLP498	990940	Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP499	990942	Do not support. An airfield is one of the best ways of preserving small to medium animals and birds, grasses, mosses and lichens.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP500	990943	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP501	990944	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP502	990946	Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP503	Individual	Do not support. The draft plan aims to protect the environment by destroying vital infrastructure rather than make it complementary and additive to the region?	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP504	990949	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP505	Individual	Support. Any proposal to improve the environment is welcome. It should not have to be dependent on 2 new villages being built .	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP506	990952	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP507	990954	Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP508	990955	Do not support. While I support endeavours to protect the environment at large, the building of major housing developments does in no way protect our surroundings unless worded very cleverly with twisted statistics. I do not believe any of the promises in the bassetlaw draft plan as there are already factual contradictions evident. The entire document I'd flawed.	Comments noted.
DBLP509	990959	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP510	990961	Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP511	990962	Support. The former Lound Hall colliery site should be used and the airport left in its entirity.	Comments noted.
DBLP512	990964	Do not support. Gamston Airport should be retained as an established active airport as part of the national transport infrastructure. Amongst aviation businesses and services, the airport supports the air ambulance and air ambulances are becoming an increasingly important part of the National Health Service infrastructure as more areas suffer from increasing road traffic congestion.	Should the garden villages proceed it is acknowledged that careful masterplanning will be required to ensure the built and natural environment is appropriately protected and enhanced.
DBLP513	990965	Support	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP514	990980	Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP515	991045	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP516	991153	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP517	991157	Support. Yes that is why I am against the site especially at Gamston /Eaton which needs to be conserved as the villages and surrounding farm land already help and maintain the	Should the garden villages proceed it is acknowledged that careful masterplanning will be required to ensure the built and natural environment is appropriately protected and enhanced.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		natural habitat of a multitude of birds and wildlife. Which would be vastly depleted with these two new village's.	
DBLP518	991172	Do not support. Although all the other policies in the plan are destroying the rural environment we live in.	Comments noted.
DBLP519	991173	Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP520	991174	Do not support. All the other policies in the plan are destroying the rural environment we live in, so I think this needs to be stronger, and the other policies need to work with the plan as well, it can't be just a stand alone policy.	Comments noted.
DBLP521	991176	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP522	991178	Do not support. As a result in the proposed development there will be a negative effect on the natural environment , with development comes a lot of new people who will wander and disturb the surrounding habitat which will reduce species numbers ,(an undisturbed pheasant for example although laying 12 eggs will only rear 2-3 chicks this number will reduce with increased human traffic)	Should the garden villages proceed it is acknowledged that careful masterplanning will be required to ensure the built and natural environment is appropriately protected and enhanced.
DBLP523	991181	Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP524	991184	Do not support. How can your proposed policies possibly "conserve and enhance the natural and built environment" when you plan to bulldoze Retford Gamston Airport that has been there since 1942 and been evolving into its present form as a general aviation hub since 1993 under the present ownership? The airport was invited to represent Bassetlaw by the council and John Mann MP in parliament for "Bassetlaw Day" on 6 September 2016 and after being voted General Aviation Airport of the year in 2015 by the Airport Operators Association... so what has so dramatically changed in a little over 3 years that sees the council moving from using it to help showcase the area to now wishing to see it closed?	Should the garden villages proceed it is acknowledged that careful masterplanning will be required to ensure the built and natural environment is appropriately protected and enhanced.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		https://twitter.com/johnmannmp/status/77310697094135398 4	
DBLP525	991186	Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP526	991188	Do not support. I have no comment on this.	Comments noted.
DBLP527	991190	Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP528	991208	Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP529	991209	Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP530	991219	Do not support. Attempting to conserve and enhance the already natural habitat would be to not build in the first place. Whatever you attempt in aid of protecting it won't help, you will be disturbing all the wildlife already here, which may not come back once building is complete. The noise and traffic alone will disturb all the wildlife and not to mention their homes.	Should the garden villages proceed it is acknowledged that careful masterplanning will be required to ensure the built and natural environment is appropriately protected and enhanced.
DBLP531	991221	Do not support. why destroy Gamston Aerodrome as it is at present. the Farming, Aerodrome and wildlife live in harmony.	Comments noted.
DBLP532	Individual	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP533	991230	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP534	991231	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP535	991234	Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP536	991235	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP537	991237	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP538	991240	Support. Although looking at all the existing developments that have occurred recently in Bassetlaw I do not believe this will happen.... there are no existing developments which retain the planned natural environment. You only have to drive around the Gateford developments in Worksop to see the total lack of green space to 'enhance the natural environment'.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP539	991241	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP540	991243	Do not support. See above.	Comments noted.
DBLP541	991264	Do not support. There is no question that airfields provide extensive natural environments that will not be adequately compensated by an increase in human activity, an increase in non native garden species of plants, extensive tarmac and paved surfaces.	Comments noted.
DBLP512	990964	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP542	991336	Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP543	991990	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP544	992014	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP545	992366	Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP546	992635	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP547	993337	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP548	993387	Do not support.	Comments noted.
Infrastructure Delivery and Community Facilities: Policies 23-24			
DBLP2	Individual	Supports the policies to deliver and safeguard infrastructure.	Support for policies 23-24 noted and welcome.
DBLP16	Individual	Supports the policies to deliver and safeguard infrastructure - provided that we don't lose too much of our green and pleasant land.	Support for policies 23-24 noted and welcome.
DBLP24	Individual	Supports the policies to deliver and safeguard infrastructure.	Support for policies 23-24 noted and welcome.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP31	BDC Councillor	Not Bassetlaw's remit	Under the Duty to Cooperate the Council is required to engage a range of key stakeholders and infrastructure providers on the development of the Local Plan. Although much infrastructure is not provided by the Council, the infrastructure providers are expected to positively engage to help ensure that the Local Plan is deliverable. Statements of Common Ground will be used to ensure infrastructure is delivered.
DBLP32	Individual	Supports the policies to deliver and safeguard infrastructure - not sure that the policies adequately deliver the above.	Support for policies 23-24 noted and welcome.
DBLP74	Sport England	Sport England is concerned that proposals involve the development of new community and leisure and sports facilities without appropriate evidence. This is covered in Policy 23 - how will this demand from and for new development be calculated? Para 92 of NPPF promotes positive planning - it is noted that your authority does not have an up to date evidence base with respect to built sports facilities how will policy 23 be understood what is needed? What facilities need improvement what should be replaced and where? Sport England would expect that the emerging Playing Pitch Strategy (which we support) would be the key evidence base to understand the priority of each playing field site, the assessment has been carried out to provide evidence in accordance with para 96 of NPPF. Which sites are important and should be protected? which need enhancement? Policy 23 is about new development, a reference to the Playing Pitch Strategy in guiding this development with regard to sports pitches should be made. This policy is confusing as sports pitches are also referenced in policy 20 open space which policy takes primacy?. Both policies imply that sports pitches can relocated and replaced. The pitches may be identified in the PPS as being in the right place, there other elements to para 97 NPPF regarding alternative sports facilities on sports	The Council's emerging Playing Pitch Strategy and Retail and Leisure Study will provide the evidence for the Local Plan, including the type of facilities required and when, and which facilities should be protected. Chapter 15 will provide the primary policy framework for playing fields and sports facilities with additional complementary references made throughout the document. Further detail will be added to the next version of the Local Plan to reflect the emerging evidence base. Reference to active design will be added to Policy 23

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		pitches is this covered? A reference to active design could be added to policy 23	
DBLP37	Marine Management Organsation	The East Marine Plan contains a number of policies that are relevant to policies highlighted in the Draft Bassetlaw Plan. The following east plan policies may be relevant to policies 14, 15, 17, 19, 21 and 24 within the Draft Bassetlaw Plan: CC1, CC2, SOC2, SOC3, BIO1, BIO2, ECO1, GOV1. Recommend you consult East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans and Marine Information System for further information.	All relevant planning documents will be considered and referred to, where appropriate, in the Local Plan including the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans - these wil form part of the evidence base for the Local Plan.
DBLP51	Canal & River Trust	Significant new developments in the vicinity of the canal network place extra liabilities and burdens upon the waterway infrastructure and it is essential that apporriate contributions are secured from developers where necessary to mitigate the impact of new development on the Trust's assets. Welcome 19.7 that developer contributions will be requird to ensure that any adverse impacts on local services is appropriately mitigated. Important to note that infrastructure included on an adopted Regulation 123 list through CIL cannot be funded through s106 agreements. Note Policy 24 includes aspirations to include CIL contributions towards physical and green infrastructure. Concerned that waterway infrastructure could be subsumed into these broad categories. There is a risk that if a development is likely to have an adverse impact on the canal network off site mitigation may no longer be possible via the s106 route as an argument could be made that such	It is accepted that developer contributions cannot be used to provide for infrastructure identified on the Regulation 123 list. However, this depends on the way the infrastructure on the Regulation 123 list is defined. Therefore it is inappropriate to restrict provision of green infrastructure and transport via s106/s278 agreements. It is possible that developer contributions can be used used to help mitigate impacts of development on waterway infrastructure, even if CIL is used for some elements of green infrastructure.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		improvements should be achieved via CIL. Likewise because the categories of green infrastructure and transport are broad mitigation might not be achieved via this route either. To prevent this risk the policy should be expanded to state that off site provisions necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms for the provision of green infrastructure and transport scheme should be achieved via the use of developer contributions under s106/s278. This will make the policy more effective and ensure that para 19.7 can be fully met.	
DBLP71	Wood plc on behalf of the National Grid	National Grid is happy to provide advice and guidance to the Council concerning our networks. To help ensure the continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect our assets. Please remember to consult National Grid on any Development Plan Document (DPD) or site-specific proposals that could affect our infrastructure.	The Council will ensure that the National Grid will continue to be involved in the site selection process.
DBLP74	Sport England	As a general observation should it be clear what facilities will be covered by CIL and what would be covered under planning obligations?	The Council's Regulation 123 list provides details of the current infrastructure schemes that CIL will be used for. But as the Regulation 123 list can be updated more frequently than the Local Plan it would be inappropriate to identify the content of the list in Policy 24. However, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan will provide more detail on the which infrastructure projects will be provided by developer contributions and those where CIL will be involved.
DBLP91	Highways England	Considering the wider development proposals outside of the Plan area, high levels of cumulative growth are coming forward across Bassetlaw and adjacent local authority areas. A Statement of Common Ground has been prepared between Chesterfield, North East Derbyshire, Bolsover and Bassetlaw	The Council will ensure that Highways England will continue to be involved in the local plan process.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		Councils and the highways authorities setting out an agreed approach to managing and mitigating future growth and impacts on M1 junction 30. It would be beneficial to continue to engage with the Council in order to agree upon an approach for the future assessment of traffic impacts on the M1 and how these could be mitigated and delivered.	
DBLP129	Sturton le Steeple Parish Council	Welcome the prominence of Neighbourhood Plans in achieving the District's development targets and in stimulating and regulating development in the rural areas. It is unrealistic to expect the rural areas to accept 27% of the burden of new housing. In the case of Sturton le Steeple, this could be an additional 1-200 residents over the Plan, with consequences for the inadequate infrastructure, in particular transport, schools and GP surgeries. At present, public transport in Sturton le Steeple is limited to 6 buses per day, from Retford to Gainsborough. This does not allow flexibility for residents to make the journeys to fit with other services. Consequently, most resort to private cars, with the negative effect on the environment. Sturton le Steeple School, despite being modernised and extended, is at capacity. The only GP surgery is in North Leverton, and it is used by all surrounding Parishes. There are two partners and a locum. Waiting time for routine appointments is usually 3-4 weeks. The consulting rooms are at capacity, and there is no room for extension. The approach was to expect practices to join up. This would make patients, many of whom are aged and/or lacking mobility, to travel some distance. The lack of public transport will make this difficult and would not be consistent with Policy 24 10: Promote health and wellbeing by delivering new and enhanced infrastructure which will improve the quality of life in Bassetlaw: This is welcomed, as long as it keeps pace with developments. At present health resources are insufficient for the present population. An increase in population must be accompanied by	Under the Duty to Cooperate the Council is required to engage a range of key stakeholders and infrastructure providers on the development of the Local Plan, including site allocations. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be produced which will set out how infrastructure will be provided to meet the needs of the Local Plan. This will include health facilities and education. Para 19.7 refers to developer contributions being used to ensure that adverse impacts of development on local services such as health facilities are appropriately mitigated. Health facilities are also referred to in Policy 24 2bii as being a potential recipient for infrastructure contributions.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		a comparable contemporaneous increase in health resources, in particular GP surgeries. Note that health facilities are not included in para 19.9 as a specific area for support under Sect 106 agreements: 19.9 All new development covered by CIL criteria will be obligated to pay the CIL charge. Where necessary, some new development will also be subject to planning obligations (s106 agreements), particularly in relation to education, highway improvements, SuDS, and affordable housing provision. This should be amended.	
DBLP138	Bothamsall Parish Council	Supports the policies to deliver and safeguard infrastructure.	Support for policies 23-24 noted and welcome.
DBLP142	Ranskill Parish Council	Like to see further clarification in the plan regarding upgrades to services, infrastructure and public transport to be provided to cope with the increased population. The CIL rate proposed in the plan is £30 per square metre for residential properties. This is a very large reduction on the current rate of £55 per square metre in place in rural East Bassetlaw. The Plan requires that rural villages with very limited infrastructure and facilities take on increased population (at the rate of 2.5 people per dwelling the 119 houses to be built in Ranskill would amount an additional 300 residents). The current financial climate means that there are fewer grants available and although there will be a corresponding increase in Precept from new residents this does not provide sufficient finance for new projects and enhancements to village facilities. Welcome details regarding the rationale behind this as there seems to be no evidence that	An Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be produced which will set out how infrastructure will be provided to meet the needs of the Local Plan. The Interim Whole Plan and CIL Viability Report provides the evidence for the reduction in the CIL rate across the District.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		the current CIL rate has put off potential developers in East Bassetlaw.	
DBLP143	Persimmon Homes & Charles Church	CIL was first introduced by Bassetlaw in 1st Sept 2013 with 3 different charging zones identified for residential development: 1. Retford rural east £55 2. Worksop rural west £20 3. Northwest Bassetlaw £5 The Plan indicates a viability assessment conducted Aug 2018 found no justification for this differential approach. Detail would be welcomed on regarding what stage Bassetlaw intends to implement this proposed change?	Following adoption of the Local Plan a CIL Examination will be required prior to adoption of a new CIL Charging Schedule. This is expected to be 2021-2022.
DBLP144	Individual	Support the proposed policies that seek to safeguard infrastructure, transport, education, health, flood mitigation and open space.	Support for policies 23-24 noted and welcome.
DBLP151	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	Development should be located close to all necessary services including employment so that reliance upon the private motor car is reduced. This is at odds with some of the more proactive parts of this plan. This will be a thing of the past with the government limiting the production and sale of petrol/diesel cars in the UK and the increase in production and use of electric cars which are becoming more affordable. The problem will remain for many villages where the public bus service has been reduced. With this in private hands, only the most viable routes are retained, all others are lost. Services used to be regular, affordable and pleasant. In rural areas the use of smaller “buses” on a more frequent basis would attract more users. There are areas around the UK where authorities have embraced public transport for rural areas and they become the	Policy 24 supports the use of infrastructure contributions for public transport. The emerging Infrastructure Delivery Plan will set out how infrastructure will be provided to meet the needs of the Local Plan.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>lifeline for such areas. Local and District Council used to have some control over bus routes but much has been lost. Some form of encourage, support and directive by these bodies is required. If CIL money was used towards this rather than sitting in the Council's bank or carrying out highway improvements that are questionable then development would indeed have a positive impact upon the area, the wellbeing of communities and the general health and wellbeing of its occupants. Not suggesting that buses are the lifeline for Bassetlaw but they do have a part to play in reducing carbon production but helping with congestion which is a cause for concern, particularly with air quality.</p>	
DBLP155	NHS Property Services Ltd	<p>NHSPS manages, maintains and improves NHS properties and facilities, working in partnership with NHS organisations to create safe, efficient, sustainable and modern healthcare and working environments. NHSPS has a clear mandate to provide a quality service to its tenants and minimise the cost of the NHS estate to those organisations using it. Any savings made are passed back to the NHS. Policy 23 restricts the loss or change of existing 'community facilities'. NHSPS objects to the wording of this policy, specifically point 2. An essential element of supporting the wider transformation of NHS services and the health estate is to ensure that surplus and vacant NHS sites are not strategically constrained by local planning policies, particularly for providing alternative uses (principally housing). Faced with financial pressures, the NHS requires flexibility in its estate. The capital receipts and revenue savings generated from the disposal of unneeded or unsuitable sites and properties for best value is an important component in helping to provide funding for new or improved services and facilities. Policies aimed at preventing the loss or change of use of community facilities and assets, where healthcare is included within this definition, can have a harmful impact on the NHS's</p>	<p>It is important that the Local Plan adopts a fair and transparent approach to all community facilities and does not treat the consideration of one type of facility any differently to others. It should not be the case that health sites should be granted a presumption for housing or other uses - each site should be considered in the same way, or their merits. The Council would therefore encourage the NHSPS to work with the Council through the Local Plan process to identify potential unneeded or unsuitable sites so that these can be considered as part of the site selection process for alternative uses such as housing. If such sites become available once the Plan has been adopted a 12 month marketing period is not unreasonable to justify the loss of community facilities.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>ability to ensure the delivery of facilities and services for the community. Where such policies are overly restrictive, the disposal of unneeded and unsuitable healthcare facilities for best value can be prevented or delayed. This has a direct impact on the provision and quality of healthcare facilities and services, as it can prevent or delay the reinvestment of capital in modern and fit-for-purpose facilities and require ongoing revenue to be spent on maintaining inefficient parts of the estate. Most surplus healthcare facilities are purpose built and at the end of their useful lives, and highly unlikely to be viable or suitable for other uses. There are separate, rigorous testing and approval processes employed by NHS commissioners to identify unneeded and unsuitable healthcare facilities, including continued health service provision for the population. These must be satisfied prior to any property being declared surplus and put up for disposal. Much surplus NHS property is outdated and no longer suitable for modern healthcare or other C2 or D1 uses without significant investment. Where NHS commissioners can demonstrate that healthcare facilities are no longer required there should be a presumption that such sites are suitable for housing (or other appropriate uses) and should not be subject to restrictive policies or periods of marketing. NHSPS would only support Policy 23 if it is clear that evidence of the wider NHS estate reorganisation programme would be accepted as justification for the loss of a community facility, and would therefore be excluded from the requirements of this policy. NHSPS would support the inclusion of the following: The loss or change of use of existing health facilities will be acceptable if it is shown that this forms part of a wider estate reorganisation programme to ensure the continued delivery of services. Evidence of such a programme will be accepted as a clear demonstration that the facility under consideration is neither needed nor viable and that</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>adequate facilities are or will be made available to meet the ongoing needs of the local population. In such cases Part A of Point 2 Policy 23 would not apply, and no viability or marketing information will be required. Without this further clarity, NHSPS would strongly object to Policy 23. The requirements of this policy are considered overly-onerous and inflexible.</p>	
DBLP170	East Markham Parish Council	<p>Notes on page 128 Policy 24(1) the CIL rate has been equalised throughout the District. This will be detrimental to the rural areas of East Bassetlaw. Concerned that the reduction from £55 per sqm to £30 per sqm will result in less CIL monies available to Parish Councils to spend on village projects. Given that the villages of East Bassetlaw will not have the retail opportunities of the towns they will see an increase in population. It is vital that the existing rates are retained. The differential rates were not originally campaigned for, so there must have been a rational that justified the differences in the first instance and they should be retained. Concerned about other facilities within the area e.g. the ability of the local GP services to cope with the increased population. The new properties built in the village are unable to obtain a high-speed internet connection due to a lack of capacity in the system. This</p>	<p>The Interim Whole Plan and CIL Viability Report provides the evidence for the reduction in the CIL rate across the District. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be produced which will set out how infrastructure will be provided to meet the needs of the Local Plan.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		will severely impact on people who plan to start a business in the village or work from home. Notes that the plan does discuss community infrastructure, but does not specifically included the provision of internet access nor indeed any improvement in other facilities. Examples of what is proposed and how it can be financed would be welcome.	
DBLP172	dha planning on behalf of Laing O'Rourke	Strongly welcome the proposal to remove the current CIL charge for employment development. The current CIL charge of £15/sqm (+ factoring) has proved to be a significant constraint to the delivery of large employment buildings at EIP. Nearly every other local authority that has introduced CIL has recognised that CIL charges on general employment uses adversely affect the viability of job-creating projects, so strongly support this proposal. Strongly welcome section 4 of the policy, which recognises that in certain circumstances it may be acceptable to consider a reduction in the extent of planning obligations where this threatens the viability and deliverability of development.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP186	Natural England	Pleased to note the inclusion of Green Infrastructure in Policy 24.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP192	Johnson Mowat on behalf of Barratt Homes	Question the inclusion of a CIL charge of £30 per square metre for residential development, which differs from information contained in the current charging schedule on the Council's website (dated September 2013). The current CIL includes three residential charging zones, varying from £55, £20, and £5. The charging zone in Harworth (North West Bassetlaw charging zone) is £5 per square metre. The proposed amendments to the CIL are recommended by the Council's CIL Viability Assessment (August 2018) this has not been tested and should not be included in the Policy. Given the viability implication associated with the adopted Community Infrastructure Levy and the additional requirement to deliver contributions to primary school education, the Council should	It is acknowledged that the CIL rate in Policy 24 is that proposed by the Interim Whole Plan and CIL Viability Report and has not undergone testing at CIL Examination. Therefore reference to the proposed rates will be deleted from Policy 24. A Whole Plan Viability Assessment will be undertaken to inform the next version of the emerging Local Plan.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		undertake a wide ranging viability assessment of the Local Plan prior to the publication of the next document.	
DBLP221	Gladman Developments	Raise concerns over the proposed CIL charge as it has not been subject to independent examination and should not be implemented. This element of the policy should be deleted. It is clear from the policy 12 that the Garden Villages will be providing necessary mitigation ‘across the board’ and included as part of the planning obligation. There should be no additional requirements for a CIL contribution for any further mitigation projects.	It is acknowledged that the CIL rate in Policy 24 is that proposed by the Interim Whole Plan and CIL Viability Report and has not undergone testing at CIL Examination. Therefore reference to the proposed rates will be deleted from Policy 24. A Whole Plan Viability Assessment will be undertaken to inform the next version of the emerging Local Plan. Further work will be undertaken to determine the impacts of securing infrastructure for the Garden Villages alongside a CIL rate.
DBLP229	Individual	Supports the policies to deliver and safeguard infrastructure. The delivery of key physical and social infrastructure will be provided by the Community Infrastructure Levy and for residential development this is set at £30 sqm. The proposal at Church Farm, Hayton could deliver the appropriate CIL payment. In addition it could deliver the appropriate amount of new affordable housing through a Section 106 Agreement.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP255	Home Builders Federation	Policy 24 sets out the Council’s proposed CIL charge of £30 per square metre for residential development however this CIL charge has not yet been subject to independent examination. The setting out of this charge in Policy 24 is inappropriate. This policy requirement should be modified before the publication of the pre-submission Local Plan consultation.	It is acknowledged that the CIL rate in Policy 24 is that proposed by the Interim Whole Plan and CIL Viability Report and has not undergone testing at CIL Examination. Therefore reference to the proposed rates will be deleted from Policy 24. A Whole Plan Viability Assessment will be undertaken to inform the next version of the emerging Local Plan.
DBLP262	Anglian Water Services Ltd	Support Policy 24 as it states that the provision of infrastructure and infrastructure improvements will be required to make the development proposals acceptable (in Planning terms) and that planning conditions will be used to secure this where appropriate.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP267	Sustrans Bassetlaw Rangers	Strongly support Policy 23 – New Community Facilities, paragraph 1 a: especially sustainable transport links to schools	Support for policy 23 noted and welcome.
DBLP270		For rural areas, “local need” must mean “Parish Need”. Do not expect land values in one village to be paying for facilities in other villages.	Local need is defined by the second sentence of Policy 23 as being close to the development or within the appropriate catchment for the community facilities. This will vary by facility so it would be inappropriate to define local needs as Parish needs.
DBLP267	Sustrans Bassetlaw Rangers	Strongly support Policy 24 – Infrastructure funding, paragraph 2 a i: developer contributions for cycling and walking provision.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP270	Individual	The flat rate for residential CIL across the district is welcomed although it is not known whether that proposed flat rate is viable. In Everton, land values are eroded by (catchment) secondary school results that are significantly below the national average: DFES grades A-C GCSE results inc: Maths and English Elizabethan School Retford also Retford Oaks), meaning that many parents will feel bound to find/pay for “alternative” provision. The Council will need to support developers where Notts CC issue s106 contribution demands when they are not required. In 2016 signed a s106 giving payment to Notts CC education despite a large number of vacancies in the Neighbouring School (Mattersey Primary) within maximum walking distances. Those vacancies had arisen as a result of poor results/management meaning that Mattersey parents were/are choosing to access Everton Primary in preference to their own. Our site was penalised by poor educational performance in a neighbouring village with Notts CC behaviour exhortative (see 16/01656/OUT). Our solicitor was extremely unhappy with the Bassetlaw Open Space policy wording and it took a significant amount of time to elicit acceptable clarification from the Open Space Team. Policy 24 makes reference to contributions for affordable housing delivery yet the DCLG formula used to calculate the district’s 5 year land	Developer contributions can only be secured where they are necessary to mitigate the impacts arising from new development as defined by paragraph 19.8. A Developer Contributions SPD will be prepared to provide further details relating to how, when and for what purpose developer contributions will be sought.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		supply, has enabled the eradication of the Bassetlaw housing “non-delivery” backlog. The specific element of the formula that has allowed the district to “scrub” the backlog is the affordability ratio. The affordability ratio for Bassetlaw, is one of the lowest in the country.	
DBLP271	Individual	Supported. It has got to include a new doctor's surgery. Worksop GPs can't cope as it is now. Also it has got to include a new secondary school with higher education. Make sure it has a good bus route - not everyone has got a car.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP273	Friends of Woodlands and Coachwood Green Ltd	A tourist attraction should be created to develop local leisure and recreation facilities with its accompanying rural economic benefits. Woodlands Country Park and the adjacent Chesterfield Canal, National Cycle Route 6 and the Cuckoo Way provide a unique opportunity in Bassetlaw which should be central to enhancing the natural build and historic environment. These facilities will promote the Health and Wellbeing of residents and visitors.	The Local Plan supports the appropriate provision of leisure and recreation facilities and cycling infrastructure. However, the Local Plan can only identify facilities which are deliverable. Unfortunately without a deliverable scheme this type of facility cannot be allocated in the Local Plan.
DBLP273	Friends of Woodlands and Coachwood Green Ltd	Traffic management is a major national concern, specifically in Shireoaks it is a major and growing problem. Shireoaks Row with its lack of parking for residents results in parking on both sides of the road with only a narrow gap inadequate for two larger vehicles to pass. With two businesses requiring access to large lorries day and night via Shireoaks Common and many people using the roads through the village as a shortcut to the A619 it is only a matter of time before a serious incident	The next version of the Local Plan will include policies relating to transport infrastructure. This will also include provision of parking standards for new development in the District.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		occurs. It is very important to the health and wellbeing of residents that this traffic problem is resolved.	
DBLP296	975737	Support for policies which seek to deliver infrastructure.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP301	977042	Support for policies which seek to deliver infrastructure.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP303	978627	Support for policies which seek to deliver infrastructure.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP304	986292	Support for policies which seek to deliver infrastructure.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP308	986480	No support for policies which seek to deliver infrastructure.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP314	987642	No support for policies which seek to deliver infrastructure. back to basics ! the current situation in Bassetlaw is currently struggling and needs a more direct approach to providing the area and therefore the people a more sustainable answer to the current problems.	Comments noted.
DBLP315	987680	Closure of Gamston would certainly be a loss of infrastructure.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP317	987880	Support for policies which seek to deliver infrastructure.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP318	987892	Support for policies which seek to deliver infrastructure.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP319	987959	Support for policies which seek to deliver infrastructure. Safeguarding infrastructure like a local airfield is essential to the prosperity of the area and the country.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP325	988054	Do not support the infrastructure policies. What about safeguarding the current infrastructure at Gamston Airport? This is a thriving airport and flying community. Instead it would be better to see a plan that includes the airport - perhaps supporting its growth for example.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP326	988057	Support for policies which seek to deliver infrastructure.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP328	988061	Support for policies which seek to deliver infrastructure.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP330	988064	Support for policies which seek to deliver infrastructure provided it wouldn't result in the loss of Gamston Airfield.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP333	988091	Support for policies which seek to deliver infrastructure provided it wouldn't result in the loss of Gamston Airfield.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP336	988172	Support for policies which seek to deliver infrastructure. Yes so that's why we should keep airport as a transport link and used for air ambulance	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP339	988184	No support for policies relating to infrastructure delivery	Comments noted.
DBLP343	988216	Support for policies relating to infrastructure delivery	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP344	988235	Support for policies relating to infrastructure delivery	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP345	988237	No support for policies relating to infrastructure delivery	Comments noted.
DBLP346	988247	No support for infrastructure policies. No it never works with large developments it just causes problems elsewhere - Spend time trying to cross a road in Retford Town or near the retail park !! journey times longer pollution greater because of stop start at traffic/pedestrian lights.	Comments noted.
DBLP349	988325	Support for policies relating to infrastructure delivery	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP350	988344	Support for policies relating to infrastructure delivery	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)	Item 3, must be taken to mean an enhancement of and not a replacement of the community building, a Village Hall for example.	Policy 23 3 does not refer to replacement of a community building.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)	Support for infrastructure delivery policies. But will have an effect on the deliverability of the housing requirement.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP359	988461	Infrastructure. It proposes "Health provision" yet will be making the air ambulance based at Gamston without a base.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP363	988482	Support for policies relating to infrastructure delivery	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP364	988487	Support for policies relating to infrastructure delivery	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP371	988500	Support for policies relating to infrastructure delivery	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP372	988501	Support for infrastructure delivery and safeguarding policies if proposal takes the needs of local villages into account by protecting our need for lower vehicle usage on roads not designed to carry the number or size of vehicles that already use the smaller villages as a means of getting away or to the A1 an Retford.	The Council works with the Highways Authority to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by the local road network.
DBLP373	988503	Support for policies which seek to delivery and safeguard infrastructure. Why not improve the infrastructure to already existing areas such as Worksop and improve education and health provision there?	The Council works with infrastructure providers to ensure that all development sites can be accommodated by the infrastructure network. Where this is not possible the Council will see whether use of developer contributions can help mitigate impacts identified. This could include health and education provision in Worksop.
DBLP375	988527	Support for policies relating to infrastructure delivery	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP376	988557	Support for policies relating to infrastructure delivery	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP384	988726	Support for policies relating to infrastructure delivery. Broadly we support the policy of ensuring that appropriate policies are put in place to safeguard and allow for future infrastructure provision	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP385	988746	Only support infrastructure policies. There are options for the proposed siting of the new development ,and the option for placing it on the airport should not even be considered. Housing developments are essential, but in the correct locations and not at the detriment to local thriving businesses and the loss of highly skilled workers	Comments noted.
DBLP386	988747	Support infrastructure policies. Transport improvements are essential. One of my reasons for opposing the Gamston development is that the A1 is already over crowded and there are accidents daily on it. Without significant improvement this would only get worse. There is land available in East Markham	The Council works with Highways England and the Highways Authority to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by the strategic and local road network. A new secondary school is not required in East Markham.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		for the development of a secondary school land on Great Lane fields on both sides of the road and a very large field adjacent to it, all in common ownership. Again Bassetlaw don't seem interested in working with landowners	
DBLP387	988748	No support. Killing off General Aviation is a backward step for transport, employment and global business. If anything the airport should be enhanced to allow business aviation usage. In 2005 there were about 100,000 airport/aerodrome pairs in Europe served by General and Business aviation traffic (as opposed to about 30,000 linked by scheduled airline connections). Only 5% of them had a scheduled alternative (at least one scheduled flight per working day). The same pattern remains when we look at the city-pairs. In 2005 General and Business aviation in Europe served over 80,000 city pairs. Vast majority of this traffic was between city-pairs that had only very limited scheduled alternative (less than one scheduled flight per working day).	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP388	988749	Support for policies which seek to deliver and safeguard infrastructure. Needs to be better schools to support the high number of people with low levels of academic ability in the area.	The Council works with NCC Education to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by existing education facilities. Where this is not possible the Council will see whether use of developer contributions can help mitigate impacts identified.
DBLP389	988774	No support. The proposed solutions do not deliver and safeguard infrastructure and transport facilities - the destruction of the airport removes from both the Council area and the nation a useful facility which is not otherwise available. Doncaster-Sheffield is too far to the north, and Humberside and East Midlands too far away to the east and south respectively.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP391	988813	Do not support the infrastructure policies. Safeguard should include keeping a useful airfield	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP392	988889	Support for policies which seek to deliver and safeguard infrastructure. We are a group of rural communities, urbanising the environment has a significant reduction in the quality of life for those who choose a less 'built up' environment.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP393	989007	Support for policies which seek to deliver and safeguard infrastructure. So why propose getting rid of an airport. In the 22nd century we may all be travelling more by local air services??	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP394	989023	Support for policies which seek to deliver and safeguard infrastructure.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP398	989658	No support. At the consultation event the person to whom I spoke was very vague about plans for increased health care, education provision and infrastructure. Clearly the current provision would not support the number of individuals who could move into the area and the thinking about the global needs did not seem to be joined up.	The Council works with infrastructure providers to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by existing facilities. Where this is not possible the Council will see whether use of developer contributions can help mitigate impacts identified. Until development sites are identified it is not possible to determine the infrastructure needs of future development. These will be identified in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP399	989741	No support. The threat to Gamston Airport means you are not safeguarding the current infrastructure.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP402	990030	No support for policies which seek to deliver and safeguard infrastructure	Comments noted.
DBLP403	990043	No support for policies which seek to deliver and safeguard infrastructure.	Comments noted.
DBLP404	990059	No support for policies which seek to deliver and safeguard infrastructure. Later buses would help.	Comments noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP405	990062	Support for policies which seek to deliver and safeguard infrastructure. The enhancement of footpaths, cycle and bridleways is positive. A 'green bridge' over the A1 to link Bevercotes to Retford would be good if it could be located to the Robin Hood site to encourage custom to it (the field at the back of the pub would be ideal). There are significant transport improvements that would be needed and these have not been addressed in the plan. It reads as if the road network is suitable in its present form and this is far from accurate. We have a rural road network. Building new schools at Bevercotes and Gamston would likely render the existing schools at Walesby, Elkesley, Ordsall and the existing one at Gamston redundant. Removing the Elkesley school would take away a major asset of the village and a reason why people move there. Why cant the existing schools be developed and extended? If new schools are built then until that point the current ones will have to take more children, become overcrowded and then see numbers drop making their long term planning extremely difficult.	Support for footpaths, cyclepaths and bridleways and green bridge is noted. The Council will work with infrastructure providers to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by existing facilities including roads and education. Where this is not possible the Council will see whether use of developer contributions can help mitigate impacts identified. Until development sites are identified it is not possible to determine the infrastructure needs of future development. These will be identified in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP407	990068	Do not support. We are suffering with extra traffic , speeding through the village of Eaton currently. If on average we look at 2 to 3 cars per new household the local village roads struggling now , litter is also a major problems	The Council works with Highways England and the Highways Authority to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by the strategic and local road network.
DBLP408	990070	Don't support infrastructure policies. I would if they were built first and plans in place before the dwellings But how many schemes start on promises	Developer contributions are secured via a legal agreement binding the developer and/or landowner to make the provision at a specific point in time. Although it is possible to secure infrastructure prior to housing, it is common practice for a number of properties to be occupied prior to receipt of the infrastructure - there is no need for the infrastructure until the residents occupy the dwellings.
DBLP409	990071	Support. Yes supporting the preservation of Gamston airport, and the education that takes place there.	Comments noted.
DBLP410	990076	Support for policies which seek to deliver and safeguard infrastructure.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP411	990079	No support for infrastructure policies. No as I don't believe they are sufficient to safeguard any of these	Comments noted.
DBLP415	990150	Support the proposed amendments to the Community Infrastructure Levy restricting charges to residential and food supermarket retail proposals	Support noted and welcome.
DBLP416	990240	No support for policies which seek to deliver and safeguard infrastructure. Do not believe that the majority of these proposals are within the Bassetlaw Remit; Highways are the responsibility of the County Council, who seem to be currently unable to resolve the issues that are keeping Twyford Bridge (over the A1) as a 'single line operation' with the use of an extremely expensive Traffic Light System. Public Transport is generally a private venture supported by Grants from the County Council/National Government. I do not see how Bassetlaw can have any input to this. If that Authority does have influence then it should seek to reinstate local Bus Services to communities that are 'cut off'. The Local Schools supply and capacity is not within the remit of the Bassetlaw Authority. Health Centres are not within the remit of the Bassetlaw Authority. There are already many natural areas for relaxation and enjoyment within the local area. Communication Infrastructure is either Privately or County Authority/National Government supported, not within the remit of the Bassetlaw Authority.	Under the Duty to Cooperate the Council is required to engage a range of key stakeholders and infrastructure providers on the development of the Local Plan. Although much infrastructure is not provided by the Council, the infrastructure providers are expected to positively engage to help ensure that the Local Plan is deliverable. This will be set out within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Statements of Common Ground will be used to ensure infrastructure is delivered.
DBLP418	990387	Support for policies which seek to deliver and safeguard infrastructure.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP419	990400	Support for policies which seek to deliver and safeguard infrastructure.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP420	990465	Don't support policies which seek to deliver and safeguard infrastructure because Gamston Airport is infrastructure which isn't proposed to be safeguarded.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP421	990489	Support for policies which seek to deliver and safeguard infrastructure	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP422	990506	Don't support policies which seek to deliver and safeguard infrastructure	Comments noted.
DBLP423	990541	Support for policies which seek to deliver and safeguard infrastructure	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP424	990549	Don't support. The airfield forms part of the transport infrastructure which should be retained.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP425	990570	Don't support. Closing Gamston does the opposite!	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP426	990571	Don't support	Comments noted.
DBLP427	990577	Don't support. How is our policy of building on green and open space in any way compatible with the safeguarding you propose?	Policies 18 and 20 seek to protect and enhance green infrastructure unless in exceptional circumstances when criteria are met. This is consistent with national policy.
DBLP428	990594	Don't support. Loss of airfield would have a massive effect on local economy	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP429	990613	Support	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP430	990614	Don't support. This is not supporting transport networks. It's closing an important hub at a high local cost for many.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP431	990633	Don't support.	Comments noted.
DBLP434	990659	Don't support.	Comments noted.
DBLP435	990666	Support	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP436	990682	Support.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP437	990704	Don't support.	Comments noted.
DBLP438	990717	Don't support.	Comments noted.
DBLP439	990719	Don't support. You can't do what you are suppose to be doing now let alone increase the demand on this. The council needs to tick a box and you are doing this to the detriment of your residents and the landscape. It is smoke and mirrors and nothing proposed will live up to the carefully written housing plan. The bridge near Gamston over the A1 - strange how this has not been fixed. Is the council delaying this until the	Comments noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		consultation is over! Corruption evident, from the poorly promoted consultation events in the hope this would all be pushed through behind closed doors.	
DBLP440	990764	Don't support	Comments noted.
DBLP441	990783	Don't support	Comments noted.
DBLP442	990799	Support. Yes, if the garden village proposed for Gamston is abandoned.	Comments noted.
DBLP443	990800	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP444	990802	Do not support. The rationale for the proposed two sites appears to be that they are both close to the A1 and B6387 connects the two sites and provides good connectivity with Retford and the East Coast mainline. On looking at the map that may seem appropriate but realistically the B road is narrow in places with bad bends and the A1 slip roads are short and the immediate stretch of the A1 is congested. Also this part of the A1 has had several accidents even since the Elkesley bridge has been finished. Local villages such as Bevercotes and Eaton are going to be seen as more 'rat runs' than currently and therefore dangerous with narrow roads, bad bends and Eaton and Gamston bridges both significantly causing many road accidents. Surely with 10000 extra people in the area it will mean that there will be too many vehicles for this updated road infrastructure. I cannot see that the house builders would be interested in investing in an updated road infrastructure until after the first 15 years. Retford Train Station surroundings and parking areas are already packed. There is mention that 40000 journeys are made to use Retford Station now never mind when an extra 10000 people are living in the area!!	The Council works with Highways England and the Highways Authority to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by the strategic and local road network.
DBLP445	990806	Do not support	Comments noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP446	990814	Do not support. The amount of additional hard standing will mean extra run off and put more pressure on existing drainage systems.	The Council works with the Environment Agency, Anglian Water and Severn Trent to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by the infrastructure network. Where this is not possible the Council will see whether use of developer contributions can help mitigate impacts identified. Until development sites are identified it is not possible to determine the infrastructure needs of future development. These will be identified in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP447	990818	Do not support	Comments noted.
DBLP448	990826	Do not support. If two new villages are built at Gamston & Bevercotes, this would put an enormous strain on the public services & road systems in the area. This would increase the amount of pollution in the area, rather than improve the environment, so I believe the council should only look to allow the building of new homes in any village or town by small numbers.	The Council works with infrastructure providers to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by the existing network. Where this is not possible the Council will see whether use of developer contributions can help mitigate impacts identified. Until development sites are identified it is not possible to determine the infrastructure needs of future development. These will be identified in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP449	990829	Do not support	Comments noted.
DBLP450	990836	Do not support	Comments noted.
DBLP451	990837	Support.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP452	990841	Do not support. I cannot imagine that these policies make any more sense than the proposal, so NO.	Comments noted.
DBLP453	990842	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP454	990843	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP455	990845	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP456	990846	Do not support.	Comments noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP457	990847	Do not support. Infrastructure within the proposed housing developments only appears to have been considered, there is no information around access and impact on infrastructure leading too and from the sites.	The Council works with infrastructure providers to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by the existing network. Where this is not possible the Council will see whether use of developer contributions can help mitigate impacts identified. Until development sites are identified it is not possible to determine the infrastructure needs of future development. These will be identified in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP458	990848	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP459	990849	Do not support. Areodromes are open space, transport infrastructure that requires protection as per government policy.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP460	990850	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP461	990852	Do not support. The benefits of having transport opportunities from Gamston Airport are being ignored.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP462	990854	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP463	990855	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP464	990856	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP465	990859	Do not support. I cant support policies that ran we lose an important facility such as Gamston airport.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP466	990862	Do not support. This is incorrect, you are destroying current infrastructure. Costing private families at least tens of thousands. Removing jobs from people with specialist skills that will have to re-locate to find similar employment.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP467	990865	Support. But you're getting rid of one of the most vibrant GA airfields! Gamston airport is an essential GA hub. It is thriving and vibrant. Replacing it with a village would remove a vital piece of infrastructure in the region.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP468	990869	Do not support. Keep Gamston airport.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP469	990882	Do not support.	Comments noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP470	990884	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP471	990885	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP472	990886	Support.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP473	990889	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP474	990891	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP475	990893	Do not support. No because they don't safeguard the infrastructure of Gamston airfield.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP476	990895	Support	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP477	990901	Support. Building over 6000 homes on an active airfield will not help climate change, natural habitate for wild life and will remove an open green space	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP478	990904	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP479	990910	Do not support. The assessment does not appear to be thorough in terms of road capacity and road safety as this falls to the responsibility of the county council and highways England . The characteristics of many of the roads surrounding villages and smaller settlements are not constructed to a modern standard conducive to modern vehicles and driving. Nor does there appear to be an acknowledgement of this. The Council do not hold the remit for school provision. Gamston C of E Primary and the County maintained Elkesley Primary Schools are near to capacity, but serve their local communities well. Whilst it is suggested the new Garden Villages would have their own schools, it is not envisaged that these would be up and running prior the completion of the first phase of 600 properties. So where would these children go. New schools are only authorised when existing demand proves the need for investment and this is assessed at Notts County Council. This is a non political process which only becomes an obligation with certain criteria. In the meantime, the pressure would be on the existing facilities.	The Council works with Highways England and the Highways Authority to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by the strategic and local road network as well as NCC in relation to education. Where this is not possible the Council will see whether use of developer contributions can help mitigate impacts identified. Until development sites are identified it is not possible to determine the infrastructure needs of future development and when the infrastructure is likely to be required. These will be identified in the next version of the Local Plan.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan– Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP480	990912	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP481	990913	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP482	990914	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP483	990915	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP484	990916	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP485	990917	Support.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP486	990918	Support.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP487	990919	Support.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP488	990921	Support. If you're serious about safeguarding; open space, transport, education. Closing a STEM enabling site such as an airport, is stupid. Would never known about Retford if It hadn't been for the airport. Would never have wanted or needed to go, but because of the airport have spent and invested money that airport. Money supporting local families and business, also council taxes. You would lose a lot of tax from airport closure	Comments noted.
DBLP489	990922	Do not support the proposed policies regarding infrastructure including the transport, education ect. The major factor here is that a huge part of the areas infrasturcture (Gamston Airport) will be removed which provides a huge part in the local community. There are 3 flying schools to my knowledge teaching people anything from the Private Pilots License upto commercial level. These skills and training is something that the normal education system cannot provide. This airport provides more skilled jobs than what would be created with villages in the long term ie low skilled shop workers.	Comments noted.
DBLP490	990926	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP491	990928	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP492	990930	Do not support. It removes infrastructure - aka the airfield. Likely as drone technology and electric flight becomes a reality to be a big loss for the area.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP493	990933	Support.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP494	990934	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP495	990936	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP496	990937	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP497	990938	Do not support. Eaton is a tiny village, it cannot cope with an influx of houses with the added traffic. They'll not be enough spaces in schools to support this	The Council works with Highways England and the Highways Authority to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by the strategic and local road network as well as NCC in relation to education. Where this is not possible the Council will see whether use of developer contributions can help mitigate impacts identified. Until development sites are identified it is not possible to determine the infrastructure needs of future development and when the infrastructure is likely to be required. These will be identified in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP498	990940	Do not support. I hardly class destroying Gamston Airport as stipulated in paragraph 10.3 as safeguarding infrastructure. Particularly the transport infrastructure provided by the airport. I also see contradiction with paragraph 10.5 which speaks of seeking to support opportunities in order to retain and create.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP499	990942	Do not support. How does closing the airfield improve transport links? The open space is much better at flood mitigation than any housing estate. Flying training, aircraft maintainence apprenticeships and other jobs are all vocational education.	Comments noted.
DBLP500	990943	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP501	990944	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP502	990946	Do not support.	Comments noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP503	Individual	Do not support. Instead of destroying vital national infrastructure and skilled jobs could support the airport and build an economic hub. The destruction of Retford Gamston Airport would remove a vital local and national facility that is virtually impossible to re-create once destroyed. The plan would displace 10 independent businesses and over 50 based aircraft, including business jets and the Children's Air Ambulance helicopter, with no alternative accommodation in the area. The Draft local plan has significant flaws in this area and chiefly ignores the national requirement to maintain a strategic network of airfields as outlined in paragraph 104f of the NPPF. It fails to Consider "the importance of maintaining business, leisure, training and emergency service needs" and Paragraph 10.3 disregards the locally and nationally significant transport infrastructure provided by the airport. The aims for development at the airport also contradict paragraph 10.5 which seeks to support such opportunities.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP504	990949	Support	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP505	Individual	Do not support. This type of infrastructure should be in place as standard policy . The present infrastructure is not adequate for the current level of housing that we have now without adding to it.	The Council works with infrastructure providers to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by the infrastructure network. Where this is not possible the Council will see whether use of developer contributions can help mitigate impacts identified. Until development sites are identified it is not possible to determine the infrastructure needs of future development and when the infrastructure is likely to be required. These will be identified in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP506	990952	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP507	990954	Support.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP508	990955	Do not support. Transport infrastructure alone does not show how surrounding villages and traffic bottle necks will be protected or improved to the levels required today let alone with the addition of 9149.4 additional vehicles in the bassetlaw area after the building of 6630 houses (1.38 vehicles per household, east of England, www.statista.com)	The Council works with Highways England and the Highways Authority to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by the strategic and local road network as well as NCC in relation to education. Where this is not possible the Council will see whether use of developer contributions can help mitigate impacts identified. Until development sites are identified it is not possible to determine the infrastructure needs of future development and when the infrastructure is likely to be required. These will be identified in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP509	990959	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP510	990961	Support.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP511	990962	Support. But there is no need to close Gamston airport to do this.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP512	990964	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP513	990965	Support	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP514	990980	Support. YOU ARE NOT SAFEGUARDING TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE - YOU'RE DESTROYING A PERFECTLY GOOD ACTIVE AIRFIELD!!!!!!!!!! which provides transport links for local businesses, provides lots of skilled job opportunities, and can attract visitors to the area!! The airport has flourished for the last thirty years, yet you are proposing to demolish it.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP515	991045	Do not support. The plan will destroy instead of safeguard transport infrastructure. You have ignored aviation and how strongly local people feel about their airport. I hope you review your plans.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP516	991153	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP517	991157	Do not support. There needs to be a lot more done in the Retford area before any new projects are introduced the infrastructure now in certain areas is cracking there is land built on many years ago that still floods the roads through and	The Council works with infrastructure providers to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by existing infrastructure. Where this is not possible the Council will see whether use of developer contributions can help mitigate impacts

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		around the town get gridlocked regularly that is even before anything happens on the A 1 around Markham Moor and Elkesley (which unfortunately it does on a regular basis). If one new garden village was proposed around Bevercotes that would create its own infrastructure that would have less of a detrimental impact on the immediate area around Retford and its neighbouring villages which need to be kept as rural villages.	identified. Until development sites are identified it is not possible to determine the infrastructure needs of future development and when the infrastructure is likely to be required. These will be identified in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP518	991172	Do not support. Although the plan is all assumptions as BDC does not have the power to manage transport, education and health, these are managed by other agencies, just as it can't insist on developers delivering new facilities. This plan should show a commitment from the other agencies and this plan needs to go out to consultation again without the cost cutting exercise in order to gain any appropriate responses from local residents.	Under the Duty to Cooperate the Council is required to engage a range of key stakeholders and infrastructure providers on the development of the Local Plan. Although much infrastructure is not provided by the Council, the infrastructure providers are expected to positively engage to help ensure that the Local Plan is deliverable. Statements of Common Ground will be used to ensure infrastructure is delivered.
DBLP519	991173	Support. Who wouldn't.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP520	991174	Do not support. The plan is all assumptions as BDC does not have the power to manage transport, education and health, just as it can't insist on developers delivering new facilities. There needs to be some sort of agreement from the other agencies that buy into this plan before I can agree to this. the plan needs to go back out to consultation without the cost cutting exercise so that appropriate responses from villagers can be made.	Under the Duty to Cooperate the Council is required to engage a range of key stakeholders and infrastructure providers on the development of the Local Plan. Although much infrastructure is not provided by the Council, the infrastructure providers are expected to positively engage to help ensure that the Local Plan is deliverable. Statements of Common Ground will be used to ensure infrastructure is delivered.
DBLP521	991176	Do not support. No - even if efficient policies are put in place, it does not alter the fact that all this new development would radically change the countryside in Bassetlaw leading to loss of village life and rural living as we know it.	Comments noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP522	991178	<p>Do not support. If the development goes ahead as residential there are roughly 6 car movements a day which will total over 24000 per day when the development is completed .as we know there will have to be a complete upgrade of Twyford Bridge , but what about the rest of the A1 ? how will that be improved for the increase in traffic flow . What provision is being made for the upgrade of the smaller roads A lot of traffic will go through Eaton Village which has poor road structure and cant cope now when there is an accident on the A1, Ollerton Road leading on to Jockey Lane /Brick yard Road again is very poor and would need a complete upgrade . The Road from the A1 to Gamston although better quality as many bad bends ,there are already numerous accidents which I feel would only get worse with the increased traffic flow , more street lights needed and maybe a cycle path . As for Education , it will be years before a new primary school or secondary school is needed ,but if new schools were to be built on the new sites then pressure would be put on the existing local schools which are struggling as it is .I cant see new health centres being a priority at the moment there are staff shortages in the hospitals we have already got (and Schools for that matter) so what makes the council think people would want to work at these smaller sites when generally they like to work at the more specialist units .</p>	<p>The Council works with infrastructure providers to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by existing infrastructure. Where this is not possible the Council will see whether use of developer contributions can help mitigate impacts identified. Until development sites are identified it is not possible to determine the infrastructure needs of future development and when the infrastructure is likely to be required. These will be identified in the next version of the Local Plan.</p>
DBLP523	991181	Support.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP524	991184	<p>Do not support - do exactly the opposite of "delivering and safeguarding infrastructure". As already mentioned above the draft plan totally fails to comply with the NPPF, as its stated objective, by virtue of the fact that it has failed to recognise or act upon paragraph 104 f) of the NPPF and therefore totally fails "to deliver and safeguard infrastructure" by proposing the closure of Retford Gamston Airport that is already acting as a strategic hub for business within Bassetlaw. And how also is it</p>	<p>Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		delivering and safeguarding infrastructure when the closure of Retford Gamston Airport will also result in the closure of a total of 11 businesses that require to operate from an airport, the loss of a training facility for Nottinghamshire Police, a base for a Children's Air Ambulance helicopter and the loss of almost 100 jobs (a large number of which are STEM), the loss of 96 hectares of actively farmed arable land, as well as all the direct benefits to the local economy?	
DBLP525	991186	Support. Yes, but not in the context of the currently proposed developments.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP526	991188	Do not support. This plan does not safeguard the current infrastructure at Gamston Airport. It seeks to destroy it.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP527	991190	Support.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP528	991208	Support.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP529	991209	A District wide CIL rate will see developers favouring rural locations as the margins on sale will be greater. Proposing that zone rates still apply to counter the rural effect	Comments noted.
DBLP529	991209	Support.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP530	991219	Do not support. Any schools built will have to be huge to cater for all new children moving into the houses. Not all will have children, however those that do will potentially have more than 1 child. So there could be potentially 4000 children minimum to house in the schools. The village schools that already exist cannot educate anywhere near that number, so any new school will have to extremely big. What an eyesore for a 'village location'. Open spaces.....will these all be accessible by foot for existing residents in Gamston? There are no pavements after Muttonshire Hill en route to the airport and that road is very busy and has a speed limit of 50mph (but will be in excess of that by motorists). I would not want to walk my children along there unless much better provisions are put in place to assist with their safety. If I had to drive to these open	The Council works with infrastructure providers to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by existing infrastructure. Where this is not possible the Council will see whether use of developer contributions can help mitigate impacts identified. Until development sites are identified it is not possible to determine the infrastructure needs of future development and when the infrastructure is likely to be required. These will be identified in the next version of the Local Plan.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		spaces, it would defeat the object of having them on the doorstep.	
DBLP531	991221	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP532	Individual	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP533	991230	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP534	991231	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP535	991234	Support.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP536	991235	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP537	991237	Do not support. Again what's in the plan will not be delivered. I do not believe that you, the Council will deliver the infrastructure required to support the Plan.	Comments noted.
DBLP538	991240	Do not support. I can not support policies that do not exist! Specifically went to one of the consultation meetings to ask about the supporting policies around the housing strategy and was told that they did not exist and would not exist as they are only developed once the housing development is started and approved ! Asked about; 1. Bassetlaw hospital/NHS funding and growth plans 2. Dental practices 3. Road networks and developments 4. Public transport plans for the future You have no plans for any of the above and so I can not agree to this question.	Policy 24 sets out the way the Council will ensure that infrastructure required to mitigate the impacts of development is sought. The Council works with infrastructure providers to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by existing infrastructure. Where this is not possible the Council will see whether use of developer contributions can help mitigate impacts identified. Until development sites are identified it is not possible to determine the infrastructure needs of future development and when the infrastructure is likely to be required. These will be identified in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP539	991241	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP540	991243	Do not support. You're not safeguarding transport or education by getting rid of Gamston Airport. Not only does Gamston	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		support General Aviation in the area, it educates new pilots and support a number of full time jobs.	
DBLP541	991264	Do not support. This development safeguards nothing in terms of infrastructure. It adds risk and demand to housing required infrastructure including water demand in a resource limited area. It removes the only airfield infrastructure in the area capable of serving a significant an economically active segment of the population. In infrastructure terms it is actually completely harmful as a proposal.	Protecting infrastructure is covered by other topic specific policies in the Local Plan. Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP542	991336	Support.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP543	991990	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP544	992014	Support. Please do not destroy our aviation heritage at Gamston Airport.	Comments noted.
DBLP545	992366	Support.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP546	992635	Do not support. Usually houses are built without any regard to infrastructure.	Policy 24 sets out the way the Council will ensure that infrastructure required to mitigate the impacts of development is sought. The Council works with infrastructure providers to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by existing infrastructure. Where this is not possible the Council will see whether use of developer contributions can help mitigate impacts identified. Until development sites are identified it is not possible to determine the infrastructure needs of future development and when the infrastructure is likely to be required. These will be identified in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP547	993337	Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP548	993387	Do not support.	Comments noted.
Appendices			
DBLP31	BDC Councillor	Representation refers to Para 104 of the NPPF ab, b and f.	References to NPPF paragraph 104 is noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP179	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	<p>Public Highway to the north west of Worksop and south of Rotherham, in particular the A57: The Council's highway officer welcomes this issue being picked up through the Local Plan as the increased pressure of development along the A57 corridor, from both authorities, requires a strategic approach to the management of traffic along this important link. The continued growth of housing and employment land in Worksop has prompted investment in the immediate transport infrastructure around the vicinity of the sites but the wider distributional impact on the whole route (into Rotherham) needs to be considered. Agree with the shared approach transport assessment although the Inspector may question "what is it". The Council as the highway authority do not have any specific plan to address this issue and it would be for BDC and NCC to demonstrate. This will be a challenging issue as the Council would not want anything to further impact the Rotherham network whereas NCC would not want this constraint to implicate their development. A Statement of Common ground is the next step to which the Council would welcome a discussion and agreed approach.</p>	<p>The Council will continue to work with Rotherham Metropolitan District Council through Duty to Cooperate requirements and will ensure all necessary Statements of Common Ground are in place as the Local Plan progresses.</p>
DBLP211	Bawtry Town Council	<p>Bawtry Town Council would like to register the wish to be consulted about the content of the Statement of Common Ground with DMBC, as opposed to this simply being consultation with DMBC.</p>	<p>The Council will have a statement of Common Ground with DMBC and this is between the two authorities. BDC will explore the potential of a SoCG with Bawtry TC at the relevant time.</p>
DBLP215	Sheffield City Region	<p>Supportive of work that has already taken place, and keen to continue positive working relations.</p>	<p>Support welcome and noted.</p>
DBLP284	Doncaster Council	<p>Under the heading Sheffield City Region, it states that "The Council has received no requests from the other members to address their development needs". Doncaster Council emailed Bassetlaw District Council on 27 September 2018 with a formal request to respond to a table setting out potential strategic/cross boundary issues and formally asking whether Bassetlaw would be in a position to allocate land for housing in</p>	<p>The Council acknowledges that a request for addressing Doncaster's development needs has been received. This is to be clarified in the next version of the Local Plan.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		the Bassetlaw Local Plan in order to contribute to meeting some of Doncaster's housing need. Follow up emails were also sent. Still awaiting a response.	
General			
DBLP18	Individual	Express surprise at the lack of other options when attending my local Local Plan consultation considering it is meant to be only draft plans.	Comments noted.
DBLP19	Harworth and Bircotes Town Council	The Town Council welcomes the opportunity for consultation with/and views of the local community.	Support for consultation noted and welcome.
DBLP19	Harworth and Bircotes Town Council	It is well structured and makes clear the objectives of the Plan and the relevant planning policies influencing the priorities such as: - a balanced approach to housing growth, economic development and retail/leisure facilities in Bassetlaw, plus recognition of the need for conservation of local heritage; - a balanced approach that is underpinned by the intention to deliver the strategic priorities of the area; - the acknowledgement that where is housing growth, it should be in a managed way; - it is pleasing that the Plan recognises the differences between settlements, pays attention to the rural community and continues to support Neighbourhood Plans; - it is reassuring that the Plan pays attention to the priorities, plans and aspirations for future developments as detailed in Neighbourhood Plans	Support welcome and noted.
DBLP31	BDC Councillor	Rubbish	Comments noted.
DBLP32	Individual	There is a desperate need in Wheatley for smaller properties for single/2 person families. Older residents wanting to downsize find it increasingly difficult as all building work - either new or renovation seems to be focused on providing larger dwellings.	Comments noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP32	Individual	Developments which allow for multiple dwellings to share one access are beginning to put a strain on the roads around the village as there is inadequate provision of parking within the curtilage of individual properties leading to on street parking.	Comments noted.
DBLP59	Styrrup with Oldcotes Parish Council	Oldcotes is incorrectly spelt throughout the document	Noted. Reference to Oldcotes will be changed in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP74	Sport England	Refers to Sport England web site for information regarding the importance of planning for sport – active recreation and the health and wellbeing of communities. Refers to website for information on forward planning and policy development. Sport England does not have a statutory planning remit to protect open space but we are concerned that the loss of POS or incidental open space within residential areas could be promoted. Sport England's strategy (Towards an Active Nation) seeks to move the inactive to active. Our evidence suggests that access to open space near to where people live is a strong factor to moving people from inactive to active particularly in areas of deprivation. https://www.sportengland.org/active-nation/our-strategy/	Comments noted.
DBLP91	Highways England	Understand that moving forward the Council will be undertaking Transport Assessments to underpin the Plan, and this is welcomed. Highways England will be happy to engage with the Council on proposed transport assessments related to the operation of the SRN and its junctions. Note that both an Infrastructure Capacity Study and Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be produced in support of the Local Plan and this is welcomed by Highways England as a means of understanding the impact of growth on the SRN.	The Council will continue to work with Highways England through Duty to Cooperate requirements and will welcome guidance on site selection to inform the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP97	Lound Parish Council Neighbourhood	Lound Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group have been working on a Neighbourhood Plan since early 2016. Would like to take this opportunity to thank you for all the help and guidance which BDC has provided us over this time. Of particular	Comments welcome and noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
	Plan Steering Group	assistance was attendance at our committee meeting on 7 February and subsequent joint consultation event on 12 February.	
DBLP119	The Coal Authority	<p>The Bassetlaw area has been subjected to coal mining which will have left a legacy. Whilst most past mining is generally benign in nature, potential public safety and stability problems can be triggered and uncovered by development activities. Problems can include collapses of mine entries and shallow coal mine workings, emissions of mine gases, incidents of spontaneous combustion, and the discharge of water from abandoned coal mines. These surface hazards can be found in any coal mining area, particularly where coal exists near to the surface, including existing residential areas. Within Bassetlaw there are approx 18 recorded mine entries and around 33 coal mining related hazards have been reported to The Coal Authority for emergency response. Mine entries may be located in built up areas, often under buildings where the owners and occupiers have no knowledge of their presence unless they have received a mining report during the property transaction. Mine entries can also be present in open space and areas of green infrastructure, potentially just under the surface of grassed areas. Mine entries and mining legacy matters should be considered by Planning Authorities to ensure that site allocations and other policies and programmes will not lead to future public safety hazards. Although mining legacy occurs as a result of mineral workings, it is important that new development recognises the problems and how they can be positively addressed. It is important to note that land instability and mining legacy is not a complete constraint on new development; rather it can be argued that because mining legacy matters have been addressed the new development is safe, stable and sustainable.</p>	Mine entries and mining legacy will be considered as part of the site selection process. The Council will continue to work with the Coal Authority as part of the preparation of the next version of the Local Plan to ensure all relevant matters are taken into account.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	The Part 1 Local Plan does not seek to make site specific allocations for development save for two proposed strategic allocations for Garden Villages. Consider that Land to the South of Ordsall, Retford and Land to the south of Snape Lane, Harworth form strategically significant sites which are vital for the delivery of the District's housing and employment needs. The Plan should seek to allocate the above Sites, and other strategically significant Sites for the District.	Site allocations will be identified in the next version of the Local Plan. If appropriate this may include strategic sites.
DBLP138	Bothamsall Parish Council	Will the plan support spiritual welfare of the community, if so, how?	Policy 23 supports the provision, retention and enhancement of community facilities which include places of worship.
DBLP176	West Stockwith Parish Council	No major comments to make on this consultation	Comments welcome and noted.
DBLP179	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	No detailed comments to make regarding the draft policies.	Comments welcome and noted.
DBLP182	Severn Trent Water Ltd	The Plan identifies significant number of development being required across the district, it is acknowledged that there will be a focus on Worksop, Retford and Harworth & Bircotes, identifies significant growth spread proportionally across the District. The Plan does not provide any identification of where these sites are to be located. Not possible to undertake detailed planning for growth related infrastructure requirements. Recommend that discussions are held as soon as developments are identified for development.	Site allocations will be set out in the next version of the Local Plan. The Council will work with Severn Trent to ensure that the site selection process is informed by detailed planning for growth requirements.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP186	Natural England	<p>Should give appropriate weight to the roles performed by the area's soils. These should be valued as a finite multi-functional resource which underpins our wellbeing and prosperity.</p> <p>Decisions about development should take full account of the impact on soils, their intrinsic character and the sustainability of the many ecosystem services they deliver. The plan should safeguard the long term capability of best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a in the Agricultural Land Classification) as a resource for the future in line with NPPF para 170. Expect the plan to address the impacts of air quality on the natural environment. In particular, it should address the traffic impacts associated with new development, particularly where this impacts on European sites and SSSIs. The SA and HRA should consider any detrimental impacts on the natural environment, and suggest appropriate avoidance or mitigation measures where applicable. Advise that one of the main issues in the plan and the SA/HRA are proposals which are likely to generate additional nitrogen emissions as a result of increased traffic generation, which can be damaging to the natural environment. The effects on local roads in the vicinity of any proposed development on nearby designated nature conservation sites (including increased traffic, construction of new roads, and upgrading of existing roads), and the impacts on vulnerable sites from air quality effects on the wider road network in the area (a greater distance away from the development) can be assessed using traffic projections and the 200m distance criterion followed by local Air Quality modelling where required. Consider that the designated sites at risk from local impacts are those within 200m of a road with increased traffic, which feature habitats that are vulnerable to nitrogen deposition/acidification. APIS provides a searchable database and information on pollutants and their impacts on habitats and species. Should identify relevant areas of tranquillity and</p>	<p>The next version of the Local Plan will include a range of development management policies. This will include a policy on environmental quality which will include criteria relating to soil quality, air quality. The SA and HRA will also ensure that any adverse impacts on the natural environment from Local Plan policies and/or site allocations are identified and mitigation/changes recommended. It is also expected that where this is not possible the SA/HRA will recommend avoidance.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>provide appropriate policy protection to such areas as identified in NPPF para 100 and 180. Tranquillity is an important landscape attribute in certain areas e.g. in National Parks/AONBs, particularly where this is identified as a special quality. The CPRE have mapped areas of tranquillity which are available here and are a helpful source of evidence for the Local Plan and SEA/SA.</p>	
DBLP187	Individual	<p>Express my overall support for the Plan. As a member of a rural community, the 2011 plan was written for townsfolk – countryfolk lived in polluting, unsustainable communities that would be allowed to die whilst concentrating investment and development in urban areas. The townsfolk did like to get out in the country now and then so no rural development thank you very much. The most perverse outcome of the 2011 Plan was what development did place on the countryside was often in totally inappropriate areas, eg flood zones or village greens. Have obviously listened to feedback from the rural community and incorporated it in the draft plan because it addresses all of these concerns and allows appropriate development whilst enhancing Bassetlaw and creating a district people will want to live in and enjoy – Well Done!</p>	Support welcome and noted.
DBLP226	Retford Civic Society	Welcome the new plan and hope that it will be progressed speedily to adoption, followed by rapid production and	Support for progression of the Local Plan is noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		adoption of a detailed plan allocating sites for development. The failure in recent years to agree a land allocation plan has been largely responsible for loss of control over where new house building takes place and this must not be repeated.	
DBLP245	Individual	Support most of the policies as long as common sense is applied in considering applications.	Support welcome and noted.
DBLP258	Broadgrove Planning and Development Ltd on behalf of MLN Land and Properties Ltd	National Planning Practice Guidance (paragraph 042) is clear that every 5 years from the date of adoption, a Local Plan must be reviewed to assess if the policies need updating in light of any changes to local circumstances and national policy. This is not currently reflected in the Plan and it is recommended that a commitment to review the Plan every 5 years should be captured within a Policy.	The commitment to review the content of the Local Plan every 5 years wil be identified in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP259	Historic England	With particular reference to site allocations, draw attention to the The Historic Environment in Local Plan - Good Practice Advice in Planning, Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment - Good Practice Advice in Planning, The Setting of Heritage Assets - Good Practice Advice in Planning and The Historic Environment and Site Allocations and Local Plans - Advice Note 3 which would be of use in developing your methodology for site assessment. Happy to discuss any methodology prior to work commencing.	Site allocations will be set out in the next version of the Local Plan. The Council will work with Historic England to ensure that the site selection process is informed appropriately by information on heritage assets.
DBLP266	Broadgrove Planning and Development Ltd on behalf of MLN Land and Properties Ltd	National Planning Practice Guidance (paragraph 042) is clear that every 5 years from the date of adoption, a Local Plan must be reviewed to assess if the policies need updating in light of any changes to local circumstances and national policy. This is not currently reflected in the Plan and it is recommended that a commitment to review the Plan every 5 years should be captured within a Policy.	The commitment to review the content of the Local Plan every 5 years wil be identified in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP267	Sustrans Bassetlaw Rangers	Welcome this stage of the draft Plan which has evidently been skilfully crafted, accounting for essential levels of residential and employment growth with associated community infrastructure, whilst promoting policies to safeguard and	Support welcome and noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		enhance the District's historical, landscape and environmental context	
DBLP281	Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England	<p>The Local Plan does not have a consistent approach to sustainable travel. It supports sustainable travel by - requiring the implementation of a transport user hierarchy (with walking and cycling the highest priority, then public transport, and other motorized transport lowest priority) in Policy 12 1.d; - making reference to travel plans elsewhere; - requiring "necessary infrastructure, including green infrastructure, which ensures development is sustainable must be delivered" at 8.18 [principles for development and growth]; -requiring good public transport access in Policies 9, 10 and 11; -requiring the prioritisation and promotion of access by walking, cycling and public transport in Policy 23 (Community Services and Facilities). Other policies do not include similar requirements without a justification for the difference. Policies 6 and 7 include requirements to meet highway standards and to provide parking on site but not even a reference to non-car access. Policy 8 only mentions highways, under 'sustainable infrastructure'. Policy 24 refers to a. physical infrastructure, including: i. transport improvements, including highways, public transport, provision for cyclists and pedestrians;" While public transport can require enhanced infrastructure, it is more important to secure funding for new or enhanced bus services and behaviour change programmes. The transport study identifies the need for changes in travel behaviour: "To help reduce traffic impacts a minimum target modal shift of 5% from car driving to sustainable modes is recommended to bring the average travel to work modal split across the district in line with the County average. To achieve this, new Local Plan development will need to deliver significantly higher modal shift away from car use and should be set appropriately higher targets. Sustainable travel infrastructure, services and</p>	<p>The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure transport infrastructure can be efficient and effective in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to transport will provide a clear approach for the consideration of transport infrastructure and sustainable travel in the future.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		initiatives will therefore need to be identified on a site-by-site basis to achieve this." (WYG Transport Study Update Jan 2019, Executive Summary). It is unclear whether Bassetlaw intend to reflect this in at a later stage, or if they do not, what the justification is for not doing so. The Plan does not include relevant policy wording, whereas road junction improvements are identified and CIL is mentioned as the funding source. There is a mismatch in clarity and commitment between highway improvements and facilitating more sustainable travel.	
DBLP288	966527	No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP298	975897	No support for any policy. Building more houses increases climate change and destroys vital countryside. The Plan will do the opposite of what you propose. The Council needs to concentrate on deprived areas, like Worksop and Harworth rather than build out of area. Rural locations need protection, not building on.	A balanced approach to future growth needs to be taken. Where possible the Council will ensure that regeneration and brownfield sites in existing towns are developed. However, it is not possible for all the Districts needs to be provided in these locations. Greenfield sites and rural areas will need to be used as well.
DBLP302	977408	No support for any policy. Living in a rural location would like to protect this as the benefits from just a health perspective we value. Our son for years suffered from asthma prior to moving here, he now does not have to use any medication and his quality of life has improved. More housing, worries us and the health impact this will have. Air pollution and the destruction of green space has a massive impact on health and well being. Moved here for the green open space to improve health and quality of life. Evidence states that an increase in housing impacts on health and wellbeing. Air pollution causes up to 36,000 early deaths per year in the UK. Public Health England states that air pollution is one of the UK's biggest killers. The Council's 2017 air pollution report states concerns about air pollution from the A1, in particular around Tuxford. Why is the Council proposing more housing in the areas next to the A1? The new villages will create an increase in traffic in the surrounding villages. The proposal will impact on residents in	The impact of new development upon the health and well-being of the community is important and will be considered through the site selection process, as well as the Sustainability Appraisal process.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		relation to an increase in rubbish, crime, traffic accidents, and air pollution.	
DBLP305	986296	No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP304	986292	No support	Comments noted.
DBLP306	986333	No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP307	986349	No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP309	986836	No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP310	986858	No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP312	987284	No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP313	987594	No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP316	987785	No support for any policy. This proposal clearly does not safeguard the transport infrastructure as it will destroy an airfield which is part of that infrastructure.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP318	987892	Support for all policies.	Support noted and welcome
DBLP320	988034	No support for any policies.	Comments noted.
DBLP321	988036	No support for the majority of the Plan.	Comments noted.
DBLP322	988044	No support for any policy.	Comments noted.
DBLP324	988050	No support for any policy. I do not support large developments in this area. There are better places where houses could be built.	Comments noted.
DBLP325	988054	No support for any policy.	Comments noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP329	988063	No support for any policy. Climate Change will not be changed by Bassetlaw council ! That is a matter for the world to face not a local councils wanting to take green land away and replace it with hardcore and housing !! Which will use more resources and won't be helping climate change !!! The land proposed is just a complete waste of naturally beauty and that of our local History !! By wanting to close such a wonderful private community and replace it with housing in my opinion isn't for the benefit of community nor that of the atmosphere as surgested above ! This whole outfit will simply benefit those such as you the council and those developing the land also ! So I strongly disagree to all the above as it's clearly a matter of community which we currently have or authority which we don't ! Leave the airport as it is and endeavour to expand your pockets else where!!	Climate change mitigation and the support for the low carbon economy forms a central part to the revised Local Plan.
DBLP330	988064	I disagree with the plans that will detrimentally impact the airport.	Comments noted.
DBLP331	988083	No support for any policies in the Plan.	Comments noted.
DBLP332	988087	No support for any policies in the Plan.	Comments noted.
DBLP334	988094	No support for any policies in the Plan.	Comments noted.
DBLP335	988095	No support for any policies in the Plan.	Comments noted.
DBLP337	988176	No support for any policy.	Comments noted.
DBLP338	988180	No support for any policy.	Comments noted.
DBLP340	988204	No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP341	988213	No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP342	988214	No support for any policy	Comments noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP345	988247	No support for any policy. use smaller areas already either disused or derelict land , the smaller the pockets used - the more the roads etc can cope - All Councils really need to learn from their own and others past mistakes - mass concrete surfaces more flooding	A balanced approach to future growth needs to be taken. Where possible the Council will ensure that regeneration and brownfield sites in existing towns are developed. However, it is not possible for all the Districts needs to be provided in these locations. Greenfield sites and rural areas will need to be used as well. The use of sustainable drainage required through new development can help areas that experience flooding.
DBLP347	988306	No support for any policy.	Comments noted.
DBLP348	988323	No support for any policy.	Comments noted.
DBLP353	988357	No support for any policy.	Comments noted.
DBLP354	988363	No support for any policy.	Comments noted.
DBLP355	988394	No support for any policy.	Comments noted.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)	Disappointed that have not provided the ability for a Yes / No vote against the 5 major housing growth areas. Say "Yes" to some and "No" to others which would not necessarily give an overall Yes or No. Have many individual comments which are attached. However, instead of repeating the words of each page, paragraph, section, policy, etc., the document simply states the page number and point or policy reference number before our comments. Therefore please read the comments with the Strategic Plan document alongside.	Comments noted.
DBLP358	988458	No support for any policy.	Comments noted.
DBLP359	988461	No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP361	988480	No support for any policy.	Comments noted.
DBLP366	988491	No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP367	988492	No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP368	988494	No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP369	988496	No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP370	988499	No support for any policy. You're killing off existing employment and infrastructure to create this. That doesn't	Comments noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		make sense. Closing Gamston Airport will frustrate transport infrastructure rather than improve it.	
DBLP371	988500	I am unsure whether I support the proposed strategy or level of housing and employment development proposed.	Comments noted.
DBLP374	988517	No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP377	988599	No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP378	988625	No support for any policy. Cause you wont build enough schools, doctors surgeries and infrastructure. In fact you'll be long gone in 2035 to see the consequences.	The Council works with infrastructure providers to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by existing infrastructure. Where this is not possible the Council will see whether use of developer contributions can help mitigate impacts identified. Until development sites are identified it is not possible to determine the infrastructure needs of future development and when the infrastructure is likely to be required. These will be identified in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP379	988630	No support for any policy with the exception of the climate change policies and built and natural environment policies.	Comments noted.
DBLP380	988631	No support for any policy. The a1 and other major roads is already extremely busy, and although there is traffic calming in place, still really dangerous. Will it be able to cope with the extra traffic?	The Council works with infrastructure providers including Highways England and the Highways Authority to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by existing infrastructure. Where this is not possible the Council will see whether use of developer contributions can help mitigate impacts identified. Until development sites are identified it is not possible to determine the infrastructure needs of future development, including impacts upon the road network and when the infrastructure is likely to be required. These will be identified in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP381	988686	No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP382	988706	No support for any policy	Comments noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP386	988747	Bassetlaw should work with local people more especially landowners who seek to promote land for development and stop listening to NIMBY's. East Markham need affordable homes for local people to be able to stay near their families. I know many people who have grown up children who cannot stay in the area as they have no chance of buying a £650,000 house and are not able to buy any more affordable homes as they are snapped up by a few local families who are buying to let all small properties. Equally older people want to stay in their village but have nowhere to but to downsize. In recent months two landowners in East Markham have tried to build such housing and been blocked by Bassetlaw's conservation officer who refused to work with either landowner to agree development. They have also said that they are willing to look at social housing but Bassetlaw have shown no interest in working with them. In contrast a number of fake threshing barns have been built and sold for £750,000 to people who have no ties to the community. A traditional working class farming village is being destroyed to be a yuppie playground with posh people making landowners lives a living hell, trespassing on their land, upsetting live stock and threatening them if the dare to apply to build on their own land.	Affordable housing is considered by Policy 3 and housing for older people by Policies 6 and 7.
DBLP388	988749	Should be more consultation with landowners who seek to promote land for development	The Council engage regularly with landowners through call for sites consultations to ensure an appropriate mix of sites are considered for development.
DBLP389	988774	No support for any policy.	Comments noted.
DBLP389	988774	The Council should be aware of discussions ongoing in Westminster which are likely to remove from NPPG guidance the classification of airfields as brown field sites.	The Council is aware of Government discussions relating to airfields. The Council uses the current national planning guidance to inform the Local Plan. Should national guidance be changed then the emerging Local Plan will be amended accordingly.
DBLP390	988777	No support for any policy	Comments noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP395	989195	No support for any policy.	Comments noted.
DBLP396	989197	No support for any policy.	Comments noted.
DBLP397	989207	No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP398	989569	No support for any policy.	Comments noted.
DBLP400	Nottinghamshire County Council	NCC support all policies in the Plan.	Support for policies welcome and noted.
DBLP400	Nottinghamshire County Council - Education	<p>WORKSOP – Primary Gateford has 0.4ha of land, NCC to increase size of school to 315. Secondary – NCC will require contributions for 45 children based on £17763 per child. S106 for application 14/00431/OUT makes provision for 1.1 ha + optional 0.4ha for £40k, which will be paid for by the consent granted under application 14/00213 – Land at Gateford Common.</p> <p>RETFORD – NCC will require two additional primary class rooms, contributions to be based on build costs.</p> <p>HARWORTH & BIRCOTES – Existing NCC strategy remains the same. 5 FE (1050 places primary) 7 FE secondary (1470 place secondary) on Serlby Park Academy site.</p> <p>GAMSTON AIRPORT AND BEVERCOTES COLLIERY (NEW VILLAGE) – NCC will require 2ha of land for each development to future proof primary place provision. Further discussions are needed to identify the appropriate solution to deliver the secondary provision that will be required, including the possibility for a new school which, if required would need an area of land to be safeguarded within the Plan.</p> <p>NCC have based the following comments on the upper cap of potential dwellings.</p> <p>CLARBOROUGH & WELHAM – NCC will require an additional primary class room, contributions to be based on build costs.</p> <p>NCC will require contributions for secondary provision – at Retford Oaks High School.</p>	The Council will continue to work with NCC Education to ensure education facilities in the District are able to accommodate students generated by new development.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>CUCKNEY/NORTON/WELLBECK/HOLBECK – no comments.</p> <p>ELKESLEY - NCC will require primary contributions – possible expansion of Elkesley or contributions to bigger provision at Gamston or Bevercotes proposals.</p> <p>MISSON – NCC will require primary (at Misson) and secondary (at ROHS) contributions.</p> <p>EAST MARKHAM – NCC will require builds costs for an additional primary classroom. There is potential for the secondary school to expand.</p> <p>HEADON CUM UPTON – There is currently primary capacity. NCC will require secondary contributions.</p> <p>SHIREOAKS – NCC will require secondary contributions (At Portland OGAT).</p> <p>TUXFORD the secondary school is circa 8 hectares and is supporting an 8 FE (1200 statutory aged (11-16) children) A site of this size could possibly support a statutory population of circa 1500 students – with associated 6th form. Currently, the published admission number of 240 places the school at near the upper limit of its net capacity. The school is an importer of students from Retford and Worksop therefore any growth in the first instance would lead to out of catchment applicants being unable to be accommodated. Tuxford – secondary.</p> <p>Consideration may need to be given to acquiring additional land to accommodate expansion at this school in the longer term.</p> <p>CARLTON IN LINDRICK – NCC will require 2 additional primary classrooms (at Langold PS), based on build costs.</p> <p>LANGOLD & HODSOCK – Primary currently has capacity. NCC will require secondary contributions for an extension to the existing school (at Portland OGAT).</p> <p>EVERTON – There is capacity for both primary and secondary school provision.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>MATTERSEY – There is capacity for both primary and secondary school provision</p> <p>TRESWELL & COTTAM – NCC will require both primary and secondary contributions.</p> <p>MISTERTON – NCC will require an additional primary classroom (at Misterton), based on build costs and secondary (at ROHS) contributions.</p> <p>BYLTH – NCC will require build costs for a new primary extension and contributions to secondary provision.</p> <p>LOUND – no contributions required.</p> <p>RAMPTON & WOODBECK – NCC will require secondary contributions.</p> <p>SCROOBY – NCC there is a current plan in place.</p> <p>WALKERINGHAM – NCC will require contributions to extend the existing primary school (possibly at Walkeringham or at Misterton) and contributions to secondary (at ROHS) provision.</p> <p>BECKINGHAM – NCC will require build costs for a primary extension (at Beckingham or Misterton) and contributions to secondary (at ROHS) provision.</p> <p>HAYTON - NCC will require build costs for a primary extension and contributions to secondary provision.</p> <p>RANSKILL – No contributions will be required.</p> <p>RHODESIA - NCC will require build costs for a primary extension and contributions to secondary (at OGAT Portland) provision.</p> <p>ASKHAM - NCC will require build costs for a primary extension and contributions to secondary provision.</p> <p>BABWORTH & RANBY - NCC will require build costs for a primary (at Ranby) extension</p> <p>BARNBY MOOR - No contributions will be required.</p> <p>BOTHAMSALL - NCC will require build costs for a primary extension and contributions to secondary provision.</p> <p>CARBURTON - No contributions will be required.</p> <p>DUNHAM ON TRENT/RAGNALL/FLEDBOROUGH/DARLTON -</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>NCC will require build costs for a primary (at Dunham on Trent) extension and contributions to secondary (at Tuxford) provision.</p> <p>EAST DRAYTON – NCC will require secondary (at Tuxford) contributions.</p> <p>GAMSTON/WEST DRAYTON/EATON - NCC will require build costs for a primary (to Gamston village project) extension and contributions to secondary (at Tuxford) provision.</p> <p>GRINGLEY ON THE HILL - NCC will require build costs for a primary (at Gringley) extension and contributions to secondary (at RODS) provision.</p> <p>LANEHAM - NCC will require build costs for a primary extension and contributions to secondary provision.</p> <p>MARKHAM - NCC will require build costs for a primary (in Tuxford planning area) extension and contributions to secondary (at Tuxford) provision.</p> <p>NETHER LANGWITH - NCC will require build costs for a primary extension.</p> <p>NORMANTON ON TRENT – NCC will require secondary contributions.</p> <p>STYRRUP & OLDCOTES - NCC will require build costs for a primary extension and contributions to secondary provision.</p> <p>TORWORTH – No contributions will be required.</p> <p>WISETON - No contributions will be required</p>	
DBLP400	Nottinghamshire County Council - HIA	<p>The Plan sets out a positive vision in line with the Nottinghamshire Health & Wellbeing Strategy ambition for healthy and sustainable communities. Planners should always consider the protection and improvement of health, and the reduction of health inequalities, as fundamental principles when making planning decisions. It is recommended the Strategic Plan makes a clear reference to the Nottinghamshire Joint Strategic Needs Assessment and 2018 Bassetlaw District Health profile. There are recommendations in relation 10 HIA</p>	<p>Health and wellbeing is an important element of the Local Plan. References to the Health and Wellbeing Strategy, Joint Strategic Needs Assessment and Health Profile will be added to the Local Plan. The recommendations of the HIA will be reflected in the next version of the Local Plan to provide better consistency with the HIA.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>domains.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Housing quality and design: An updated reference to 2018 Bassetlaw Health Profile is required. 2. Access to healthcare services and other social infrastructure: Encourage housing developers to sign up to the BRE Home Quality Mark (HQM) 3. Air quality, noise and neighbourhood amenity: Consider the principles for natural and sustainable environments to include a policy on air quality aligned with the Nottinghamshire Air Quality Strategy which is being refreshed for publication. 4. Accessibility and active transport: Consider the principles of Active Design 2; 5. Crime reduction and community safety: Recommendations re lighting and walk way design - to enhance connectivity with safe and efficient infrastructure: enhancing street connectivity via provision of walking and cycling infrastructure and improving access to public transportation 6. Access to healthy food: This could do with strengthening to reflect The TCPA six Healthy Weight Environment elements and the Food Environment Priority within the Nottinghamshire Health & Wellbeing Strategy 2018-2022. 7. Access to work and training: Consider, as part of this policy, prioritising the creation of supported employment opportunities for people with mental illness and/or learning disabilities, and that priority be given to care leavers as part of Nottinghamshire's role as a corporate parent for this group. 8. Social cohesion and lifetime neighbourhoods: Consider, as part of this policy, prioritising the creation of supported employment opportunities for people with mental illness and/or learning disabilities, and that priority be given to care leavers as part of Nottinghamshire's role as a corporate parent for this group. 9. Climate change: The Council could encourage housing developers to sign up to the BRE Home Quality Mark (HQM) which is a voluntary sustainability standard for new homes 10. Health inequalities: This section could do with strengthening with clearer referencing to health inequalities 	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		for example Section 2 Bassetlaw in Context: Geography. The completed Rapid HIA tool attached as a table.	
DBLP400	Nottinghamshire County Council - Minerals and Waste	The County Council is the Minerals Authority, Bassetlaw as a district council also play a key role in safeguarding minerals. Minerals are a finite resource and can only be worked where they are found - safeguarding minerals is important to ensure a steady and adequate supply to meet future demand. As per NPPF paragraph 203 (2018), the NCC safeguards these minerals by defining a Minerals Safeguarding and Consultation Area (MSA/MCA). To further ensure the safeguarding of minerals, the local district councils should consider the MSA/MCA and the potential affects allocations made in their local plan may have on the Local Minerals Plan. The MSA/MCA should also be shown on the districts Local Plan policies map (PPG paragraph 5, 2014).	The Council will ensure that the MSA/MCA are considered as part of the site selection process for the site allocations. The MSA/MCA will be shown on the draft Policies Map.
DBLP400	Nottinghamshire County Council - Highways	There are no specific transport policies or guidance re transport assessment requirements which are strongly recommended.	The next version of the Local Plan will include policies relating to transport infrastructure and sustainable travel.
DBLP406	990063	No support for any policy.	Comments noted.
DBLP407	990068	No support for any policy.	Comments noted.
DBLP408	990070	No support for any policy. We seem to have extra surplus housings currently. Why put strain on a system struggling to cope now. I see no positives to the plan , only negatives.	Comments noted.
DBLP409	990071	Do not support any policy apart from safeguarding infrastructure.	Comments noted.
DBLP412	990081	No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP413	990083	No support for any policy.	Comments noted.
DBLP414	990128	No support for any policy.	Comments noted.
DBLP417	990255	No support for any policy. I cannot support any plan that closes an important airfield. As a private pilot i see airfields being	Comments noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		closed in many areas. They should be reclassified as green field sites. They are becoming an ever more important facility which once lost cannot be replaced.	
DBLP497	990938	NHS - the nhs is widely struggling with cuts, low/no staff, departments being shut, Worksop no longer have a children's ward meaning having to drive to Doncaster taking up to an hour putting the lives of children at risk so show me where the money's coming from and where the staff are coming from to put in a building and call it a "doctors surgery" Education - only yesterday on the 8/4/19, good morning Britain had a councillor on regarding school cuts, to which schools up and down the country cannot even afford stationary for the children or even loo rolls, plus again they're short staffed. Eaton bridge, every summer we have at least 100 kids down playing in the river, running across the bridge to jump in the water, the speed of which cars go through the village and then with the added influx of cars coming from your "bassetlawplan", one day a child is going to get killed when playing with their friends! We have enough cars already to which nothing is being done about it. We have asked for speed cameras, speed awareness signs to which yes one was put up but lasted less than a month before some unknown reason it was taken down. The airfield - it is a busy airfield, why take people's jobs away from them to put housing for people, where there is no jobs for them to afford these houses?! Car parking - as noted previously, there are no car parks at the train station, or the Worksop side of Retford, the area is gridlocked every day between 8-10 and 4-6/7.	The Council works with infrastructure providers to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by existing infrastructure. Where this is not possible the Council will see whether use of developer contributions can help mitigate impacts identified. Until development sites are identified it is not possible to determine the infrastructure needs of future development and when the infrastructure is likely to be required. These will be identified in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP508	990955	One assumes that any objections are pointless at this stage, while the plan answers many questions and fixes symptoms of a problem, it does not solve the problem and causes many more problems than it resolves. It is a demonstration of bassetlaw council looking for easy options rather than	Comments noted.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		attempting to provide more complicated to achieve solutions for the improvement of bassetlaw residents and business.	
DBLP521	991176	The only people to profit from these proposals would be the builders.	Comments noted.
Consultation			
DBLP31	BDC Councillor	Whilst thanking BDC for including Gamston in the consultation at the Gamston School this was far too late. Running the evening on the 6th March, when the close is the 9th March does not allow anyone sufficient time to prepare an efficient response, and they are the most effected by the New Town proposals other than Bothamsall who 4 miles away did not have a mobile consultation opportunity. The consultation in general was not adequately publicised, and a longer consultation would have been appreciated. What was the rush?	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP33	Individual	More avenues should be explored for letting people know about the plans for Retford. Most of my neighbours do not have access to the Internet so didn't know that the event was taking place, nor do they purchase the Retford Times.	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP132	Individual	The consultation period for this whole process seems to have been extremely short - is this deliberate? Obviously with such a small number of houses in Gamston petitioning would be of little influence, a fact which I am sure the District Council will no doubt use to defend their decisions! It is NOT a lack of opposition, it is simply not a heavily populated area - something its inhabitants wish it to remain!!!	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP146	Individual	You have commissioned 2,489 pages of information, to ensure due diligence over every and any point, but many of the residents of Gamston had known nothing about it until a few days previously. Three years of study and work, tens of thousands of pounds spent yet the people who would be impacted heavily by one of the suggestions knew nothing. Its virtually unreadable by the layman. It is on the Bassetlaw website but how were people supposed to know about it unless they are devotees of Local Government or ardent social media followers? Your actions have disenfranchised many the chance to read and comment on everything before the cut off date. There is a feeling it is a done deal.	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP206	Individual	A 5-day consultation time was woefully inadequate; it would leave us to suspect that you are not interested in our concerns or feedback! After Speaking to several neighbours in Gamston, not everyone had been notified of the plans for the airport or the meeting on the 5th, can you please tell me how many residents of Gamston and Elkesley were actually notified of the plans and the meeting held at Gamston School on 05/03/2019?	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP230	Individual	The inclusion of Gamston in the consultation at the Gamston School on the evening of Tuesday 5th March, just 5 days before this consultation was to Close was far too late and did not allow anyone sufficient time to put together a comprehensive reply. The consultation in general was not adequately publicised, and a longer consultation would have been appreciated.	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP232	Elkesley Parish Council	Does not support this plan in its current form and are unanimous in their opinion that the consultation has been woefully inadequate. The Parish Council were given less than three days' notice of the consultation event in the village,	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>hence the vast majority of villagers were unaware it was taking place. The expectation by BDC staff was that the Parish Council would advertise it on their behalf and at such short notice only people who follow Facebook or our web site would have been informed, this amounts to less than 10% of the local population. The number of comments received will be significantly lower than normal and not a true representation of villagers' and can't be classed as full consultation with the local population. The cost cutting exercise in consultation that has taken place needs to be redone, in a manner that targets all of BDC electorate and not just the few who participate in social media or the internet.</p>	<p>in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.</p>
DBLP233	Individual	<p>The way the consultations were carried out was incredibly unfair, Gamston wasn't even mentioned in places to view the plan and they would be the most effected, and had the shortest period of time in which to object.</p>	<p>The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.</p>
DBLP246	Individual	<p>The Council should have been 'braver' in its approach to consultation. Considering the 2 proposed Garden Villages will be within 2.2km it would have been appropriate to begin the consultation in the village. The late arrival of our consultation event and the early close date for comments coupled with the lack of response (from council employees) to basic questions during the consultation - the plan and the approach is heavily flawed. Would like to have had more than 3 days to pull together my response, but unfortunately this was not possible. Was the consultation at Gamston 'over looked' or purposefully left until the final few days so our communities feedback would be limited?? Maybe it was hoped no one would attend and 'Garden Village' plans could be pushed through without</p>	<p>The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>interruption? Why when the introduction of the plan states the public consultation will begin in LATE 2019 was it pushed forward to January? What was the rush? Why were the officers unable to answer specific questions relating to the plan? Especially as I was informed after the event at least one of them was integral to the construction of the plan? Why did they deny there had been other potential locations looked at for garden villages? Why is the Plan reactive instead of proactive? Was told this was addressing issues 'for today' and didn't seek to plan for the future!</p>	
DBLP250	Gamston with West Drayton and Eaton Parish Council	<p>Very concerned that the consultation process resulted in the villages that will be greatly affected by the plans, were those last to be included in the opportunity to view the plans in detail and present their concerns to council representatives. The consultation has relied on the Parish councillors organising appropriate forums for discussion and this has been done in a very limited time span. A further concern is the lack of engagement with residents who would be affected by this development due to a range of issues that include age and access to literature and the limited forums.</p>	<p>The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.</p>
DBLP257	Individual	<p>This development will have a massive impact on the local residents and there has been little publicity regarding the proposed developments on our doorstep. The first public consultation came before anything had been mentioned in local publications and even then the implications for the villages were not highlighted to the residents. Gamston does not have a Neighbourhood Plan and was not aware that we needed and could have developed one. The process has not been inclusive as not everyone has access to the Internet and the information at the consultations has been limited (not all documents were available for viewing) and verbally contradictory. A last minute consultation was provided at Gamston school with leaflets advertising it delivered only two</p>	<p>The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		days before, so not everyone would be able to attend and those who did, only had a few days to digest the information and comment on before the closing date. The Bassetlaw Plan and associated documents available online are very long-winded, repetitive and difficult to read! Believe that if these garden villages are to go ahead, it is because the rural settlements surrounding them are so small and there are fewer people to object, than if they were to be built closer to an existing town.	
DBLP261	On behalf of All Saints Parochial Church Council, Eaton and Gamston	The inclusion of Gamston in the consultation on the evening of Tuesday 5th March, just 5 days before this consultation was to Close was far too late and did not allow anyone sufficient time to put together a comprehensive reply. The consultation was not adequately publicised, and a longer consultation would have been appreciated.	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP263	Individual	The consultation process was not sufficiently robust or inclusive. The planned consultation events were mainly advertised online on the council's website and via social media. The demographics of Eaton and Gamston show that a significant proportion of residents are elderly and most do not have access to a PC. A significant proportion of Eaton residents also have English as a second language, but documents have not been translated. Disappointed that the consultation event at Gamston School was only added in the planned events towards the end of the process, meaning that those most affected by the plans have only had the time from the evening of the 5th March to the submission deadline on the 10th to formulate their response.	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP264	Individual	Object to draft plan for the development of the Gamston airfield site for housing. Grateful for the opportunity to discuss proposals with the planning officers in detail at the consultation event at Gamston School. Questions either weren't fully answered or were met with a defensive attitude. Giving 10th March as the closing date for objections when the event was Tuesday 5th March does not allow sufficient time to give a detailed and considered response.	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP265	Individual	While a consultation meeting was finally added 5 days before the closing date of this stage of the consultation, for the people of the Gamston, West Drayton and Eaton Parish it has not given those who live nearest to one of the potential development sites sufficient time to comment on it and therefore not given a true consultation to the local residents especially those with no electronic method of communicating.	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP268	Individual	There has been a lack of timely consultation with those most likely to be affected by this proposal. As a resident of Gamston, found out about these proposals from a friend in Retford. It was several weeks after this that any information was received by Gamston residents. No meeting was originally planned in Gamston. The meeting that was subsequently arranged, at the request of the Parish Council, took place on Tuesday 5th March, giving residents less than a week to respond to the plan before consultation ends. The attitude of some of the officers attending the event was disappointing. The event was publicised to be held from 5-8pm, yet at 7.40pm officers had begun to tidy away. Some residents were spoken to in a rude manner.	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP275	Individual	The residents of Gamston were not informed properly and that the consultation meeting that took place on 5th March did not give the residents sufficient time to respond.	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP276	Individual	Disappointed that a Consultation wasn't planned for the village of Gamston until the very last minute despite those residents being the most affected by these plans.	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP279	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	I alongside my employees at Radiola located at the airport in question, have not been contacted, neither have any other airport business employees. There has been no official representation of anything at the airport site in relation to this plan. A lot of secrecy has surrounded the plan. Untrue statements have been made by representatives of the airport management in support of the Garden village plan. Wonder how deep the concern is about the "economic value in serving business, leisure, training and emergency service needs, and the Government's General Aviation Strategy." or the need for a national network of GA fields.	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP284	Doncaster Council	<p>The Council was not informed about the Local Plan consultation in line with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) England Regulations 2012. It is imperative that we are consulted as part of the Localism Act 2011 (through the inclusion of Section 33A into the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) for Duty to Cooperate purposes. It is also necessary that Tickhill Town Council and Bawtry Town Council are additionally consulted. Please ensure that we are all included on your Local Plan consultation database.</p>	<p>The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.</p>
DBLP405	990062	<p>The advertising of the consultation events has been very poor, little notice was given to Parishes and an expectation assumed that they would advertise it within their areas. Whilst the cost of letter dropping Bassetlaw may be prohibitive it would not have cost much to produce large posters to be displayed in shops and bus stops. The questions on this form are very guided - eg Do you support the proposed policies that seek to address climate change? No I dont support the BDC policies but I do support the principle of addressing climate change. It would have helped if the questions had identified the relevant sections of the Plan (different terminology is used in the questions as against the plan)</p>	<p>The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.</p>
DBLP444	990802	<p>Ensure that further consultation events involve local people who are likely to be affected immediately – A Gamston session was requested by the local Parish Council and only took place 5 days before the end of the consultation period. As a local Parish Councillor I witnessed a large number of local people at our meeting on 7 March and they were rather disgruntled with the lack of information about these developments.</p>	<p>The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP446	990814	This consultation has been very poorly advertised. It came to Headon Village Hall and nobody in the village knew anything about it, so the chance to explain the plan to residents was largely missed.	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP450	990836	This consultation form appears to have been either written by someone who has absolutely no knowledge and experience of creating a neutral and unbiased questionnaire, or someone who has lots but has a predetermined picture of the results they want to receive...incredibly disappointed in the way that BDC has approached this entire situation.	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP457	990847	The consultation event only being arranged at Gamston School as a last minute after thought just 5 days before consultation submissions were due is inexcusable. At the consultation event reference was made to a feasibility study of the 6 possible sites for the garden villages, which is published but no reference made to in the draft plan and no opportunity for consultation	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP479	990910	The inclusion of Gamston in the consultation at the Gamston School on the evening of Tuesday 5th March, just 5 days before this consultation was to Close was far too late and did not allow anyone sufficient time to put together a comprehensive reply. The consultation in general was not adequately	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		publicised, and a longer consultation would have been appreciated.	through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP518	991172	It gave very little notice at the beginning of the consultation so much so that large swathes of the local residents did not know about it.	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP522	991178	There was very little publicity ! the acoustics in the town hall were poor at best then the following roadshows appeared to have very little regard for the villages that were affected most by the plan . Elkesley was the first meeting , where hardly anybody knew about and then right at the end there was a meeting at Gamston School which you could argue is the most affected parish and the residents of Gamston ,Eaton and west Drayton were only left with 3 days in which to submit their comments .	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP531	991221	Consultation has been poorly delivered, especially for people near the proposed new villages. Elkesley where given little notice of their event with it taking place so early. on the other hand Bothamsall had no event and Gamston only had it's event put on at last minute on 5th March with 95 attendies, which I believe was higher than any other advertised event in the short consultation period. This left only 5 days to put comments in	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP532	Individual	<p>As a resident of Gamston Village I feel Bassetlaw Council should have been 'braver' in its approach to consultation of the Bassetlaw Plan. Considering the 2 proposed Garden Villages will both be within 2.2km of us it would have been appropriate to begin the consultation process within our village. I feel the whole plan and the approach Bassetlaw has taken to it is heavily flawed. I would like to have had more than 1 day to pull together my response to the Garden Village proposals, but unfortunately due to the inadequately thought through consultation process and work commitments this was not possible. Was the consultation at Gamston 'over looked' or purposefully left until the final few days so our communities feedback would be limited?? I was unaware of the consultation events and working away when the date was added to Gamston – this left inadequate time to respond fully. Maybe it was hoped no one would attend and 'Garden Village' plans could be pushed through without interruption? Why when the introduction of the plan states the public consultation will begin in LATE 2019 was it pushed forward to January? What was the rush?</p>	<p>The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.</p>
DBLP539	991241	<p>Insufficient time was given to the residents of Gamston to feedback after the meeting on Wednesday.</p>	<p>The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.</p>
Sustainability Appraisal			

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP136	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	<p>It is necessary for the SA to appraise reasonable alternatives for the Local Plan to properly understand the implications of the Council's proposed housing requirement. Do not consider that such an assessment has been adequately undertaken.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.41 of the SA notes that it has taken into account the SMOAN, updated ONS household projections and an updated evidence base, including a draft EDNA. It considers the following development options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1: Government's standardised OAN figure – 306 dpa • Option 2: SHMA-based OAN – 374 dpa • Option 3: Overall housing requirement to support economic growth based on the Oxford Economics midpoint scenario (EDNA-based) – 390 dpa • Option 4: EDNA-based higher requirement to support economic growth based on the Experian midpoint scenario – 493 dpa <p>Para 4.42 of the SA notes the revised set of four housing target options has been appraised. Note that the Interim SA report comments how the options would contribute to HMA-wide OAN and city region employment ambitions. Para 4.42 stresses that these have not been considered because it was considered that up to date figures for wider needs were not available at the time of assessment and the Council no longer considers the Sheffield City Region Strategic Economic Plan figure (636 dpa) to be a reasonable alternative, based on the updated evidence available. This is an inadequate assessment of alternative options - It is vital for the SA to consider the sustainability implications for the delivery of an ambition Local Plan, including a scenario where the employment land it has permitted comes forward (with the housing growth to support it) and at least consider a level of growth that supports the City Region for which it forms part of the LEP. It is not clear why an increased figure of 636dpa has no longer been considered as a reasonable alternative. The assessment provides an oversimplified and misleading representation of the</p>	<p>Disagree. The Council is satisfied that the Sustainability Appraisal is robust and covers all reasonable alternatives.</p> <p>Housing and Economic Needs Assessment Planning Practice Guidance (Paragraph: 002 Reference ID: 2a-002-20190220) indicates that the standard method should be followed when assessing housing need. The Standard Method sets out a formula to assess the minimum housing requirement for each local authority area. It then goes on to consider when it may be appropriate to plan for a higher housing need figure than the standard method calculation using the formula. There are a number of circumstances where it may be appropriate to increase the housing requirement figure. This may be where an LPA is seeking to deliver economic growth or where unmet need from neighbouring authorities has been agreed in a statement of common ground.</p> <p>The housing requirement for Bassetlaw using the Standard Method equates to 306 dwellings per annum. The Bassetlaw EDNA includes an assessment of housing need based on the need to deliver enough development to support economic growth. This uses the 306 dpa as a starting point. The EDNA concludes that, to support economic growth, 390 dwellings per annum are required to be delivered.</p> <p>Bassetlaw is not in the same housing market area as Sheffield and it does not adjoin Sheffield's boundary. The Council's have not entered into an agreement regarding the delivery of Sheffield's development needs.</p> <p>The Council is seeking to deliver a significant amount of housing over and above the housing requirement, sufficient to meet the district's needs beyond 2037.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>development options available. The benefits of the options in terms of their housing contribution have been capped once they have exceeded the minimum expectation of the SMOAN. This is not an acceptable assessment of sustainability where planning guidance notes that sustainability of the plan can be enhanced through the provision of additional supply of housing; the Council has sought to boost the supply of housing above the minimum requirements of the SMOAN to increase the sustainability of the Local Plan.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP143	Persimmon Homes & Charles Church	<p>Strategic policies should provide a clear strategy to bring sufficient land forward at a sufficient rate to address housing needs over the plan period by planning for and allocating sufficient sites to deliver strategic priorities. Table 6 states 3949 homes from the OAN target 6630 homes have planning permission or are allocated in Neighbourhood Plans. Based on the proposed OAN figure 6630, only 2681 homes remain to be allocated through the site allocation process. The SA sets out the methodology looking at the likely social, environmental and economic effects of proposed Local Plan policies and proposals to maximise sustainable development. The assessment suggests that significant growth in rural settlements and a lower growth for Worksop and Retford will reduce large scale development on Greenfield sites. The reality is rural settlement growth is as likely to use Greenfield land as urban extensions. An important question is whether the sustainable outcome from adopting a differentiated rural growth pattern is greater than pursuing large scale urban extensions. Don't consider the SA provides sufficient evidence to suggest why a higher apportionment of rural development is sustainable. Bassetlaw is served by three towns; the Largest Worksop (41,000 population); Retford (22,000 population) and Harworth (7800 population). The remainder of the District is served by circa 40 or so rural villages & hamlets. The draft Local Plan apportions: Worksop (24%) 1600 homes; Retford (13%) 853 homes; Harworth (21%) 1400 homes; New villages (15%) 1000 homes; Rural settlements (27%) 1777 homes. The rationale in the SA behind the spatial distribution of housing numbers is questionable. Table 4.2 scores the 5 available spatial approaches against 14 sustainable objectives and provides a brief overview stating whether an approach is considered to provide a positive or negative impact. Unfortunately the level of detail provided to justify positive or negative outcomes lacks</p>	<p>Disagree. The SA finds that this option will reduce the intensity of effects in one location, thereby minimising the effects on the landscape. As identified by the SA, the distribution of development will likely provide a positive effect in relation to cultural heritage, landscape and land use as development is likely to be fairly small-scale, thereby minimising the intensity of any effects on the landscape, and any cultural assets, as well as the amount of greenfield land which is to be developed in any one location. It is essential that both urban and rural bassetlaw remain sustainable by supporting services and businesses in all areas of the district. It should be acknowledged that there are some large businesses/organisations in the rural areas (e.g. Rampton Hospital which employs approximately 2000 people). There is a need to maintain a workforce to sustain economic growth both in the urban and rural areas of Bassetlaw.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		the necessary detail to allow a full appreciation of the Council's rationale. Without this detail unable to determine whether the scoring in Table 4.2 is accurate, by extension whether a hybrid or parallel strategy is justified.	
DBLP186	Natural England	Note the Sustainability Appraisal follows an appropriate methodology. Note the significant positive effects on biodiversity from strategic objectives 5 to 10.	Thank you for your comments.
DBLP221	Gladman Developments	Should ensure that the results of the SA process conducted through the review clearly justify any policy choices that are ultimately made, including the proposed site allocations (or any decision not to allocate sites) when considered against 'all reasonable alternatives'. In meeting the development needs of the area, it should be clear from the results of the assessment why some policy options have been progressed and others have been rejected. Undertaking a comparative and equal assessment of each reasonable alternative, the Council's decision making, and scoring should be robust, justified and transparent.	Agree. Thank you for your comments

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
DBLP223	Stone Planning Services on behalf of the Charterpoint Group	Paragraph 4.5 is very much focussed on planned growth commensurate to settlement size with a growth cap of 20%. References are made to 'new homes' with no reference to employment.	Whilst paragraph 4.5 does not mention employment, it has been assessed - see the assessment of option 7 in table 4.1 on page 49.
Evidence Base			
DBLP186	Natural England	Welcomes the Habitat Regulations Assessment Screening Report. Agree with the conclusion of no Likely Significant Effect on Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC, Hatfield Moor SAC, Thorne Moor SAC and Thorne and Hatfield Moors SPA. Pleased to note that the screening report follows Natural England's prescribed precautionary approach for the Sherwood Forest possible potential Special Protection Area (ppSPA). The report shows that the two proposed Garden Villages (Bevercotes and Gamston) fall within the 5km buffer area for the Important Bird Area (IBA) as identified by the RSPB. Based on the location of the garden villages the report concludes that Likely Significant Effects on the Sherwood ppSPA cannot be ruled out and that further environmental assessment (appropriate assessment) will be undertaken in the second round of consultation on the Bassetlaw Local Plan. Happy to advice further.	An Appropriate Assessment will be undertaken to inform the next version of the Local Plan. The Council will engage Natural England to ensure that the approach taken is appropriate.
DBLP191	National Trust	Concerned that the EDNA Appendix 1 Bassetlaw Site Assessments includes a large area of land off the A57 with a recommendation that some of the site should be identified for employment use (site 13. Land off A57, 188.5ha). This is a large area of greenfield land that maintains open countryside between Worksop and the A1. The gradual sprawl of land uses with an industrial character to the south and east of Worksop already has a significant impact on the character of the area. The land is located in Natural England - National Character Area 49: Sherwood. The area profile summary includes the following description: "The oak and birch wood pasture in the heartland of Sherwood Forest and more recent pine plantations,	The National Trust's comments will be used to inform the approach to site selection for employment use.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>contribute strongly to the sense of place. Large estate parklands, heathland, open arable land and a strong mining heritage also characterise the area.” The Statement of Environmental Opportunity for Sherwood includes: SEO1: Protect, enhance and promote Sherwood as a landscape of international environmental and cultural significance by securing and expanding the iconic mosaic of woods, heaths and parklands, and enhancing sustainable recreation and cultural opportunities. The document also refers to recent changes and trends including: ‘marked dispersed development between Ollerton, East Retford and Worksop’. Further development along the A57 corridor will contribute to the cumulative erosion of the Sherwood character area. Any proposed site allocation in this area should, as a minimum, secure protection in perpetuity of the band of woodland in the south of the site which is identified as a Local Wildlife Site.</p>	
DBLP270	Individual	<p>Object to the equal weighting of Primary Schools to GP Surgery, Convenience Retail and Post Office services. There is no evidence to show that primary school provision in Bassetlaw has been volatile historically, or that it is likely to be so in the future. Section 4 states that the differentiation between rural settlements where growth is/isn’t supported, is based on settlement size/impact of development as opposed to on service provision and accordingly, fig 2 identifies 30 rural settlements where growth would not be supported. The subsequent list (fig 3) identifies 73 rural settlements where growth would be supported. Of these, less than 30 villages can offer primary school provision meaning that for in excess of 40 villages, travel to another settlement will be necessary. To rank villages without primary school provision as equal in development capability/sustainability terms to those who have, does not take into account the traffic congestion that occurs when children are driven to school. This consultation</p>	<p>The Rural Settlement Study has been reviewed which has informed the revised spatial strategy, growth distribution and Local Plan.</p>

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>document may quote maximum acceptable journey times to school but it does not take into account the impact in health or infrastructure terms, upon the “receiving” settlement. NPPF PARA 84: Planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads and exploits any opportunities to make a location more sustainable (for example by improving the scope for access on foot, by cycling or by public transport). The use of previously developed land, and sites that are physically well-related to existing settlements, should be encouraged where suitable opportunities exist. NPPF PARA 78: To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby. The 40+ rural villages identified to receive 20% growth in Bassetlaw and which do NOT retain a primary school, will not therefore, be supporting the primary school service in their village (NPPF para 78). They will be provoking an unacceptable impact on local roads (NPPF para 84) in the villages where primary school provision is already in situ. The draft LP identifies that traffic accidents in Bassetlaw are above the national average and for many villagers with small children, walking/cycling/public transport to Another settlement for school, will not be an option. The fall-back position, as ever, will be the car. The Rural Settlement Study fails to reference</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		Everton with a convenience store. The Yurt sells milk, eggs, butter bread and other store cupboard items	
DBLP270	Individual	In not differentiating between rural settlements with/without primary school provision, the LPA is ignoring sustainability policies (climate change, healthy infrastructure, road safety) in the draft Plan and in the NPPF. The Appendix 6 capped growth figure of 20% is too high for villages without a primary school and should be reduced to the 10% requirement. The cumulative reduction arising from this % cut, should be shared equally between villages that DO retain a primary school. The 2019 consultation document puts forward that the review of the Functional Cluster model was instigated by 2016 consultation comments that: a. Costhorpe, Grove, Mattersey Thorpe and Misson had not been identified within a cluster b. Other clusters were not representative of reality c. Clusters might “merge” and lose distinctiveness All the above elements are easily resolved either through – identifying a relevant cluster; identifying that a cluster is not necessary for that particular settlement; verifying that settlement “merge” will be prohibited by policies etc etc.....The more likely reason for the change in spatial strategy away from Rural Service Centres and their linked “functional cluster” is the reflection of Neighbourhood Planning experiences found on page 4. Whilst some Neighbourhood plan groups may have: “sought to plan	The Rural Settlement Study has been reviewed which has informed the revised spatial strategy, growth distribution and Local Plan.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>positively to respond to identified housing need in their respective areas"and been frustrated by their inability to do so because they were not a Rural Service Centre or part of a functional cluster; this has not been the case with the Everton Neighbourhood Plan. In fact, during Examination, the Examiner downgraded the level of development achievable via allocations from the purported 49 units to a mere 16.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Planning in Bassetlaw has been used as a development "blocking" tool. Evidence from the Everton Neighbourhood Plan Hearing shows that the Examiner agreed with our assessment. The Steering Group, in conjunction with the LPA, were overstating the number of units that would come forward from compromised sites and placing a block on other sites coming forward thereafter (via highly dubious site assessments). Following 11 made Neighbourhood Plans (NP) in the District, Everton NP is the first to have been granted a Hearing. It has taken three years of consultation responses, challenges, complaints against the NP Steering Group Chair, complaints against the Parish Council, complaints against the Neighbourhood Planner, letters to the Council Solicitor and the sufferance of a smear campaign. Based on our experience, it is entirely likely that some or all of the 11 Neighbourhood Plans in the District will have overstated the development potential of their allocated sites. Far from being concerned that villages were frustrated by their inability to deliver growth (pg4), prior to the Everton NP Hearing, Neighbourhood Planners will have realised the ease with which growth could be limited through the NP process. Thus meaning that growth could be "awarded" to a higher number of (previously unsuitable) settlements lacking in services. The LPA's reasoning for eradicating Rural Service Centres and awarding equal growth to 73 rural settlements across the district is not believed. At 12.1 (pg87) reminded that the Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan 2016 put forward</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Reference No	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
		<p>the possibility of developing a garden village. At the time, my consultation response stated that this was not necessary as there was enough land availability amongst existing villages to satisfy growth requirements. Others have put forward this view and it has been ignored DESPITE the LAA confirming more than adequate availability of land adjacent to settlement boundaries in the district. Pg 87 describes the options appraisal work undertaken to identify sites for garden village delivery. No cost benefit analysis is provided in terms of allocating those sites, adjacent to the A1, as employment sites. No cost benefit analysis is provided in terms of utilising the 2017 LAA finding to deliver the housing required amongst existing settlements. The LPA are satisfied that they have had viable sites put forward and they have been confident that they could limit growth in rural settlements via the NP process. At 8.19 the 2019 draft LP is proposing 1777 units across 73 settlements 2018-2035 representing an average of 24 units per settlement over 18 years (1.35 houses per annum). If this was doubled to 2.7 units per annum over the 18 year period, it is still pitiful (average) growth for Rural Service Centres. The Garden Village Proposal should be dropped and the growth identified through that mechanism, awarded to existing rural settlements.</p>	

The Bassetlaw Local Plan– Statement of Consultation

Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020 (January Consultation)

The following table includes the representations received during the consultation and the responses provided by the Council to address them. Where necessary, the Council's response identifies the changes which would be made for the following iteration of the Plan as a result of the submitted representations.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
1190067	Resident	Principles are well meant but limiting. New housing will go in places accessible by sustainable and public transport with a promise to protect important green spaces. This is at odds with ST21 site HS7 proposal to relocate Leafield and Denman allotments	The Council is now proposing to remove Site HS7 Leafield Allotments from the site allocations. It will remain as an allotment site.
REF010	Resident	The problem (puzzle might be a better word) is that predicting population and economic growth is incredibly difficult. My worry is that Bassetlaw is over optimistic and that has led to projections for way too much housing development and, crucially, allowing housing to be developed without first putting in place adequate infrastructure to support it. Now really important for housing development to begin in places with no or little impact on other residents. In Retford, many people have been affected by unsympathetic building sites. More sympathetic North Road site in Retford is very important. That site should be developed before any further demands are placed on the town or villages. All Retford needs is the excellent Garden Villages, which could be wonderful, and the North Road development. Have an interest in villages and some will want to expand considerably. See my comments about the small village of Lound, where your consultation reads like a set of demands at a time when local people have very recently undertaken 4 years of work to write a Neighbourhood Plan. The real danger is that imposed, rigid targets for housing development without prior visible changes in transport, shops or appreciation of local residents' work to help planning through existing Village Neighborhood Plans will lead residents to become very cynical about local government.	The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment has been updated which demonstrates the justification for the housing and employment targets and the balance between the two. Policy ST1 has been updated to reflect comments received from the previous consultation in January. This has led to a change to the proposed percentage requirement and to the list of eligible Small Rural Settlements. The updated Rural Settlement Paper provides a narrative to the evolution of the strategy for rural Bassetlaw since 2016 and how the percentage requirements were derived and changed overtime.
REF023	Water Management Consortium	The Board is primarily concerned with the rate of flow and volume of water to our network of maintained watercourses; supports the preference for sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) and recommends that SUDS are incorporated into all developments where feasible. SUDS should be designed to mimic the pre development 'greenfield' surface water regime and must be agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority. Recommend including in this section that drainage design needs to take into account climate change by allowing for an expected increase in the volume of rainfall, when assessing the storage and conveyance requirements for potential development sites. Bassetlaw is served by two Internal Drainage Boards. Below is information regarding Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board and Isle of Axholme & North Nottinghamshire Water Level Management Board's operations and responsibilities which may be useful to include as an overview of the Boards' activities.	The Council will ensure that the evidence is updated accordingly.
REF029	Torworth Parish Council	Within the Spatial Strategy Document (Jan 2020) Torworth has been incorrectly identified as having a Village Hall – which therefore determines it as being classed as a small rural settlement. Don't have one, or any of the other facilities that would class it as being a small rural settlement. How can this be corrected ?	The Spatial Strategy Background Paper will be updated accordingly.
REF089	NEDDC	Offer support, in principle, for Bassetlaw's strategy to deliver sustainable development and accommodate all its development needs within its own boundaries. Require further clarification in relation to the Draft Plan's housing and employment land targets, before could recommend that this Council signs up to any cross-boundary agreement on these matters.	The Council has followed national Planning Practice Guidance: Housing and economic development needs assessment in determining the requirement for Bassetlaw. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment has been updated which demonstrates the justification for the housing and employment targets and the balance between the two.
REF132	CODA Planning	Planning permission for development have been subsequently built out or are under construction; • emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan residential, employment and mixed-use allocations which are considered physically related to the settlement; and • areas of land which are physically related to the settlement, are defined by a strong physical boundary, and are capable of being developed without compromising: i. residential amenity of neighbouring properties; ii. the setting of a Listed Building or Conservation Area; iii. the natural beauty of an AONB; iv. an internationally designated wildlife site; v. flood risk (i.e. is not within Flood Zones 2 or 3); or vi. protected Public Open Space.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
REF136	A and D Architecture	2) Policy ST1 should be modified by adding new sub-paragraph (f) to paragraph C as follows: f) No less than 60 pitches will be allocated for static caravan development.	Local Plan policies must be evidence led. The Gypsy and Traveller Needs Assessment 2019 provides no evidence to support this approach.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
1195216	Resident	Is there any evidenced need for new houses to be built Any new garden village if needed should be built on brownfield sites such as Bevercotes and not on greenfield.	National policy requires the Council to provide housing to meet identified needs. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment has been updated which demonstrates the justification for the housing and employment targets and the balance between the two. The Local Plan does try to put as much development as possible on brownfield sites but there is not enough suitable land available to meet local needs. So some greenfield land is needed. Bevercotes is protected as a Local Wildlife Site so is unsuitable for residential development.
1195356	Resident	Easy access to A1 and A57 !!!!!!!! Seriously..... the A57 from Gateford is a mass car park, what used to be a 35 - 40 minute commute to Sheffield is now approx. 90 minutes or more. Access to A1 through Worksop via Five Lane Ends is horrendous and getting worse with the building of DHL so more lorries. It can take me 15 minutes just to get through Worksop alone. And travelling to the A1 via Blyth is slightly quicker however that road also contends with HGV from Peppers Warehouse and Blyth is struggling to cope with this and normal cars and you want to add a futher potential 3000 cars onto that route by building houses on ST15 HS1 Peaks Hill Farm. The infrastructure cannot handle it and you refuse to change as you will only build 40 houses at a time to slip the through the loop hole that the Highways Agency limit state is 40 + houses then requires a change of roads. As currently been seen on Thievesdale Lane This cannot be allowed to happen the roads cannot cope and are accidents waiting to happen	The Local Plan is informed by the Bassetlaw Transport Study Parts 1, 2 and 3 which identifies the impact of the allocations on the highways network and recommends highway improvements to aid traffic flow around the town including to the A57 and a new road between Blyth Road and Carlton Road. The Council continues to work with Nottinghamshire County Council Highways and Highways England on the Local Plan. This ensures proposed allocations are suitable and deliverable in highways terms.
1195356	Resident	<i>Worksop will deliver...</i> Re read your quote above so why do we need another 1500 houses been built Peaks Hill Farm ST15 HS1 on top of the 174 houses been built by Rippon Homes The Lodge on land off Blyth Road/Thievesdale Lane This cannot be allowed to happen.... you are destroying green land , eco friendly land, animal welfare , established rural landscape for no reasonable or sustainable use. Promoting the efficient and effective use... This again is a complete contradiction to Peaks Hill Farm ST15 HS1 where you are actually destroying versatile agricultural landif the farmers want to sell at least use if for energy like solar farm or wind farm not 1500 houses that are not required as previously stated	National policy requires the Council to provide housing to meet identified needs. This needs to be part of a Local Plan which is a statutory requirement. The Local Plan does try to put as much development as possible on brownfield sites but there is not enough suitable land available to meet local needs. So some greenfield and agricultural land is needed.
REF171	Bawtry Town Council	Paragraph 5.1.25 states that, at 30/11/2019, 185 new homes had been delivered in Harworth & Bircotes and that a further 1,853 are "in the pipeline". Presumably the latter figure includes the development of 650 new homes on land south of the A631 Bawtry Rd, Harworth, for which approval was given last year. The population of Harworth & Bircotes is approximately 7,500 at present. This expansion will take it to over 12,000. The sites of some of the new and planned developments in Harworth are less than 2 miles from Bawtry's High Street; in terms of travelling time Bawtry is as close as the centre of Harworth. Concern that such a substantial expansion of Harworth & Bircotes will place an unsustainable load upon Bawtry's facilities, services and infrastructure. The Localism Act 2011 established a Duty to Cooperate between neighbouring planning authorities in relation to cross-boundary issues, including transport and infrastructure. This was acknowledged in the Initial Draft Plan to: "Support opportunities for the retention, or creation, of new community and transport infrastructure, facilities and services, and ensure that impacts on them are appropriately mitigated, including where new development impacts on areas outside of Bassetlaw's boundary." In our response to the Initial Draft we suggested there should be clarification of how this commitment would be delivered, in the context of our concern about adverse impact upon Bawtry. Appendix 2 of the Draft Bassetlaw Plan Part 1: Strategic Plan January 2019 concerns about impact upon Bawtry of the expansion of Harworth & Bircotes appeared to have been acknowledged, and there was a statement that BDC and Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council were to "continue to meet as and when required to address cross boundary issues, with the next step being agreeing a Statement of Common Ground." Requested involvement in that process, and BDC responded by stating that the Statement of Common Ground referred to was between the two planning authorities, but they would "explore the potential of a Statement of Common Ground with Bawtry Town Council at the relevant time."	A Statement of Common Ground has been signed between the Council and Doncaster Council which includes an ongoing commitment to work together to manage traffic impacts across boundaries. The Local Plan proposes no allocations in Harworth & Bircotes. The development referred to has planning permission and transport infrastructure improvements have been agreed through the planning application process for each site.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
1195879	Hamlin Estates TwelveTwentyOne Planning Services	<p>It is clear that the Local Plan seeks to identify a realistic level of housing and there is general concern that the proposed level of 468 dpa does not take account of historic underprovision across the District. The proposed spread of housing is unlikely to be achieved as there is ample evidence to show that sites such as a 'garden village' have a long gestation before and during delivery. It is thus unrealistic to expect this to deliver the full 750 units in the Local Plan - 500 would be more realistic.</p>	<p>The calculation of housing need (using national guidance Standard Method) takes into consideration under delivery. As such there is no requirement to add it on. The Bassetlaw Local Housing Need and Economic Need Assessment 2020 provides the evidence for the housing requirement and housing delivery.</p>
REF198	Consultant	<p>Para 5.1.49 page 30 This refers to ST1 which again confirms that the house numbers can be delivered but also states that this, so called, "step change" is to be included. Why? If the figures can be achieved, what evidence is there that we need a step change?</p>	<p>National policy requires the Council to provide housing to meet identified needs. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment has been updated which demonstrates the justification for the housing and employment targets and the balance between the two. This is also a requirement of national policy. The step change refers to the need to deliver better paid higher skilled jobs to the benefit of residents.</p>
REF199	Cushwake	<p>It is noted that following an updated assessment the Council has reviewed the housing requirement in light of the opportunities for an increase in economic growth across the District over the Plan period. There is a requirement to deliver a minimum of 478 dwellings per annum or a minimum of 9087 dwellings over the plan period and this increase is welcome and the inclusion of 'minimum' within the policy text of Policy ST1C (1) is in line with our previous representation and suggested amendment to the policy wording.</p>	<p>Support noted and welcome.</p>
REF199	Cushwake	<p>Policy ST1 as drafted is unjustified and unsound. Development in large and small rural settlements is capped at 20%, however the Council have not provided any clear justification for this cap in the evidence base. Each application should be determined on its own merits based on the principles of sustainable development and the future sustainable growth of rural settlements should not be restricted because an arbitrary cap of 20% has been reached. Consider that the restriction on development for larger settlements to site areas of 1ha or less for housing sites that are not allocated either through the Local Plan or Neighbourhood Plan is not justified. Similarly, for small rural settlements, development proposals are restricted to 10 dwellings – again this is not evidenced and therefore not justified.</p>	<p>Policy ST1 has been updated to reflect comments received from the previous consultation in January. This has led to a change to the proposed percentage requirement and to the list of eligible Small Rural Settlements. The updated Rural Settlement Paper provides a narrative to the evolution of the strategy for rural Bassetlaw since 2016 and how the percentage requirements were derived and changed overtime. The NPPF encourages local and neighbourhood plans to identify, " land to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare" and therefore the Local Plan is encouraging this through rural development and through the allocation of sites within neighbourhood plans. The limit to 10 dwellings per site for Small Rural Settlements has been dropped.</p>
REF205	Resident	<p>The Policy proposes delivering sustainable development and growth appropriate to the size of each settlement. This Policy is supported.</p>	<p>Support noted and welcome.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
REF214	Oxalis Planning	<p>Broadly support Policy ST1. Agree that the most logical approach to delivering the District's housing needs over the Plan period is to direct the majority of housing towards the main towns of Worksop, Retford and Harworth. It is a sensible and logical approach to divide the majority of the rest of development across the Large Rural Settlements, as these locations already have the infrastructure in place to enable them to accommodate sustainable growth, which will, in turn, help to sustain the vitality of these locations. Support Misterton's identification as a 'Large Rural Settlement'. To accord with the Council's vision and objectives, new development should ensure that it seeks to mitigate its potential impact through the provision of physical, social and green infrastructure, to ensure that growth within the Large Rural Settlements is sustainable for the long-term. However, we do not agree with the proposed distribution of housing within the Large Rural Settlements, which is limited to those sites identified within Neighbourhood Plans. The inherent nature of Neighbourhood Plans means that they have a strong focus on the local area and consequently parochial ambitions, but they do not necessarily deliver the strategic scale thinking which is required to ensure that the strategic needs of the District are accounted for. If the Large Rural Settlements are to deliver both strategic and local needs, as required through paragraph 4.1.8 of the Local Plan, then the Council should review the Neighbourhood Plan allocations and consider: 1) Whether additional sites should be allocated; and 2) whether Policy ST1 should contain in built flexibility to enable additional sites to come forward in the Large Rural Settlements to meet the strategic needs of the District, if the allocations from the Neighbourhood Plans do not come forward as expected, or do not deliver on the District's strategic needs. Previously promoted land at Grovewood Road, Misterton, through the Council's 'call for sites' and through the Misterton Neighbourhood Plan process. The Neighbourhood Plan has not allocated land at Grovewood Road for development, despite the fact that it is available now, for immediate delivery; it has the capacity to deliver up to 150 dwellings; it is one of the most sustainable locations in the village, located in Flood Zone 1 and directly adjacent to the Primary School; the proposals for the site include a substantial level of green infrastructure, including the retention of the majority of the hedgerows within the site, which would be supplemented through additional planting; and the site could deliver community infrastructure and facilities in the form of playing pitches and a pavilion. The fact that the site has been overlooked for allocation by the Neighbourhood Plan and the restrictive nature of Policy ST1 means that the District could lose out on the opportunity to provide a long-term sustainable housing delivering solution for Misterton. This could also be the case in other Neighbourhood Plan areas across the District. The Grovewood Road site could help the Council deliver on its housing needs, in a sustainable location, if the Neighbourhood Plan allocations do not progress as anticipated. Policy ST1 should be amended to include the necessary flexibility to ensure that the Local Plan remains relevant and sustainable throughout the Plan period (amendments shown in dark red): "A minimum of 1764 dwellings on sites allocated or to be allocated in Neighbourhood Plans, or on sites brought forward where it is demonstrated that there is a clear need for development and that it can be delivered quickly and sustainably to provide necessary housing for the Large Rural Settlements".</p>	<p>Consistent with national planning policy, the Council promotes Neighbourhood Planning as an appropriate tool for the local community to influence the way their local area grows. This is reflected in the Local Plan and the approach taken to Large Rural Settlements. These settlements are not as sustainable as the Main Towns therefore 20% growth is considered appropriate, unless the local community choose to exceed that figure through a neighbourhood plan. This approach ensures the local community retain influence over the sustainable growth of their area. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be reviewed and updated in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. This provides Neighbourhood Plan Groups to review the delivery of development and allocate new sites where necessary.</p>
REF214	Oxalis Planning	<p>Support the overarching plan for the District, as described through the Bassetlaw 'vision' which states at paragraph 4.1.6 that, by 2037, new development "will have been delivered in the most sustainable locations". Paragraph 4.1.8 explains, in broad terms, how this will be achieved, stating that the large rural settlements (including Misterton) will deliver residential development "to meet strategic and local needs. Necessary physical, social, green and digital infrastructure and community facilities need to support this growth will have been delivered on time". Agree that it a sensible and logical approach to distribute development to the most sustainable locations within the District, which includes those settlements defined as the Large Rural Settlements.</p>	Support noted and welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
REF215	Trustees of H S Wallis	<p>Para. 5.1.2 draws special attention to what is seen as a step change in the District's economy in seeking to reflect new priorities. Draws attention to one of these priorities - the growth zone associated with the A1 strategic corridor - (this approach derives from the 2019 Spatial Strategy Background Paper in which the value of the A1 corridor associated with Harworth is recognised as a "logistics corridor"). The following paragraph then summarises Draft Policy ST1 -to encourage the effective use of greenfield land " where this will bring social, economic and environmental benefits.... ". This in turn derives from the Background Paper para. 1.3 in setting the scene for the Local plan to look for "sustainable housing growth particularly in the rural parts of the District. " There are few sites better placed to achieve these objectives than the site fitting so well as it does into the local landscape and the built forms of "North Blyth", proximity to the A1 and close relationship with substantial areas having permission for employment uses. Subsequent paragraphs set out the process by which the Spatial Strategy has emerged. They refer to the wish to retain the Main Town, Large and Small Rural Settlements hierarchy. No where in the document is there any indication that the distinctiveness of "North Blyth" is recognised or where it does or might fit into this categorisation. Whilst being within the parish of Blyth the area could not be more distinct and separate (not least by the A1) from the core of the more historic core of Blyth. There is an argument for suggesting it is a settlement in its own right but equally it could be argued that it is better for all planning purposes to see it as being "clustered" with the main town of Harworth/Bircotes just to the north. Paras 5.1.24 - 5.1.26 briefly describe Harworth/Bircotes in part in the following terms "Harworth & Bircotes is' a strategically advantageous economic location and is expected to deliver significant employment growth (see Policy ST6)...reflecting its easy access to the A1 (M)" Paras. 5.1.27 - 5.1.31 then set out the approach to be taken with Large Rural Settlements (LRS) of which Blyth is one of five. Having noted that the rural settlements of Bassetlaw vary considerably Para. 5.1.28 goes on to state about the LRS's that they:- "...are the most sustainable due to them having the largest populations having higher numbers of journeys made to employment, shops and services and having the most frequent and commercially viable public transport services to nearby larger towns and cities. All serve both the settlements themselves and the surrounding rural area. Focusing rural development there will help support existing facilities and provide a focal point for use by residents of the surrounding smaller villages and hamlets. " In earlier para. 5.1.9 the Draft Plan in referring to future housing states that the largest towns would see the largest growth (a not uncommon approach) but it then goes on to state "...but rural settlements would be able to increase their populations by up to 20%..." Nothing in the text indicates that this the approach is to be applied to LRS's. When the Draft plan later sets out its approach to Small Rural Settlements (SRS) it again refers to a 20% maximum per parish justified briefly on the basis of the need to sustain those villages which often have greater environmental constraints. It is only Draft Policy ST1 that clearly identifies that the 20% limit will only apply to SRS's. LRS's are to be planned in the same way as the Main Towns. policy ST1-B2a refers to land allocations and appropriate forms of development within their settlement boundaries. "North Blyth" does not have any development boundary. Given the very special and strategic advantages attaching to this part of the District and the planning permissions that have already been granted that is something of an anomaly.</p>	Blyth is included within the Large Rural Settlements due to its size and function as a local service centre. North Blyth is not identified as an eligible settlement because the location is not considered to be sustainable in that location.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
REF215	Trustees of H S Wallis	<p>The Draft Local Plan appears to be diverging not only from what is set out above but also the "Vision for Bassetlaw 2037" set out in the Background Paper where at para. 4.12 it states "4.12 The district will a diverse and thriving economy with Worksop, Retford and Harworth and Bircotes and the Large Rural Settlements acting as employment and service centres for the surrounding rural areas... " In Draft Policy ST1:- Cl it indicates that a minimum of 1764 dwellings are to be permitted in the LRS's on "... sites allocated or to be allocated in Neighbourhood Plans... " So a clear statement that allocations in the Local Plan will be made thus following through on the importance the Draft Plan is attaching to LRS's. However, in "Housing Distribution" at para. 7.1.6 it states:- " In the early plan period more development will be delivered by commitments in Worksop, Retford and Harworth & Bircotes; in sustainable locations in accordance with Policy STJ. Similarly housing development will take place in the Large Rural settlements either through Neighbourhood Plan allocations or via commitments " So now there to be NO Local Plan allocations for sites in LRS's? Then the Draft Plan sets out its Policy ST2 under the heading "Rural Bassetlaw ". Under ST2- B the policy approach seems to be 'let's leave it entirely to the Neighbourhood Plans' to which a 20% cap will be applied. Without further explanation LRS's now seem to have acquired a much reduced status in the hierarchy and are to be treated just like the SRS's'. The Draft policy at sub-paragraph B then in tabulating how the 1764 dwellings (the total in the table in the Plan is actually 1747 - the difference being half of the number of dwellings the subject site in "North Blyth" could provide) are to be distributed between the LRS's the text contains the following sentence:- "Most of this growth will be delivered through existing planning permissions or through allocated sites made in Neighbourhood Plans or this Local Plan as identified on the Policies Map" There is a clear conflict between not only Draft Strategic Policies 1 and 2 but between what the Draft Plan states to be its broader ambitions. As far as "North Blyth" is concerned not only does it appear that the Local Plan will remain ambivalent, but in abdicating its role in favour of the Blyth Neighbourhood Plan, which is (in the context of Draft Policy ST1) seeking wrongly to apply a 20% cap, the strategic advantages of the area are to be wholly ignored. This seems to be a serious error and entirely contrary to the sentiments expressed in the earlier paragraphs 5.1.27 - 5.1.28 under the heading "Large Rural Settlements". THERE SEEMS JO BE LITTLE POINT IN EXPLAINING AND THEN ADOPTING A SETTLEMENT IDERARCHY HAVING THREE DISTINCT ELEMENTS AND THEN FOR THE HUGELY IMPORTANT FUNCTION OF PLANNING FOR HOUSING 'LUMPING' TWO OF THEM TOGETHER. It is noted the degree of reliance placed on developing a new settlement on the Cottam Power Station site. Given the challenges such a site presents not least in terms of clearance, contamination and flood risk and the inevitable timeframe, over which the Planning Authority has no control whatsoever, the site should surely not feature as a formal allocation but be regarded as a laudable ambition but in planning policy terms somewhat more as a windfall site. There is even a greater argument for it to be seen as an employment site rather than housing.</p>	Blyth is included within the Large Rural Settlements due to its size and function as a local service centre. North Blyth is not identified as an eligible settlement because the location is not considered to be sustainable in that location.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
REF222	Notts CC	<p>NCC has considered the housing need as identified for each settlement as per the spatial strategy hierarchy outlined in Policy ST1 and so the following response is, wherever possible, in line with the Bassetlaw spatial strategy for growth which is the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main Towns • Large Rural Settlement • Small rural settlements • Garden Villages <p>Worksop Primary across the whole planning area, NCC anticipate that there will be sufficient places to meet demand set out in the Local Plan. Projected to be a shortage of school places in Gateford, which is due to be addressed by the delivery and possible expansion of a new Gateford Park Primary and Nursery School, to which HS1 / Policy 15 (Peak Hills Farm) refers. Secondary CIL is in operation in this area but NCC would instead intend to seek the s106 contributions that are required to mitigate the effects on education of further developments. NCC is already planning to expand Outwood Portland Academy to address existing pressures but the additional housing in the Local Plan would exacerbate the already significant shortfall of secondary places in this area. NCC would seek developer contributions towards the cost of adding a further 5-6 classrooms (c180 secondary places) arising solely from housing in the local plan, on top of existing plans, subject to feasibility; Outwood Portland may not be able to cope with yet more expansion, so the need for a new secondary school site and contributions cannot be discounted. NCC will seek to clarify this matter prior to the finalisation of the Plan.</p> <p>Retford Primary Across the whole planning area, NCC anticipate that demand set out in the Local Plan would require mitigation from developers. This would largely be used to fund the expansion of existing schools, although many are on small sites that offer little scope for this. Given the 3,250 dwellings proposed to be added to the Garden Village after 2037, a new 630-place (3 forms of entry) primary school would be required around the Ranby area. Secondary NCC anticipate a small surplus of places in this area, so pupils arising from housing developments in the Local Plan could be accommodated at existing schools. However, the proposed Garden Village would necessitate the addition of a further c500 secondary places, for which contributions would be required. Potential expansions of existing secondary schools would be subject to feasibility. If circumstances at the time of a formal application had changed – i.e. changing population, school rolls and school capacities – and a new secondary school was required in this area, NCC would also need developers to contribute land.</p> <p>Tuxford Primary Across the whole planning area, NCC anticipate that demand set out in the Local Plan would require mitigation from developers. This would be best used to fund the expansion of an existing school by approximately 3 classrooms. Expansion of any of the 3 local primary schools may be problematic, so further discussions and feasibility would be required.</p> <p>Secondary Tuxford Academy falls within the Retford secondary planning area. Harworth, incorporating Styrrup Primary Across the whole planning area, NCC anticipate that approximately 3 new classrooms would be required if the Local Plan came to fruition. New housing in Styrrup would require the expansion of Serlby Park's primary provision.</p> <p>Secondary NCC anticipate a small surplus of places in this area, so pupils arising from housing developments in the Local Plan could be accommodated in Serlby Park Academy's secondary provision.</p> <p>Langold, incorporating Blyth Primary Across the whole planning area, NCC anticipate that c300 additional primary school places would be required if the Local Plan came to fruition. (New housing in Blyth is anticipated to arise from the neighbourhood plan, rather than the draft Local Plan.)</p>	<p>The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council to ensure necessary education infrastructure associated with development is delivered. This information will inform policy development and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
REF222	Notts CC	<p>Three of the four schools in this planning area are likely to have space to expand, subject to feasibility, so housing developer contributions would be calculated on that basis. Walkeringham and Misterton, incorporating West Stockwith Primary The Misterton and Walkeringham neighbourhood plans, upon which NCC Pupil Place Planning have not previously commented, would necessitate 2-3 additional classrooms. Misterton Primary has space to expand, subject to feasibility. Tuxford Primary This planning area encompasses Askham, Dunham-on-Trent, East Drayton, East Markham, Laneham, Headon-cum-Upton and Tuxford. Housing in the Local Plan would necessitate the addition of 1-2 classrooms in Tuxford. Housing in the respective Neighborhood Plans would require 1 further classroom. However, expansion of any of the 3 local primary schools would be problematic or impossible, so further discussions and feasibility would be required. Secondary Tuxford Academy (secondary) falls within the Retford secondary planning area; and so please see comments above under Retford, Secondary. Small Rural Settlements Clarborough, incorporating Welham, Clayworth and Hayton NCC anticipate that housing described in local and / or neighbourhood plans could be accommodated within existing capacity at Clarborough Primary Cuckney, incorporating Holbeck and Nether Langwith NCC anticipate that housing described in local and / or neighbourhood plans could be accommodated within existing capacity at Cuckney C of E Primary. Elkesley, incorporating Bothamsall NCC anticipate that housing described in local and / or neighborhood plans could be accommodated within existing capacity at Elkesley Primary and Nursery Everton NCC anticipate that housing described in local and / or neighbourhood plans could be accommodated within existing capacity at Everton Primary Gamston NCC anticipate that housing described in local and / or neighbourhood plans could be accommodated within existing capacity at Gamston C of E Primary Gringley NCC anticipate that housing described in local plan would require contributions towards an additional classroom. St Peter's Primary is on a restricted site, so expansion would be problematic, though reconfiguration may be possible. Further discussion and feasibility would be required. Leverton, incorporating Hablesthorne, and North and South Leverton NCC anticipate that housing described in local and / or neighbourhood plans could be accommodated within existing capacity at Leverton C of E. Mattersey NCC anticipate that housing described in the neighbourhood plan could be accommodated within existing capacity at Mattersey Primary Misson NCC anticipate that housing described in the neighbourhood plan could be accommodated within existing capacity at Misson Primary Normanton on Trent, incorporating High and Low Marnham NCC anticipate that housing described in the local plan could be accommodated within existing capacity at St Matthew's C of E Primary. North Wheatley, incorporating South Wheatley and Bole NCC anticipate that housing described in local plan would require contributions to create an additional classroom. North Wheatley C of E Primary is on a restricted site, so expansion would be problematic. Further discussion and feasibility would be required. Rampton, incorporating Woodbeck and Treswell with Cottam NCC anticipate that contributions would be required to create 3 additional classrooms within the span of the local plan. Rampton Primary is on a restricted site and would be difficult to expand, so feasibility would be required. The development at Cottam Power Station is anticipated to add a further 1,150 houses after 2037, which would necessitate a new primary school and potentially land on which to build it. Ranskill, incorporating Barnby Moor, Scrooby and Torworth NCC anticipate that developments in the local plan would result in a small deficit of places at Ranskill Primary. If expansion was indeed required, the school site should be large enough to allow it although this would be subject to final confirmation. Shireoaks NCC anticipate that developments in the local plan would result in a small deficit of places at St Luke's C of E Primary. If expansion was required, the school site should be large enough to allow it though feasibility would be required. Sturton NCC anticipate that housing described in the local plan could be accommodated within existing capacity at Sturton C of E Primary Sutton-cum-Lound NCC anticipate that housing described in local and / or neighbourhood plans could be accommodated within existing capacity at Sutton-cum-Lound C of E Primary</p>	<p>The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council to ensure necessary education infrastructure associated with development is delivered. This information will inform policy development and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
1196694	Resident	<p>The vision of Bassetlaw attracting highly paid work, new business and growth in business, is based on an assumption that providing more business land will achieve this. Not aware that there is a shortage of such land at present. Bassetlaw already has the locational advantages of proximity to road links and Doncaster airport, yet these businesses are not attracted to locate here. Parag 4.2 of the CIL Draft Charging Schedule notes that of the new developments: 81% are greenfield and 19% are brownfield. This is an appalling scenario for our environment. Bassetlaw is ahead of schedule to meet its targets for housebuilding by 2037. It should not be approving plans to build on so much greenfield land. It should continue to review what brownfield sites become available in the decades to come. There will be new brownfield sites available before (and after) 2037 which can be considered for residential building. 5.1.49 refers to building more quality housing than is required – this cannot be justified: once greenfield land is built on, it is lost forever; there is nothing sustainable about this approach.</p>	<p>National policy requires the Council to provide housing and employment to meet identified needs. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment has been updated which demonstrates the justification for the housing and employment targets and the balance between the two. The Local Plan does try to put as much development as possible on brownfield sites but there is not enough suitable land available to meet local needs. So some greenfield land is needed.</p>
1196694	Resident	<p>Parag 3.30 – the contribution of tree planting – is this annual figure referring to the amount absorbed once trees reach maturity? What number of years is being allowed to reach maturity? In the interim the amount of carbon absorbed would be negligible and far less than any mature trees felled for development.</p>	<p>Paragraph 3.30 states that this the figure refers to trees at maturity.</p>
1196694	Resident	<p>4.1.3 and 5.1.40 - The vision of Bassetlaw attracting highly paid work, new business and growth in business, is based on an assumption that providing more business land will achieve this. Not aware that there is a shortage of such land at present. Bassetlaw already has the locational advantages of proximity to road links and Doncaster airport, yet these businesses are not attracted to locate here.</p>	<p>Sites at Manton Wood and Symmetry Park are being developed at the moment. There is a need to identify land to meet the needs of the D2N2 growth sectors to attract better paid higher skilled jobs to the District.</p>
REF247	Babworth Parish Council	<p>Applaud the vision of a positive framework. Appreciate consideration of the implementation of the Local Plan so that the true ambitions remain the priority, and that our beautiful countryside is not lost and our local towns remain empty and without investment.</p>	<p>Support noted and welcome.</p>
REF253	Fisher German	<p>The Spatial Strategy which proposes a hybrid approach to meeting the District's development needs is broadly supported. The proposed role of Retford as a 'Main Town' reflects the town's role and sustainability credentials. Retford benefits from significant service provision and excellent transport connections and is considered sound for the town to be identified for future economic and residential growth. The Council's ambition to deliver increased housing, above base Local Housing Need established through the standardised methodology, is also supported. An uplift in housing is required to ensure an active working population is readily available in order to deliver the District's economic growth aspirations. This is a positive strategy which reflects the aims of the NPPF, both in supporting economic growth and boosting significantly the supply of housing. A buffer of 5% is considered appropriate when calculating housing land supply requirements, having regard for the 2019 housing delivery test results. With regards to spatial distribution, the Council intends to locate 60% of its housing requirement in the Main Towns of Retford, Worksop and Harworth. This approach is supported as it focuses development in the most sustainable locations. Concerns are however raised in respect of the Bassetlaw Garden Village (Policy ST3). The Garden Village allocation is intended to make a significant contribution to achieving and meeting the housing requirement within the Plan period, equating to just over 8% of the total requirement. To ensure a sound Plan it is imperative to ensure that the Council's delivery assumptions for the site are realistic. The assumptions currently made in respect of the delivery of the site are considered ambitious and may result in the Council not meeting its housing need over the Plan period. In addition to the above approximately 12% of the total requirement for the Plan period is reliant on Neighbourhood Plans, or non-allocated sites across the 42 Small Rural Settlements to be delivered. This is a significant quantum of development across numerous settlements and has the potential to risk the delivery of the Plan.</p>	<p>Housing delivery rates have been reviewed and amended where necessary based on evidence of delivery within the District and for Garden Villages in other areas of the country. This has been informed by Lichfield's Start to Finish 2nd Edition (February 2020).</p>
1196906	Resident	<p>There is a single reference to infrastructure provision for electric vehicles post 2035 within the scope of this entire strategy. To suggest populations will be drawn towards public transport links in new developments, particularly the proposed 'Garden Village' and Cottam sites is naive and blinkered at best. Isolated developments such as these will create increased vehicle movements to other employment/leisure/shopping sites. This strategy MUST include electric vehicle infrastructure provision to offset these carbon loading issues.</p>	<p>Policy ST45 and Policy ST50 requires all new development to incorporate appropriate infrastructure to enable the connection to an electric vehicle charging point in future. This future proofs development by ensuring that over time, and as technology develops, different charging units can be installed which reflects consumer choice.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01Bassetlaw's Strategy			
REF270	Barton Willmore	<p>The Local Plan states that Bassetlaw forms a vital part of the wider Nottinghamshire and SCR economies. Therefore, Bassetlaw sees a significant level of out-commuting in addition to in-commuting from neighbouring authorities. Economic composition is, therefore, interlinked between these authorities. Agree with paragraph 3.2 that "the performance of the local economy is a key driver that shapes Bassetlaw into a successful and growing location" and that growth of business is integral for creating a sustainable local economy for the District's continued prosperity.</p> <p>The Council must make sure that the opportunities for investors to deliver change in the District are seized; this can only be achieved through providing the economic conditions for growth; including levels of housing development to support that growth which is not overly reliant on the supply of labour elsewhere within the region. The People Bassetlaw's growing population puts an increasing pressure on the Council's housing. Paragraph 3.12 states a projected population increase of 3.8% by 2037 equates to over 4,350 additional residents which puts increased demand on the need for housing across the District. However, the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw SHMA OAN Update (October 2017) within the Council's evidence base provides the projected population growth for Bassetlaw as per the latest (2014 based) Sub-National Population Projections published by ONS in May 2016. The data shows the 2014-based population of Bassetlaw was 114,143 and projected to increase to 120,927 by 2035 (5.9% increase). The above population projection reflects a higher increase as set out within the Draft Local Plan and does not take into account the significant level of economic growth and step change within the District which is likely to further drive growth of the population. It is our position that this puts additional strain of the need for new homes.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 indicates the population of 16-64 working aged population is projected to fall by 7.3% over the plan period. These demographic changes reinforce the importance for substantial housing delivery across Bassetlaw and the delivery of sufficient employment land to provide jobs and retain the declining working population. Policy within the Local Plan must seek to change the direction of those trends beyond what the current policy approach has achieved. The retention of existing young people and attraction of in-migrants of working age will only be achieved through the provision of suitable job opportunities, provision of affordable and attractive housing to younger and working age people and through the provision of vibrant and attractive towns. The Place Paragraph 3.17 sets out that, as of 2018, 67% of the District's population live in Worksop, Retford and Harworth/Bircotes. Only 15% of the population lives in Large Rural Settlements and 18% in the remaining Small Rural Settlements. Provides a basis that the Plan should amend the proportion of housing requirement in the Main Towns and reduce the proportion allocated for rural settlements to appropriately reflect the needs of the District. Agree that Bassetlaw benefits from strong transport links by road and rail, including a strong network of bus services in some locations.</p> <p>The Local Plan refers to the sustainable accessibility of Retford at paragraphs 3.18 and 3.19. Retford train station provides direct access to the East Coast Mainline and London within 2 hours. Paragraph 3.19 states Retford bus station provides access to the wider District whereas rural parts of Bassetlaw have less frequent coverage. Advocate the suitability of Retford for an increased proportion of growth compared to less accessible locations due to its established and sustainable transport network. The effective cycle network in Worksop and Retford is identified within Chapter 3, making them sustainable locations for development by enabling sustainable movement between residential areas, work and leisure. Worksop and Retford have expanded along with their population and the delivery of new homes has spearheaded regeneration in these areas, acting as a catalyst for investment. The Local Plan emphasises "the need for new housing remains as important as ever" at paragraph 3.24 which we support, suggest the Local Plan should review its spatial housing strategy in order to reflect these needs of new homes in the Main Towns.</p>	<p>The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment has been updated which demonstrates the justification for the housing and employment targets and the balance between the two. The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's place in the settlement hierarchy. This will create the flexibility needed to support a range of development of different types and sizes. It is important to support both towns and villages by delivering development appropriate to their needs that maintains and supports local services and facilities.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01Bassetlaw's Strategy			
REF270	Barton Willmore	<p>Chapter 4 sets out the Council's vision and objectives for Bassetlaw in 2037 for increased access to quality homes, high skilled jobs and a range of quality facilities and services. Support those aspirations; stress that the key to the effectiveness of the Local Plan is in its ability to achieve that vision. Strong concerns over the plan's ability to do so. The vision for Retford set out in paragraph 4.1.7 is that it will have "retained and enhanced its character through a significant public realm intervention strengthening its town centre offer and providing an attractive base for cultural and visitor economy events". Support the delivery of town centre improvements and public realm strengthening. In the first instance, the vitality and vibrancy of the town, as with most other towns within the country will rely on growth and investment; and expenditure from future residents which is not reflected in the Council's vision for Retford. Suggest the vision for Retford in 2037 should be more ambitious by supporting more housing development in the area and performing its existing role as one of the strongest housing market areas to drive forward housing growth in the District. Retford is a significant contributor to the delivery of new homes within the District and a clearly desirable location. As the district looks to make a step change in its economic performance it will be reliant on inward investment and economic migrants being attracted to live in the district. Whilst some Rural Settlements will require small-scale and sensitively located development to support local needs and to support local services and facilities, the level of development being proposed across both the large and small rural settlements is arbitrary (in particular a proposed 20% growth target for the large rural settlements) and will cause harm to the overall sustainability of the district. Oppose the Council's vision for the new Bassetlaw Garden Village, consider the approach to be unsound, unfeasible and unviable. It should be the Council's priority to enhance existing settlements such as Retford and Harworth where development can benefit from existing transport networks and support the local economy and wider rural hinterlands rather than attempting to create a new village and transport hub which we consider not to be viable.</p>	<p>The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's place in the settlement hierarchy. This will create the flexibility needed to support a range of development of different types and sizes. It is important to support both towns and villages by delivering development appropriate to their needs that maintains and supports local services and facilities. The new Garden Village is looking to the future, beyond the Local Plan period. The NPPF is very clear that we must plan for a minimum of fifteen years and look beyond this where possible.</p>
REF270	Barton Willmore	<p>Supportive of the Local Plan's spatial strategy promoting a 'step change' for Bassetlaw's economy with growth focused around strategic corridors and growth zones and the three Main Towns as articulated at paragraph 5.1.2. 2.34 Disagree with paragraph 5.1.3 which states the Local Plan is in accordance with the NPPF's presumption in favour of sustainable development and that it "seeks to fully meet the demands for new homes, jobs and services in the District in the most sustainable manner". This same paragraph reiterates that the Main Towns are the primary focus for growth, do not consider that those aims will be realised with the current drafting of the Local Plan. The Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan proposed a 'hybrid' approach to its spatial strategy. In our previous representations we supported this hybrid approach in principle which sought to distribute development based on the scale, role, service provision, land availability and opportunities for investment and growth of settlements to benefit wider rural communities. This meant directing growth towards Worksop, Retford and Harworth and supported by rural settlements. The 2020 Draft Local Plan has reintroduced a settlement hierarchy for the District in Policy ST1. Paragraph 5.1.13 states that Policy ST1 acknowledges the importance of reducing the need to travel and prioritises major growth in the three Main Towns which we support. This is not only vital in terms of localised movement, but has an impact on regional transport networks as evidenced by the comments within the Doncaster SOCG. The growth needed to support the district's aspirations needs to be realised within the district as far as possible. Have significant concerns with how the spatial strategy has proportioned growth across the District; specifically in relation to the low level of housing requirement proposed for Retford, the overstated requirement for rural settlements and the proposed Garden Village. Despite the three Main Towns being placed at the top of the proposed settlement hierarchy, the growth required for the District to meet its economic aspirations has been underestimated and the subsequent development requirements have been understated. Paragraph 5.1.19 highlights that Retford has a population of 22,013 residents and boasts a wide range of services, facilities, shops, employment opportunities and transport links. As well as being designated as a Main Town at the top of the settlement hierarchy, Retford is also described as "a good location for development" at paragraph 5.1.20, which should be supported by policy within the Local Plan rather than constraining development in this sustainable location. The Spatial Strategy Background Paper 2019 states Retford is the second largest town in the District,</p>	<p>The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's place in the settlement hierarchy.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
		population of 22,000 and is a key infrastructure and service centre. Retford is described as the main hub settlement for Bassetlaw's central and eastern rural areas and is well connected by highways and rail links. Understand the point made at paragraph 5.1.21 of the Local Plan that "Retford is not expected to accommodate as much economic growth in the plan period". Stress that this is not a justification for the constraining of development at Retford and misunderstands the potential role of the town in meeting the development needs of the district as a whole.	
REF270	Barton Willmore	The level of housing requirement currently proposed for Retford is 1303 homes (equating to only 14% of the overall housing requirement). Paragraph 5.1.22 of the Local Plan sets out that the requirement for Retford is based on the same level of housing identified within the Core Strategy (2011) which equates to 87.4 dwellings per annum. Fundamentally disagree with the above approach. The Core Strategy is, by the Council's own admission, based on out of date evidence and cannot be taken as an up to date position on the housing needs of the district. The housing requirement for the district, and the distribution of that requirement must be based on proportionate and justified evidence. Even if we were to accept the approach of projecting the Core Strategy requirement of 87.4dpa over the Local Plan period that would equate to a requirement of 1,661 dwellings over the plan period. However, the Local Plan seeks to apply the Core Strategy requirement over a period between 2010-2037 and then reduce the level of development proposed at Retford by the 1057 dwellings delivered since 2010; resulting in a residual requirement of 1,303 dwellings for the plan period. Even if the overarching requirement was sound, which it is not, the residual requirement bares no resemblance to the calculation of need for the plan period. The Local Plan explains that 666 dwellings currently have planning permission in Retford and 109 dwellings have a resolution to grant, leaving a residual requirement of only 528 dwellings in Retford up to 2037. The result of the above mechanism is a wholly under -representative housing requirement for Retford that will constrain the level of development permitted at Retford significantly below the level of development it can and should deliver to meet the district's aims. Retford, as a rural hub for the centre and east of the District, and an area for employment growth is ideally placed to meet the bulk of the housing needs in the rural part of the District; subject to the plan identifying and meeting specific needs of the rural and local service centres. Strongly object to Retford being allocated only 1303 of the overall housing requirements for the District as set out in Figure 1 below. Retford, as the District's second largest town , has been allocated the second least amount of housing development among the existing settlements despite its position in the settlement hierarchy. This is despite Retford having suitable sites for development and a proven track record of delivering housing where other settlements within the District have been less successful. The above allocation will lead to the undue restriction of development towards the end of the plan period and leave no reasonable flexibility in the supply of housing land through the plan period to respond to change. This is completely at odds with the economic aspirations of the plan. Consider that a sustainable approach to planning for the rural area and its settlements is to establish the development needs of those villages and apportion an appropriate level of development where those needs arise. Do not support the level of growth apportioned to the villages and rural area which has simply not been evidenced based on what levels of growth are required to support the rural area. Such an evidenced based approach is vital to understanding, and planning for, the future health of rural settlements. It is not clear from the Local Plan or its evidence base how the final apportionment of development across the District has been determined or how the site selection methodology for identifying sites has been arrived at. Whilst it is not necessary to stick rigidly to a settlement hierarchy, it is necessary to take an evidence -based approach to distributing development based in the needs of those settlements.	The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy.
REF270	Barton Willmore	The Council's Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) 2016/17 sets out the level of housing completions in the District between 2006/7 to 2016/17. Across the whole district, 3474 net housing completions were made over that period. 2,619 of those completions were within the 3 Main Towns of Worksop, Retford and Harworth. Some 1,321	The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
		<p>completions were in Retford which comprises 38% of the overall completions across the entire District and over half of the completions within the District's Main Towns. The AMR demonstrates that 2005/06 to 2016/17 Retford has delivered 384 more dwellings than Worksop. The AMR states that, notwithstanding the recession, from 2005/06 to 2016/17 Retford averaged the delivery of some 110dpa which increased to an average of 152dpa in the 6 years since 2010/11 when recovery from the recession commenced. The monitoring demonstrates that the proposed distribution of development in Local Plan dramatically underestimates the role of Retford in the housing market. Retford has clearly provided the backbone for the Bassetlaw's housing delivery within a District that has struggled to meet its Core Strategy housing requirement. Crucially, the above evidence demonstrates that Retford is a desirable location within the district to buy a home. At a time that the Council is seeking to deliver a step change in the economic growth and aspirations of the district, it is vital that its most popular housing market is utilised to its full effect. Delivering sufficient homes in a location where people want to live will be a key to the success of the district. Consider that it is perverse for the Council to seek to deliver a level of growth at Retford of 87.4dpa, which would be realised as a target of circa 60dpa once completions from 2010 are taken into account, which is less than half of the delivery in the last 6 years and which has been the best performing market area across a District that has a track record of struggling to deliver its housing requirement elsewhere. That unduly low level of development becomes even more difficult to understand with the Council having failed to provide any substantive evidence for such a reduction in the housing requirement and in the face of an excellent supply of suitable and developable Sites, including our Client's Site to the south of Retford. Recognise that the distribution of development to rural settlements is important to support existing facilities and meet local needs, the proportion of housing requirement in these rural settlements is currently excessive and unjustified. Policy ST1 should be re-drafted to reflect our comments. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased housing growth towards Retford; • Removal of proposals for a new Garden Village; and • Reduction in the development directed towards the Rural Area. <p>Supportive of Policy ST1 directing development to appropriate locations in accordance with the settlement hierarchy, a greater housing requirement should be proportioned to support growth and development in the Main Towns. Disagree with B 2(c) of Policy ST1 which supports Bassetlaw Garden Village in accordance with Policy ST3. The requirement of 750 dwellings for the new Garden Village should be removed and reproportioned via a revised spatial strategy. The overall minimum housing requirement for the District set out in Policy ST1 is 9,087 dwellings. This housing requirement should be amended to at least 10,640 and distributed more appropriately across the District, with a reduction for Rural Settlements and more focus on Retford. Emphasise the policy's aim to enhance the role of the District's Main Towns. This should be reflected through an appropriate housing requirement. Retford is a major contributor to the Council's overall housing delivery, consider that the level of development in Retford should be dramatically increased in recognition of its fundamental role in maintaining the sustainability of the rural east of Bassetlaw. It is vital that the vitality and viability of the rural area is maintained and some growth in those areas will be necessary, object to the proposed minimum housing requirement of 1,764 dwellings for Large Rural Settlements and 1,090 for Small Rural Settlements is not justified and is not a sound approach. The level of development to be delivered in the rural settlements should be based on a robust assessment of each of those settlements which establishes the level of appropriate development for each settlement, taking into account its development needs and constraints. Further work is required to establish the appropriate level of development in those locations.</p>	
REF275	Consultant	<p>In Chapter 4, the vision for Retford is described "retained and enhanced its character through a significant public realm intervention strengthening its town centre offer and providing an attractive base for cultural and visitor economy events". Wholly support it is our concern that this plan is not able to achieve this. The success of this town of reliant on investment and growth,, it appears in this plan that this will not be achieved. Suggest that Retford should be supporting further housing development. Retford has proved to be one of the strongest housing markets in the area with no indication that this would not continue. With further housing will come increased use of the town centre and job creation helping to drive the local economy. Support a modest growth of rural settlements, however, with limited infrastructure and facilities currently in place, the growth should remain in keeping with their</p>	<p>The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01Bassetlaw's Strategy			
		current size to retain the character of these communities. The growth of Retford would only work to serve these communities for their local services and needs.	
REF275	Consultant	<p>Generally supportive of the spatial strategy presented (ST1), which is promoting growth focused around strategic corridors, growth zones and the three main towns of Worksop, Retford and Harworth. Disagree that this is aligned with the NPPF and its presumption in favour of sustainable development which is stated in this local plan. This section is promoting the main towns as the primary focus for growth and yet this is not realised further in the rest of the plan. Despite these main towns being places at the top of the proposed settlement hierarchy the aspirations economically have been underestimated and as such the developmental requirements have also. The plan states that Retford boasts a wide range of services, facilities, shops, employment opportunities and transport links. It goes on to suggest that Retford itself is a good location for development. This is not supported by the policy within the local plan, instead, it is covered with a policy designed to constrain any growth, despite being a sustainable location. Retford is the districts second largest town and yet it has been allocated the second least amount of housing. This does not align with the balanced increase across the district as stated in the plan. Given that Retford has plenty of available and sustainable locations for development, as well as plenty of successful examples of delivering the site, this position is unsubstantiated.</p>	The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy.
REF277	Babworth Parish Council	<p>The Parish are supportive of Bassetlaw's economic aspirations for the district. Concerns regarding how those aspirations are proposed to be delivered and concerns in relation to how the Local Plan proposes to meet the needs of its communities. Chapter 4 sets out the Council's vision and objectives for increased access to quality homes, high skilled jobs and a range of quality facilities and services. Support those aspirations; stress that the key to the effectiveness of the Local Plan is in its ability to achieve that vision. Strong concerns over the plan's ability to do so. Concerned that the emerging approach to spatial distribution of development is unsound. Consider that the Local Plan fails to direct sufficient growth to its main towns, and consider the level of housing growth proposed to be directed towards the rural areas is excessive and not based on sound planning principles; including the proposal for a 'garden village' within the parish of Babworth and the allocation of housing to Ranby village which the Parish objects to. The Parish's main service centre is Retford which the Parish is reliant upon for the provision of most of its day to day needs. The vision for Retford is that "Retford will have retained and enhanced its character through a significant public realm intervention strengthening its town centre offer and providing an attractive base for cultural and visitor economy events". Support the delivery of town centre improvements and public realm strengthening. The vitality and vibrancy of the town is reliant on an appropriate level of growth being delivered at the town. Oppose the Council's vision for the new Bassetlaw Garden Village and consider the approach to be unsound, unfeasible and unviable</p>	The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy. The new Garden Village is looking to the future, beyond the Local Plan period. The NPPF is very clear that we must plan for a minimum of fifteen years and look beyond this where possible. Spreading development across the District will create the flexibility needed to support a range of development of different types and sizes. It is important to support both towns and villages by delivering development that maintains and supports local services and facilities.
REF277	Babworth Parish Council	<p>Policy ST1 of the Local Plan should be re-drafted suggest that a greater housing requirement should be proportioned to support growth and development in the Main Towns and larger settlements. Object to Part B2(c) of Policy ST1 which supports Bassetlaw Garden Village in accordance with Policy ST3. The requirement of 750 dwellings for the new Garden Village should be removed. Emphasise the policy's aim to enhance the role of the District's Main Towns this should be reflected through an appropriate housing requirement. Retford is a major contributor to the Council's overall housing delivery, and the level of development in Retford should be dramatically increased in recognition of its fundamental role in maintaining the sustainability of the rural east of Bassetlaw. It is vital that the vitality and viability of the rural area is maintained and some growth in those areas will be necessary, object to the proposed minimum housing requirement of 1,764 dwellings for Large Rural Settlements and 1,090 for Small Rural Settlements. The level of development to be delivered in the rural settlements should be based on a robust assessment of each of those settlements which establishes the level of appropriate development for each settlement, taking into account its development needs and constraints. Further work is required to establish the appropriate level of development in those locations.</p>	The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy. The new Garden Village is looking to the future, beyond the Local Plan period. The NPPF is very clear that we must plan for a minimum of fifteen years and look beyond this where possible. Spreading development across the District will create the flexibility needed to support a range of development of different types and sizes. It is important to support both towns and villages by delivering development that maintains and supports local services and facilities.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
REF278	Fisher German	<p>The Spatial Strategy proposes a hybrid approach to meeting the District's development needs is broadly supported. The Council's ambition to deliver increased housing, above base Local Housing Need established through the standardised methodology, is supported. An uplift in housing is required to ensure an active working population is readily available in order to deliver the District's economic growth aspirations. This is a positive strategy which reflects the aims of the NPPF, both in supporting economic growth and boosting significantly the supply of housing. A buffer of 5% is considered appropriate when calculating housing land supply requirements, having regard for the 2019 housing delivery test results. With regards to spatial distribution, concerned in respect of the Bassetlaw Garden Village (Policy ST3). The Garden Village allocation is intended to make a significant contribution to achieving and meeting the housing requirement within the Plan period, equating to just over 8% of the total requirement. To ensure a sound Plan it is imperative to ensure that the Council's delivery assumptions for the site are realistic. The assumptions currently made in respect of the delivery of the site are considered ambitious and may result in the Council not meeting its housing need over the Plan period. Approximately 12% of the total requirement for the Plan period is reliant on Neighbourhood Plans, or non-allocated sites across the 42 Small Rural Settlements (including Treswell). This is a significant quantum of development across numerous settlements and has the potential to risk the delivery of the Plan. The Council need to do more to ensure that the number of dwellings assigned to the Small Rural Settlements will be delivered.</p>	Housing delivery rates have been reviewed and amended where necessary based on evidence of delivery within the District and for Garden Villages in other areas of the country. This has been informed by Lichfield's Start to Finish 2nd Edition (February 2020). The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy.
REF281	Notts Campaign to Protect Rural England	Welcome the inclusion of a settlement hierarchy at ST1 B.2. This directs development to the most sustainable locations and provides clarity for decisions on planning applications over the Plan period.	Support noted and welcome.
1197063	Resident	Para 1.9.2 CIL monies are provided to support the infrastructure required for additional housing. This should remain as is, smaller rural villages require this additional money to increase amenities etc. than larger rural areas. CIL rates are also a way of reflecting the overall impact that development may have on an area from the surrounding villages and the new garden village for example.	The Council is proposing to retain CIL in the District. Site allocations of 50 or more units are exempt from CIL but will be delivering infrastructure through developer contributions instead.
1197063	Resident	Unclear how the calculations around growth have been conducted. Worksop is twice the size of Retford. The policy acknowledges this and the environmental differences between Retford and Worksop, yet it appears that Retford is required to deliver houses in excess of 70% of Worksop's required increase for 2010-2037 (2360-2180). Why is this and what is the rationale when the policy also acknowledges the constraints required re "safeguarding the landscape setting, preventing coalescence with neighbouring settlements, avoiding areas of flood risk, protecting the heritage and the ecological value of Retford's environment"? The figures and calculations are (deliberately?) confusing. Figures quoted are not comparable as they refer to different time periods i.e. Retford' calculated figure is from 2010-2037 (para 5.1.22) whereas Worksop's figures seem to be for 2018-2037(para. 5.1.17). To avoid confusion and clarity the figures quote throughout the document must be drawn from a consistent time period.	Worksop already has a significant amount of land for housing with current planning commitments. This needs to be deducted from the requirement. The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy. The time period for Retford is 2018 to 2037. The reference to 2010 is to highlight housing delivery since the adoption of the current Local Plan (Bassetlaw Core Strategy).

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
1197063	Resident	Para 5.1.32. states that for small rural settlements, there has been a total of 1747 dwellings already allocated within Neighbourhood Plans. This exceeds the required value of 1090 dwellings required at 20%. This is again confusing as it suggests that Neighbourhood Plans are already delivering over and above what is required. Villages who have produced a Neighbourhood Plan have undertaken significant work required to consult with local residents and identify growth needs in line with continuing to keep the character and amenities of the village. The Local Plan does not acknowledge their importance and should have been developed using these figures as a framework. So use the figure they have already created and impose the cap should be for villages where a Neighbourhood Plan is not in place?	The level and distribution of housing has been amended following consultation in January and updated evidence. Policy ST1 proposes a revised settlement hierarchy and the distribution of growth which includes around 1400 for the Large Rural Settlements and 1500 for the Small Rural Settlements. This in combination with neighbourhood plan allocations, housing commitments and completions means that the majority of growth has been permitted in these areas. However, Policy ST2 allows for some flexibility in how the proposed distribution of housing is managed locally and how the Council will treat additional growth beyond that proposed in the Local Plan through the focus of community development in neighbourhood plans. Growth in rural Bassetlaw will be monitored regularly to give communities and developers and up-to-date picture of housing commitments in these settlements. It is recognised that this will change frequently as permissions vary in their delivery and lapse rates. The proposed cap in previous versions of the Local Plan has been removed and replaced with a requirement per eligible settlement. This is detailed in Policy ST2 and evidenced within the revised Rural Settlement Study 2020.
1197063	Resident	Para 5.1.44 To ensure a sustainable strategy is delivered, the number of homes must be balanced with the number of jobs expected to be delivered in the District. Where are the jobs being created in the District? Apart from additional builders of course.	The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment has been updated which demonstrates the justification for the housing and employment targets and the balance between the two. 10 sites are identified for employment growth, 8 already have planning permission. The main areas for new employment are in Worksop, Harworth and Retford and along the A1/A57 strategic growth corridors.
1197063	Resident	No potential reduction in village sizes acknowledge anywhere in the Local Plan? This could happen.	The Plan is looking to deliver growth, not to reduce the number of homes.
REF282	National Trust	Support elements of the Spatial Strategy, in particular bullet point 1 which promotes the efficient use of land, re-use of brownfield land, and protection of Best and Most Versatile agricultural land. Concerned about bullet point 2(d) which is overly permissive in relation to development in the countryside. Suggest that this should be qualified by inserting the words 'small scale' or 'of an appropriate scale'. This recognises that development in rural areas may be less inherently sustainable due to limited populations, transport, services etc. as well as the need to protect biodiversity and landscapes. Object to bullet point 2(c) which seeks to allocate 'at least 199.6ha' of surplus strategic employment land. The Economic Development Needs Assessment provides no evidence of need for this land. There is also a lack of evidence that this allocation would not impact detrimentally on regeneration of brownfield sites in the district or elsewhere. See also our comments on Policies ST8 and SEM1.	The text in ST1 is considered to be flexible "by supporting development in the countryside necessary to that location, including those which support the rural economy and where consistent with other policies in this Local Plan." There are other policies in the Local Plan which guide the scale and type of development in the countryside. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment has been updated which justifies the site at Apleyhead. The Local Plan does try to put as much development as possible on brownfield sites but there is not enough suitable land available to meet local needs. So some greenfield land is needed.
REF285	Home Builders Federation	Policy ST1 sets out a 5 tier settlement hierarchy and HLS provision for a minimum of 9,087 dwellings (478 dwellings per annum) for the period 2018-2037. There is no certainty that Neighbourhood Plans will come forward with the inclusion of housing site allocations. The sufficiency of the Council's HLS should not be delegated to Neighbourhood Plans without evidence of the deliverability and / or developability of such sites. There is no recourse if a Neighbourhood Plan is not made. It should be clear that the Council will undertake the necessary plan-making work should the Neighbourhood Planning process not successfully deliver the strategy of the Local Plan.	The Plan does not rely on Neighbourhood Plan allocations for the majority of the housing requirement. A significant amount of development will come from sites with planning permission and proposed Local Plan site allocations. Housing delivery will continue to be reviewed on an annual basis and the Local Plan will be reviewed within five years to ensure the housing requirement can continue to be met.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
REF286	Pegasus Group	<p>The overarching spatial strategy at Policy ST1 sets out the scale and distribution of development across the District, and provides a housing requirement of 9,087 dwellings for the District over the plan period 2018 – 2037 (478 dwellings per annum), 10% of which will be on sites of no larger than 1ha. This housing requirement is then distributed to Worksop, Retford and Harworth (a minimum of 5,483 dwellings), allocated Neighbourhood Plan sites in Large Rural Settlements (a minimum of 1,764 dwellings), non-allocated sites or sites to be allocated in Neighbourhood Plans in Small Rural Settlements (a minimum of 1,090 dwellings), and 750 dwellings at the Bassetlaw Garden Village. Policy ST1 C) proposes that 10% of the overall housing requirement for the District will be delivered on sites of 1 hectare or less, and this approach is supported. A wide range of sites will provide access to suitable land for a range of housebuilders; from small local companies to larger regional and national companies, which in turn offers a wide range of house types in order to meet housing needs across the District. The 2019 NPPF at paragraph 68 notes the important contribution small and medium sites can make to meeting the housing requirements of an area and notes that these sites are often built-out quickly.</p>	Support noted and welcome.
REF288	JVH Planning	<p>The strategy for the distribution of new homes is based on the three main settlements of Worksop, Retford and Harworth/Bircotes; the larger rural villages, smaller villages; a garden village and the redevelopment of a power station site. The Plan is confusing over the amount of land to be allocated in each of these tiers or locations once the existing commitments in the form of planning permissions have been deducted. It appears that Worksop there is a remaining required allocation of +546 In Retford there is a remaining required allocation of +528 Harworth Bircotes 0 In the Larger Rural Settlements ? [impossible to deduce from the plan} In the smaller rural settlements - 319 In a Garden Village +750 As a result of this the Plan is misrepresenting the position in the small rural settlements as set out in table ST2, which is completely misleading. The table implies that each village will be able to allocate a 20% figure over and above the number of dwellings in the settlement at 2018. This is clearly not the case as the overall figure for the smaller villages has already been exceeded. The Plan is completely unworkable as it is presently drafted.</p>	The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy.
REF288	JVH Planning	<p>Object to Policy ST1 on the basis that it includes new settlements at Cottam and at the A57/A1, which are unsustainable and undeliverable. It implies that there will be allocations in the main towns, but it is known already there is no requirement at Harworth Bircotes and it suggests that there will be a 20% growth in the smaller villages, which we know is incorrect because that number is already exceeded by the commitments. Object to the Cottam Power Station and the Garden Village being included in the strategy and suggest that the whole settlement hierarchy needs to be re visited with proper consideration of the level of homes that are needed over the Plan Period. The proposed development in the Garden Village and Cottam can be redistributed within the existing settlement hierarchy to settlements that can deliver new homes and can provide existing social and physical infrastructure.</p>	The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy. The new Garden Village is looking to the future, beyond the Local Plan period. The NPPF is very clear that we must plan for a minimum of fifteen years and look beyond this where possible. Spreading development across the District will create the flexibility needed to support a range of development of different types and sizes. It is important to support both towns and villages by delivering development that maintains and supports local services and facilities.
REF289	Lichfields	<p>Oppose the 20% growth cap ("Rural Growth figure") that is proposed to be applied to Small Rural Settlements and consider it to be at odds with Part C (1, c) of this same policy which, in Small Rural Settlements, seeks to deliver a minimum of 1090 dwellings on non-allocated sites or sites to be allocated in Neighbourhoods Plans. Support Policy ST1 seeking to define a 'minimum' number of dwellings to be delivered across the settlement hierarchy and, subject to the conflicting growth cap for Small Rural Settlements being removed, such an approach would ensure that that the draft Local Plan is sufficiently flexible to meet the demand for new housing throughout its lifetime. Part B (2, d) of Policy ST1 is welcomed in providing support for the development in the countryside where it is necessary to that location, including where it would support the rural economy. This approach is pragmatic and reflects paragraph 83 of the NPPF's support for a prosperous rural economy.</p>	The Strategy is seeking to ensure that there is a mix of development in all areas of the District. The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
REF290	JVH Planning	<p>The strategy for the distribution of new homes is based on the three main settlements of Worksop, Retford and Harworth/Bircotes; the larger rural villages, smaller villages; a garden village and the redevelopment of a power station site. However the Plan is confusing over the amount of land to be allocated in each of these tiers or locations once the existing commitments in the form of planning permissions have been deducted. It appears that In Worksop there is a remaining required allocation of +546 In Retford there is a remaining required allocation of +528 Harworth Bircotes 0 In the Larger Rural Settlements ? [impossible to deduce from the plan] In the smaller rural settlements -319 In a Garden Village +750 As a result of this the Plan is misrepresenting the position in the small rural settlements as set out in table ST2, which is completely misleading. The table implies that each village will be able to allocate a 20% figure over and above the number of dwellings in the settlement at 2018. This is clearly not the case as the overall figure for the smaller villages has already been exceeded. The Plan is completely unworkable.</p>	<p>The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy.</p>
REF290	JVH Planning	<p>Object to Policy ST1 on the basis that it includes new settlements at Cottam and at the A57/A1, which we consider are unsustainable and undeliverable. It implies that there will be allocations in the main towns, but it is known already there is no requirement at Harworth Bircotes and it suggests that there will be a 20% growth in the smaller villages, which we know is incorrect because that number is already exceeded by the commitments. Object to the Cottam Power Station and the Garden Village being included in the strategy and suggest that the whole settlement hierarchy needs to be re visited with proper consideration of the level of homes that are needed over the Plan Period. The proposed development in the Garden Village and Cottam can be redistributed within the existing settlement hierarchy to settlements that can deliver new homes and can provide existing social and physical infrastructure.</p>	<p>The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy. The new Garden Village is looking to the future, beyond the Local Plan period. The NPPF is very clear that we must plan for a minimum of fifteen years and look beyond this where possible. Spreading development across the District will create the flexibility needed to support a range of development of different types and sizes. It is important to support both towns and villages by delivering development that maintains and supports local services and facilities.</p>
REF291	Heyford Developments Ltd	<p>This draft policy identifies that the District will accommodate a minimum of 9,087 dwellings (478 dwellings per annum) for the plan period 2018-2037. In relation to the dwellings to be provided within the main towns; large rural settlements; and small rural settlements it is understood from the Land Availability Assessment, 2019 that 6,949 dwellings have planning permission; 540 dwellings are subject to a Neighbourhood Plan allocation, without planning permission; and 2,881 dwellings are to be allocated in the draft Plan. This provides an oversupply of around 1,689 dwellings (19.5%) against the proposed housing requirement of 9,087 dwellings (also taking into account completions from 2018/19). The LAA does not appear to factor in the potential for non implementation (or a 'lapse rate') of these planning permissions and allocations. Paragraph 2.16 states "where deliverability is questionable sites will be discounted", but no further details are provided. There is no commentary provided on why lapse rates have not been considered i.e. local market conditions and/or evidence of implementation rates in the District. The suggested oversupply should therefore be treated with caution. Further consideration should be given to the level of risk associated with the potential for non-implementation of those sites identified in the supply in order to ensure the overall spatial strategy is deliverable. This would be in accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance on Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessments which states that an overall risk assessment should be made as to whether sites will come forward as anticipated (Paragraph 024 ID: 3-024-20190722). Whilst the NPPF requires plans to meet 10% of the housing land supply via sites of 1 hectare or less, it should also be recognised that minor sites (9 or fewer dwellings) generally have a higher rate of non implementation given the nature of the landownership and potential developers. The evidence and draft Plan should reflect upon the degree of reliance on these small sites within the rural settlements supply. In relation to the proposed Bassetlaw Garden Village, the LAA assumes 60 dwellings will be delivered in 2024-2029; 420 dwellings in 2029-2034; and 270 dwellings in 2034-2037. Appendix C provides some further information on the site-specific trajectory. It states: "Evidence (NLP Start to Finish, 2016) indicates the site is developable beyond 5 years. Large sites have a longer lead in period but deliver at higher rates once established. This timescale also accords with the development of Harworth Colliery which will eventually accommodate approx. 1,000 dwellings." Further text within the LAA details that the Harworth Colliery site had a lead in time of approximately 8 years. The Site Selection Methodology Background Paper (2020) provides justification for the selection of the Bassetlaw Garden Village in relation to its sustainable location and ability to</p>	<p>The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy. The new Garden Village is looking to the future, beyond the Local Plan period. The NPPF is very clear that we must plan for a minimum of fifteen years and look beyond this where possible. Housing delivery rates have been reviewed and amended where necessary based on evidence of delivery within the District and for Garden Villages in other areas of the country. This has been informed by Lichfield's Start to Finish 2nd Edition (February 2020). Spreading development across the District will create the flexibility needed to support a range of development of different types and sizes. It is important to support both towns and villages by delivering development that maintains and supports local services and facilities. A lapse rate has been factored in to assumptions for underdeliverty in the rural area.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
		<p>provide for infrastructure. No information related to deliverability is provided. No further information on deliverability is provided in the Bassetlaw New Settlement Addendum Paper (2020). Have significant concerns regarding the ability of this draft allocation to provide 750 dwellings within the Plan period, particularly in a sustainable manner. The anticipated supply set out Policy ST1 and the LAA supporting evidence should be reviewed to take account of risks related to non-implementation (lapse rates) and to provide a trajectory for Bassetlaw Garden Village that relates to the site-specific circumstances. The growth identified in Policy ST1 (and ST2) is in part reliant on the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans and their ability to identify sufficient sites which can deliver the identified housing. As an example, the draft Blyth Neighbourhood Plan is reliant on one site to deliver practically its entire housing requirement, despite there being no evidence on this being deliverable or developable. This may be the case for a number of other Neighbourhood Plans and this presents risks to the Council's housing supply.</p>	
REF291	Heyford Developments Ltd	<p>Our comments in relation to the 20% growth 'cap' for Large Rural Settlements. The spatial strategy needs to be revisited in light of this, as well as the issues we have raised with the Council's housing land supply and trajectory. Consider further housing should be directed towards sustainable Large Rural Settlements such as Blyth for the reasons set out in our response to Policy ST2. This will have an effect on the spatial strategy and Policy ST1. Support the uplift in the housing requirement to 478 dwellings per annum to support economic growth, however the spatial strategy needs to ensure that housing and employment needs are aligned, so that housing is proposed where there is demand for employment. As paragraph 3.5 of the draft Plan notes, 'the logistics sector continues to grow, with significant investment taking place, and market interest evidenced, along the A57 and A1 corridors'. The recently upgraded A1 junction to the north of Blyth offers a significant opportunity to meet this need and assist in delivering economic growth in the District. Housing should be located nearby to ensure jobs and workers are closely located and accessible by public transport – there are regular buses running between Blyth and the A1 roundabout to the north. Suggested changes: 1. Publish a Statement of Common Ground to demonstrate compliance with the duty to cooperate in relation to outstanding matters including unmet housing needs from neighbouring authorities. 2. The anticipated supply set out in Policy ST1 and the LAA supporting evidence should be reviewed to take account of risks related to non-implementation (lapse rates) and to provide a trajectory for Bassetlaw Garden Village that relates to the site-specific circumstances (see our concerns set out in response to Policy ST3). 3. A mechanism for guarding against non-delivery of housing through Neighbourhood Plans should be included (see Policy ST2). 4. In light of the matters raised in relation to Policy ST1, and issues around supply, trajectory and deliverability, further growth should be directed to the sustainable settlement of Blyth.</p>	<p>The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment has been updated which demonstrates the justification for the housing and employment targets and the balance between the two. The Local Plan states that neighbouring authorities have agreed to meet their own housing and employment needs. This will be evidenced through forthcoming Statements of Common Ground. The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy. The new Garden Village is looking to the future, beyond the Local Plan period. The NPPF is very clear that we must plan for a minimum of fifteen years and look beyond this where possible. Housing delivery rates have been reviewed and amended where necessary based on evidence of delivery within the District and for Garden Villages in other areas of the country. This has been informed by Lichfield's Start to Finish 2nd Edition (February 2020). Spreading development across the District will create the flexibility needed to support a range of development of different types and sizes. It is important to support both towns and villages by delivering development that maintains and supports local services and facilities. A lapse rate has been factored in to assumptions for underdelivery in the rural area.</p>
REF292	JVH Planning	<p>The strategy for the distribution of new homes is based on the three main settlements of Worksop, Retford and Harworth/Bircotes; the larger rural villages, smaller villages; a garden village and the redevelopment of a power station site. However the Plan is very confusing over the amount of land to be allocated in each of these tiers or locations once the existing commitments in the form of planning permissions have been deducted. It appears that In Worksop there is a remaining required allocation of +546 In Retford there is a remaining required allocation of +528 Harworth Bircotes 0 In the Larger Rural Settlements ? [impossible to deduce from the plan] In the smaller rural settlements -319 In a Garden Village +750 As a result of this the Plan is misrepresenting the position in the small rural settlements as set out in table ST2, which is completely misleading. The table implies that each village will be able to allocate a 20% figure over and above the number of dwellings in the settlement at 2018. This is clearly not the case as the overall figure for the smaller villages has already been exceeded. The Plan is completely unworkable.</p>	<p>The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy.</p>
REF292	JVH Planning	<p>Object to Policy ST1 on the basis that it includes new settlements at Cottam and at the A57/A1, which we consider are unsustainable and undeliverable. It implies that there will be allocations in the main towns, but it is known already there is no requirement at Harworth Bircotes and it suggests that there will be a 20% growth in the smaller villages, which we know is incorrect because that number is already exceeded by the commitments. Object to the Cottam Power Station and the Garden Village being included in the strategy and suggest that the whole settlement</p>	<p>The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy. The new Garden Village is looking to the future, beyond the Local Plan period. The NPPF is very clear that we must plan for a minimum of fifteen years</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
		<p>hierarchy needs to be re visited with proper consideration of the level of homes that are needed over the Plan Period. The proposed development in the Garden Village and Cottam can be redistributed within the existing settlement hierarchy to settlements that can deliver new homes and can provide existing social and physical infrastructure.</p>	<p>and look beyond this where possible. Spreading development across the District will create the flexibility needed to support a range of development of different types and sizes. It is important to support both towns and villages by delivering development that maintains and supports local services and facilities.</p>
1197091	William Davis	<p>Overall the spatial strategy is supported. Worksop is considered to be the most sustainable settlement and provides a good range of services/facilities and employment opportunities. The Housing Trajectory identifies a total supply of 10339 dwellings; this represents a 13% buffer over the housing target. The Local Plans Expert Group recommended that a 20% supply over the housing target should be included in the Local Plan to provide flexibility; providing this would be consistent with national policy (paragraph 59 regarding the need to significantly (our emphasis) boost the supply of housing) and would meet the tests of soundness. Bassetlaw should aim to have a supply of deliverable/developable sites of at least 10904 dwellings during the plan period and preferably more; this requires additional allocations of around 565 dwellings; a further buffer on top of this would also be appropriate to address any shortfall due to delays at the proposed new settlements. As the most sustainable settlement, Worksop represents the most appropriate place to make these additional allocations. Some of the growth at rural settlements is to be allocated in Neighbourhood Plans; there are risks with this approach. Neighbourhood Plans may not allocate any land, allocate insufficient land or allocate non-deliverable sites. This could mean that housing need is not delivered meaning the plan is not effective, failing one of the tests of soundness. It is necessary to ensure that sufficient sites are allocated in the Local Plan to deliver the housing requirement of at least 10904 dwellings during the plan period. The trajectory identifies that a number of these sites have been submitted by landowners who have confirmed their availability in the five year period; while a number are non-major development, it is unclear if there is a housebuilder involved with the major development sites and whether there is the clear evidence to demonstrate they meet the NPPF definition of deliverable.</p>	<p>The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment has been updated which demonstrates the justification for the housing and employment targets and the balance between the two. In terms of housing supply in a Local Plan, the NPPF does not recommend a 20% buffer. The NPPF does apply three buffers in relation to the five year housing land supply, 5%, 10%, and 20%. The higher 20% should be applied where housing delivery has not met its housing requirement target over a sustained period. Bassetlaw has consistently delivered well in excess of the housing need figure over the past four years. As such, a 5% buffer should be applied to the Five Year Housing Land Supply. Upon submission for examination, the Local Plan is likely to have a larger buffer due to the number of commitments and site allocations. The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy.</p>
1197164	The Planning & Environment Studio	<p>Objection: Development Boundary – London Road, Retford. Autism East Midlands (AEM) is a registered charity established in 1968. Its mission is to advocate, provide and develop high-quality services, information, and support, in partnership with others, for all those whose lives are affected by autism. It strives to recognise and respond to the needs of the individual, enabling autistic people to live their lives with dignity, choice and independence. To help achieve these aims AEM provide a wide range of services to help individuals to live their lives the way they want, including support for independent living. Autism East Midlands own property and land on the southern edge of Retford at South Lodge, London Road (see attached plan) as a registered care home, including specialist supported living units. The development limit is not clearly justified nor reflects significant sustainability benefits or settlement character function. It is also inconsistent with the town's Conservation Area boundary. Moreover, the proposed development boundary adjustments elsewhere across the town would serve to have far more significant impacts upon character and settlement form than the changes proposed in this representation. The Settlement Development Limit for the area around South Lodge and London Road is not proposed for adjustment in the emerging Regulation 18 consultation local plan. The established limits for the south of the town within the adopted Core Strategy take a convoluted line to enclose the Allison Avenue housing estate to the east, before narrowing markedly to return back along Grove Road, before returning southwards to enclose two large properties and their curtilages at The Hardmoors and Montague House fronting London Road. The SDL then crosses London Road to enclose properties to the west of London Road. There is no explanation for the specific reasons why this line has been retained in the emerging Local Plan apart from through apparent historic inertia. The evidence base used to justify the policy framework of the adopted Core Strategy – from its 2009 Issues and Options Paper to the 2010 Publication Draft and on to adoption does not include any reference to a settlement development limits study or review. No case is set out in adopted policy why the development boundary has been drawn as it has. Whilst AEM does not challenge the overall logic for most delineation between the settlement and open countryside, it is equally not satisfactory that historic delineation is maintained without justification or evidence, when it is seen appropriate</p>	<p>The request for a revision to the proposed development boundary for Retford has been considered during the revision of the local Plan. The request however does not meet the stated methodology for reviewing the development boundary as identified within the revised Spatial Strategy Paper 2020. Therefore no change to the development boundary is proposed to this part of Retford within the November 2020 Local Plan.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
		<p>that many other elements of the plan are (and should be) periodically reviewed through the Local Plan process. As such it is vulnerable to failing the tests of soundness in respect of being positively prepared to support sustainable development and justified - being based upon evidence. The implications of the SDL are significant in relation to spatial policy which would apply within or outwith that line, and as such has sustainability consequences. AEM proposes that through the current Local Plan process the SDL to the immediate west of South Lodge, should be redrawn to follow the southern boundary of the site, immediately south of the long-established driveway to South Lodge from London Road. The existing SDL and our proposal is indicated on the Policies Map extract below. The proposed change to the SDL is justified as follows: Settlement Form. There is no logical justification for the exclusion of South Lodge from the SDL. The large detached dwelling and its curtilage/associated paddock is a clear continuation of the character of the established area of large dwellings found to the southern reaches of London Road known as White Houses. South Lodge is a large property of Edwardian heritage which associates closely with Montague House and Hardmoorlands in terms of proximity, scale, setting and character, yet those properties fall within the SDL and South Lodge does not. There are no clear and defining permanent boundary lines to the north of South Lodge which physically or perceptually indicate the edge of the town, nor separate the house and grounds from the town and immediate neighbourhood. The prominent coniferous hedgerow / treeline and post-and-rail fencing south of Montague House is neither a permanent, historic nor positive contributor to local character. The existing (and by definition 'proposed') SDL around the White Houses locale includes the large mid 20th century housing estate at Allison Avenue.</p>	
1197164	The Planning & Environment Studio	<p>This area is of a wholly different character but actually extends the SDL to the east and south of South Lodge. South Lodge and grounds therefore do not represent an outlying or disconnected element of the built framework of Retford and there is no discernable break (having regard to established character) between it at other large dwellings within the SDL. Conversely there is a clear and established break in character and physical delineation to the south of South Lodge, far more identifiable than the existing SDL boundary line. The hedgerow and driveway serving South Lodge from London Road has been established since the house was built in the early 20th century (O.S. historic maps confirm this), and this presents a long-standing physical boundary feature. It is the landscape/townscape character change which is most abrupt and definitive immediately beyond this line, and which sets an appropriate and functional SDL than the existing. The character to the south of this line is wholly arable and the change is abrupt. A very large, open field sets the immediate rural hinterland to the town. The scale of the landscape and its low broken hedge to London Road are clearly a significant change in character to that north of the gateway to South Lodge. To the south there is no pavement and soft verges affording a rural landscape character typical of the landscape character area. The prominent gateway to South Lodge announces the southern edge of the town, with pavements, ornamental hedgerows and street lighting to both sides of London Road and change in speed limits emphasising the entry to Retford. The remodelled gateway itself is of a substantial ornamental design and prominence, recently approved under (18/01532/FUL) and otherwise generally not characteristic of the rural landscape. The vehicular entrance to South Lodge can therefore be seen to announce the entry to Retford itself on arrival from the south. The frontage to the South Lodge site includes the end point of the domestic and managed long hedgerow which continues northwards to Montague House and Hardmoorlands as a strongly residential feature. This abrupt change in character from arable farmland to leafy urban area is maintained immediately east of South Lodge along the same parallel by the same sudden transition from the Allison Avenue estate to the arable open landscape. However in that area the SDL does follow the break from farmland to residential area. Conservation Area designation and boundaries are not necessarily reflective of urban and rural setting or delineation. South Lodge it is pertinent to note that Retford Conservation Area boundary follows the South Lodge driveway as proposed as SDL in this representation. The Conservation Area Analysis (BCA) is reasonably recent, adopted in 2009. This describes the special character of the White Houses area. This recognises the semi-independent history of the area to that of Retford and describes its low density character where the large</p>	<p>The request for a revision to the proposed development boundary for Retford has been considered during the revision of the local Plan. The request however does not meet the stated methodology for reviewing the development boundary as identified within the revised Spatial Strategy Paper 2020. Therefore no change to the development boundary is proposed to this part of Retford within the November 2020 Local Plan.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
REF298	Axis PED Ltd	<p>In relation to 8-hectare site at Carlton Forest. The east of the site benefits from planning permission (reference 18/01093/OUT) for employment uses. Pre-application discussions have recently taken place with the Council regarding employment uses on the western part of the site. It is anticipated that a planning application for employment uses for the western part of the site will be submitted within a few months. These two areas are shown on Figure 2. Part of the site is previously developed land and the entire site is underutilised since the site's former use as a quarry ceased. Support the Council's proposed overall strategy and objectives in relation to economic growth and development. The Local Plan should create the right conditions to ensure economic growth can take place in the right areas. FCC's site is suitably located to deliver employment land in a location which, whilst outside of the settlement boundary, is well connected to the main urban area of Worksop. Further, employment development has already been established on part of the site through the granting of planning permission (ref: 18/01093/OUT). Anticipate that this development will commence in 2022. The west of the site is currently the subject of pre-application discussions and is to be leased this year and developed as the tenant needs to move from their existing premises within Bassetlaw, this will allow an existing business and significant employer to remain within the District. FCC's site lies to the north of Worksop adjacent to existing development and employment sites. Worksop is identified as the most sustainable location for significant growth and provides the best opportunity to deliver the objectives of regional and local industrial strategies. Support paragraph B1 which promotes the efficient and effective use of land and the re-use of previously developed land in sustainable locations. In accordance with the NPPF this will help to achieve sustainable development including economic growth in the appropriate locations. Historically been subject to quarrying activity, part of the site is previously developed therefore the proposed employment uses are an efficient use of the currently underutilised site. Broadly support Policy ST1 which sets out the Council's Spatial Strategy and settlement hierarchy. This Policy directs development to appropriate locations in accordance with the settlement hierarchy. The land to the south and south west of FCC's site forms part of an existing employment site and mixed use allocation. When developed, this would bring continuous development up to FCC's site from Worksop. It is considered that greater support should be provided within the supporting text for sites within the rural area, but outside of rural settlements that are sustainably and well located to contribute to the Council's employment land supply. FCC's site is well related to the existing settlement of Worksop and is suitably located to deliver sustainable economic development in line with the aspirations of the Local Plan and NPPF.</p>	<p>Planning permission exists for part of the site and an occupier is in place to develop the remainder in 2022. On that basis, there is no need to allocate the site a tenant is lined up to occupy. Therefore there is no need to allocate this land. The planning permission and development management process is addressing the needs of the site.</p>
REF299	Gladmans	<p>Broadly support the Council's proposed spatial strategy which seeks to deliver sustainable development and growth in line with the Council's ambition to achieve a 'step change' in the local economy. The spatial strategy will be delivered through a range of sites in sustainable locations including a Garden Village and a Priority Regeneration Area. Support the exploration into the delivery of a Garden Village and Priority Regeneration Areas, of the view that the spatial strategy should be modified to acknowledge the scope for further sustainable development at Bevercotes Colliery over the course of the plan period 2018-2037. The inclusion of Bevercotes as an additional Priority Regeneration Area for mixed-use development, aligns with the overall spatial strategy for the district which seeks to prioritise the regeneration of previously developed land and strives for a step change in economic growth. Policy ST1 criterion B1 would also benefit from a modification which makes clear that development, in addition to the sites identified within B2(A), should be directed towards sites on previously developed land which can be made sustainable through their re-development, namely Bevercotes Colliery.</p>	<p>The former Bevercotes Colliery is covered by local Wildlife Sites and is identified by the Bassetlaw HRA as having the potential to host breeding and foraging protected bird species associated with the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. Allocating the site is therefore contrary to legislation and national planning policy. However, the site has planning permission for employment development which is considered to be deliverable as a mitigation package has previously been agreed.</p>
REF300	Natural England	Welcome the vision and the emphasis that it gives to the green agenda particularly the recognition of the need to address climate change. Pleased to see that the benefits of multi-functional green and blue infrastructure have been highlighted and its importance to health and wellbeing.	Support noted and welcome.
REF300	Natural England	Note that this paragraph makes reference to Bassetlaw Garden Village Background Paper, 2019 (note that there is an addendum 2020 version). Concerned that the potential impacts on the Clumber Park Site of Special Scientific Interest have not been sufficiently considered. Welcome the inclusion of bullet point B1 which includes the protection of Best & Most Versatile (BMV) land which complies with guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).	A Recreational Impact Assessment is underway in partnership with Natural England to better understand the potential impacts of the Garden Village on Clumber Park SSSI. Support for the reference to agricultural land is welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
REF308	Resident	<p>There are many references within the Draft Plan to 'sustainable development'. The Plan adopts the World Commission on Environment and Development's definition of 'sustainable' (1987) - ie: "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" (Glossary P 182). This is a profound statement which has been widely adopted as THE definition of sustainability. It is a contradiction of terms to talk about sustainable development on greenfield sites, particularly where it is prime agricultural land. Destroying food producing land clearly compromises the ability of future generations to meet their needs. This amounts to 'greenwash' and references to sustainable development on all greenfield sites should be removed or, the definition of 'sustainable' should be changed in the Plan. In the plan, it would appear to be more in keeping with the Government's definition as outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework - which involves securing net gains from three overarching objectives ie - economic, social and environmental though this in itself, makes a mockery of the concept of sustainability.</p>	<p>Paragraph 7 of the NPPF indicates: 'At a very high level, the objective of sustainable development can be summarised as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs'. This accords with the aims and objectives of the Bassetlaw Local Plan. The Local Plan does try to put as much development as possible on brownfield sites but there is not enough suitable land available to meet local needs. So some greenfield land is needed.</p>
REF316	Fisher German	<p>The Spatial Strategy which proposes a hybrid approach to meeting the District's development needs is broadly supported. The proposed role of Tuxford as a 'Large Rural Settlement' reflects the town's role and sustainability credentials. Tuxford benefits from a range of local amenities and services including shopping, doctor's surgery, public houses and educational facilities primary school and Tuxford Academy. Tuxford also has excellent transport links, particularly the A1 from the which the wider motorway network is available with good rail links at Retford to the north and Newark to the south. It is considered sound for the town to be identified for future economic and residential growth. The Council's ambition to deliver increased housing, above base Local Housing Need established through the standardised methodology, is also supported. An uplift in housing is required to ensure an active working population is readily available in order to deliver the District's economic growth aspirations. This is a positive strategy which reflects the aims of the NPPF, both in supporting economic growth and boosting significantly the supply of housing. A buffer of 5% is considered appropriate when calculating housing land supply requirements, having regard for the 2019 housing delivery test results. With regards to spatial distribution, the Council intends to locate 20% of its housing requirement in the Large Rural Settlements of Tuxford, Blyth, Carlton in Lindrick and Cothorpe, Langold, Misterton, Cottam Garden Community. This approach is supported as it focuses development in the most sustainable locations. Concerns are however raised in respect of the Bassetlaw Garden Village (Policy ST3). The Garden Village allocation is intended to make a significant contribution to achieving and meeting the housing requirement within the Plan period, equating to just over 8% of the total requirement. To ensure a sound Plan it is imperative, therefore, to ensure that the Council's delivery assumptions for the site are realistic. The assumptions currently made in respect of the delivery of the site are considered ambitious and may result in the Council not meeting its housing need over the Plan period. In addition to the above approximately 12% of the total requirement for the Plan period is reliant on Neighbourhood Plans, or non-allocated sites across the 42 Small Rural Settlements to be delivered. This is a significant quantum of development across numerous settlements and has the potential to risk the delivery of the Plan.</p>	<p>The new Garden Village is looking to the future, beyond the Local Plan period. The NPPF is very clear that we must plan for a minimum of fifteen years and look beyond this where possible. Housing delivery rates have been reviewed and amended where necessary based on evidence of delivery within the District and for Garden Villages in other areas of the country. This has been informed by Lichfield's Start to Finish 2nd Edition (February 2020). Spreading development across the District will create the flexibility needed to support a range of development of different types and sizes. It is important to support both towns and villages by delivering development that maintains and supports local services and facilities.</p>
REF321	IBA Planning	<p>Support the Plan as presently drafted and welcome and support the inclusion of their land as part of the Peak Hills Farm housing and employment land allocations. Worksop is quite rightly identified as the principal town and most sustainable location for significant growth within the District and provides the best opportunity to deliver the objectives of regional and local growth and regeneration strategies. Its identification as a main town within the Bassetlaw Spatial Strategy (Policy ST1) is supported. The Draft Plan is considered to be appropriately ambitious to achieve the Council's stated Vision and Strategic Objectives for the Plan period up to 2037, yet sufficiently realistic (certainly as far as delivery on the Peak Hills Farm allocation is concerned) to provide stakeholders and ultimately the Examining Inspector with confidence over delivery in line with annual projections and certainty regarding issues of soundness and compliance with national planning policy. The increased annual housing requirements of 478 dwellings per annum (resulting in a minimum housing provision of 5483 dwellings in Worksop, Retford and Harworth) under Policy ST1:C.1a is supported, as is the increased employment provision in appropriate locations to meet future economic development needs and safeguard existing employment sites for B1 offices, B2 industry and</p>	<p>Support noted and welcome.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
		B8 storage and distribution under Policy ST1:C.2. The proposed employment allocation at Carlton Forest (EM005 – 10.6 hectares) is welcomed and supported – with 5 hectares of this, of course, already having been consented under LPA reference 15/01477/OUT.	
REF323	Emery Planning	This Policy seeks to set out the Spatial Strategy for development in Bassetlaw over the Plan period. Support the focus of the policy on delivering sustainable development and growth through, amongst other things, promoting the efficient and effective use of land and the re-use of previously developed land, which our client's site is well placed in assisting with. Note and welcome the fact that housing and employment targets set out are identified as minimums.	Support noted and welcome.
REF325	Consultant	The draft Local Plan aspires to encourage economic growth: "To make a real step change in economicconditions in the District" (paragraph 1.5.1). This approach is supported. The Plan also notes, (paragraph 3.5) the continuing growth of the logistics sector, with market interest "evidenced" along the A1 corridor in particular. The Council-approved commercial development at Blyth, known as Symmetry Park, is an acknowledged response to this interest. It is understood that the developers intended to develop the site speculatively – that is, the developers were aware of and responded to market forces but that the initial commitment to the site was made with no end users in place, thus emphasising the strength of these pressures. Suggest that the number, size, type and distribution of employment areas is inadequate to meet the Council's over-arching aspirations in two main and related respects. Whilst the emerging Local Plan correctly notes the attractiveness to employment developers of sites close to main transport links (and the A1 corridor is specifically mentioned in this regard) and also identifies a need to attract footloose businesses, the range of sites proposed for employment development does not respond to either of these factors. Footloose businesses by their very nature can pick and choose between sites to achieve their optimum location. If suitable sites in one area are not available, the businesses simply locate in areas where they are. This suggests a need to allocate as wider a choice of sites as possible consistent with other Local Plan objectives. At paragraph 5.1.57 the draft Plan notes the potential for economic growth above that provided for in the Local Plan as currently drafted with particular reference to strategic logistics growth (i.e. growth related to the transport and distribution sectors) and, at paragraph 5.1.58, notes specifically the increasing prominence of the A1 corridor.	The draft Local Plan allocates over 287 ha of employment land which the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment 2020 recognises is appropriate to meet the needs of the District to 2037. The Local Plan allocates a range of sites capable of identifying a range of business needs in a range of locations, close to the Main Towns and along the A1/A57 growth corridors therefore meeting a range of different end user needs. Sites are expected to come forward over the plan period to meet changing needs.
REF327	Scrooby Parish	Para. 5.1.26 Figure 5 Perhaps the picture Figure 5: Housing Distribution would be better placed before para. 5.1.15 or at the end of section 5.1 as a recap. Para. 5.1.32 Small Rural Settlements Please clarify !!! this says that small rural settlements up to a maximum of 20% will be supported. BUT, is this an ASPIRATION, not a REQUIREMENT. However, every comment we hear is that this 20% is a mandatory REQUIREMENT. Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy This says (amongst other things) "...that meets the evidenced needs for new houses and jobs..." and "...supports the necessary improvements to infrastructure and services...". Scrooby Parish and Neighbourhood Plan Team - Comments on the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020 Date: 25th February 2020 Page 2 of 6 How does Item A talking about evidenced needs and infrastructure improvements reconcile with the blanket numbers based on a nominal incremental value of 20% in Policy ST2 being enforced upon us.	The spatial strategy in particular the approach to the rural area has been revised in response to updated evidence and representations to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy and that the term used are clear for all users.
REF331	Worksop College (C/O Teakwood Partners)	Policy ST1 seeks to direct development to appropriate locations in accordance with a settlement hierarchy. Small Rural Settlements ("SRS") fall second on this hierarchy, and where housing growth of up to 20% is supported, in accordance with Policy ST2. It notes that the distribution of the minimum number of homes will include 'a minimum of 1,090 dwellings on non-allocated sites or sites to be allocated in Neighbourhood Plans for the SRS'. Ranby is an SRS. The growth of SRS is supported, particularly at Ranby, where it is considered additional growth can be accommodated on land owned by the college to the east of the settlement, along Straight Mile. One of the main objectives of the NPPF is to significantly boost the supply of homes, noting the importance of ensuring a significant amount and variety of land can come forward for housing (paragraph 59). Paragraph 60 requires local planning authorities to plan for a minimum number of homes. The test should be whether development can be proven to be sustainable, (e.g. avoid or mitigate adverse impacts on the SRS and comply with other development management policies), rather than imposing an arbitrary cap on new housing. Imposing an arbitrary cap on the maximum number	This policy accords with Paragraph 65 of the NPPF which indicates: "Strategic policy-making authorities should establish a housing requirement figure for their whole area, which shows the extent to which their identified housing need (and any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas) can be met over the plan period. Within this overall requirement, strategic policies should also set out a housing requirement for designated neighbourhood areas which reflects the overall strategy for the pattern and scale of development and any relevant allocations." The approach taken to the rural area, in conjunction with other policies in the Plan is considered to be flexible and consistent with the NPPF.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
		<p>of homes supported for such areas is inconsistent with the NPPF, which renders this policy unsound. In order to make the plan sound, Part B.2.b) of Policy ST1 should be amended to remove reference to the 20% cap, or make it clear that the 20% figure has been used to identify a reliable and deliverable supply of housing land, but should not be used as an absolute cap on development. Beyond the SRS the settlement hierarchy also supports development in the countryside necessary to that location (Part B.2.d.), and where consistent with other policies in the draft BLP. This general approach is supported, but it should also allow for flexibility around exceptional circumstances such as providing enabling development for a major community benefit, beyond a blunt assessment of need.</p>	
REF347	NJL Consulting	<p>Policy ST1 takes a positive approach to meeting future employment needs, allocating 108ha of new employment land (of which at least 81ha is expected to come forward by 2037) and at least 199.6ha of 'of strategic employment land to address a subregional/regional employment need and/or the significant expansion of a local business'. The Apleyhead Junction site (Draft Policy 9; SEM1) falls within this latter 'category' of strategic sites. Supporting text also seeks to focus growth to Worksop as one of three main towns and recognises the strategic importance of the A57 and A1 for employment. These overall ambitions are supported by Caddick, especially the ambition to enable the identification and release of suitable employment land on the A57 and A1 corridor. This support is predicated on the importance of ensuring that this ambition is not frustrated by site specific policies not aligning with this strategy. The release of land at Apleyhead Junction to meet employment needs is both welcomed and logical. Without an intervention of this nature, it would not be realistic for the Local Plan to achieve the step change in regeneration which is clearly sought by the Council. Whilst the identification of land releases to meet employment ambitions is welcomed, Policy ST1 Part C2 (Employment) should simply be confined to identifying the spatial approach to the employment allocations. Any reference to the type of employment that is intended to be provided within each location is not relevant and should be a matter for site specific policies. For the Local Plan's strategic vision of delivering a step change growth to be realised, the total employment land being proposed (307.98ha) (simplified to 308ha) must be met. If any part of this need is not delivered, then the overall vision and economic growth objectives for Bassetlaw would be unfulfilled. Indeed, the plan evidence base recognises the importance of all sites in the overall employment land offer. Policy ST1 should be amended to refer to the provision of 308ha of employment land to meet the economic objectives and the vision for Bassetlaw to 2037 and beyond. The emerging policies are inconsistent in their terminology. However, these policies can be remedied with simple revisions. For example, the policies use varying terminology, in referring to a mix of sub-regional /regional / footloose / major occupiers, which does not provide a clear description of the preferred uses and overall ambitions. This should be amended for consistency. Apleyhead Junction should be identified for a range of employment uses. That way, the key employment policies can align with the strategic vision and detailed policies including site allocations can follow on. Suggested policy changes 2. Employment: provision of land in appropriate locations to meet future economic development needs and safeguard existing employment sites for B1 offices, B2 industry and B8 storage and distribution as follows: a) At least 22.1 ha of employment land completed; b) At least 108 308ha of new employment land, of which at least 81ha is expected to come forward by 2037; c) At least 199.6ha of strategic employment land to address a sub-regional/regional employment need and/or the significant expansion of a local business.</p>	<p>The Housing and Economic Development needs Assessment 2020 clarifies the approach taken to Apleyhead. It provides the justification for a strategic employment need: to address the regional/sub regional investment needs of significant indigenous growth and national and regional investment to meet exceptional, unanticipated needs over the plan period. The employment land policy will be clarified on that basis. It is appropriate for Policy ST1 to recognise that difference between the two categories of employment land. Terminology will be clarified for consistency.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
REF352 -	North and South Wheatley Parish Council	<p>At the higher level, note that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The population of Bassetlaw is projected to increase by 3.8% between now and 2037; an increase of 4350 (Para 3.12). • The population increase will be in the 65+ and 80+ age groups but a reduction is expected in the 16-64 age group. • The new housing requirement for Bassetlaw between now and 2037 is 9087 (Para 5.1.46). Do not see how an increase in population of 4350 would generate an increase in required housing of 9037 – over two houses per extra head of population 	<p>The increase in population is just one factor that is taken into consideration in determining the housing requirement for the District. Many existing households in Bassetlaw contain 'concealed households'. This happens where younger household members are unable to afford to buy or rent their own home. Also, there is a lack of the right types of home available for first time buyers, downsizers, families and specialist homes for older people. There is also a requirement to ensure there are enough homes to support jobs growth in the district. A growing older population means that there will be fewer people to take up jobs in the district. The calculation of the housing requirement takes into consideration all of these factors. The Council has undertaken an assessment of housing need in accordance with national policy (NPPF) and guidance (PPG on Housing and Economic Needs).</p>
REF363 -	Resident	<p>There again seems to be a mismatch in the number of houses to be built over the plan period. In the 2019 document on page 14 you quote a population increase of 5000. In your present document this figure is down graded to 4350 (without evidence where this figure comes from). Also in your 2019 document you proposed to build 6630 houses for this increase however in your latest document you propose to build 9087 properties to accommodate a smaller increase in population. Later in your present document on Para 5.1.42 you quote a figure of 307 houses required over a period of 19 years which equates to 5833.</p>	<p>The changes in housing numbers change to reflect changes to evidence baseline statistics. The housing requirement for the District takes into account 'concealed households'. This happens where younger household members are unable to afford to buy or rent their own home. Also, there is a lack of the right types of home available for first time buyers, downsizers, families and specialist homes for older people. There is also a requirement to ensure there are enough homes to support jobs growth in the district. A growing older population means that there will be fewer people to take up jobs in the district. The housing requirement and the changes seen reflect this. The Council has undertaken an assessment of housing need in accordance with national policy (NPPF) and guidance (PPG on Housing and Economic Needs).</p>
REF366	Broadgrove	<p>Policy ST1 states that "Development will focus on delivering sustainable development and growth, appropriate to the size of each settlement, that meets the evidenced need for new homes and jobs, regenerates the District's town centres, and supports necessary improvements to infrastructure, services and facilities." Harworth and Bircotes is identified as one of the District's three main settlements and acknowledgement of the opportunity to focus investment and new development to support the regeneration of Bassetlaw's third largest settlement and in particular the town centre. Paragraph 3.23 states "The delivery of new homes has spearheaded the regeneration and renewal of many parts of the District – acting as a catalyst for physical change and often well-needed investment in social and environmental infrastructure - Harworth & Bircotes for example will effectively double its size in the future, attracting new industry and national retail chains as a result of the growth in the town." Harworth being geographically located within the north of the district and has excellent connections to South Yorkshire and access to the A1. It also serves an important role for facilities to support a large number of rural villages in the north of Bassetlaw. Despite the focus for regeneration the level of housing is disproportionate to the level of employment land being provided across the district. There is a substantial level of employment land proposed in Harworth and Bircotes but no new housing allocations, which places a significant reliance on the delivery of the colliery site. Given the specific recognition of the plan to strengthen its role as a local infrastructure and service centre for the northeast of the district this brings into question again the overall housing target and lack of ambition for economic growth – contradictory to the aims of regenerating the town and improving the local centre. There needs to be sufficient housing to accommodate and assist the potential that exists for new economic investment and development. This needs to be increased from the level currently proposed. The NPPF and NPPG do not provide</p>	<p>The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy. A significant number of planning permissions have been granted in Harworth and Bircotes in recent years, which will result in the delivery of approximately 2000+ new dwellings. This is considered appropriate to meet Harworth and Bircotes needs over the plan period so it is not considered appropriate or necessary to allocate land in Harworth and Bircotes as the settlements already have an appropriate level of housing supply to drive and support the regeneration of the area. Employment development in and around Harworth totals over 90ha which is considered appropriate to meet growth needs.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01Bassetlaw's Strategy			
		<p>particular guidance on how housing need should be distributed in a Local Plan. Without such guidance, it is down to Bassetlaw Council to establish a distribution to support the Vision and Objectives of the Local Plan. The resulting distribution will inevitably represent a policy response to meeting identified need, however, it must be realistic, rational and soundly based. There is a significant disparity of future development across the north and south of the district. 100% of new housing allocations are proposed across the south of the district (including a new garden village) If there is a real intent to regenerate Harworth and Bircotes and see a step change of housing delivery, there should be greater focus on housing in the north of the district. A more appropriate strategy would be for greater development to be focussed around Harworth rather than a new garden village. The development of a greenfield garden village with a minimum of 750 dwellings will have a detrimental effect on the potential that could be generated from additional growth and regeneration in Harworth. A more appropriate solution would be for a significant increase in growth around Harworth and Bircotes to create another rural hub town of a similar status to Retford in the north of the district. One of the key issues raised in the Local Plan, and during the determination of planning applications by local residents is the lack of infrastructure required to adequately accommodate new development and provide support for existing residents of the town. The current strategy of allocating no new allocations and relying one existing permissions in Harworth is flawed and will not provide the appropriate levels of infrastructure to deal with existing shortages never mind mitigation and enhancement of the local services. The colliery site is heavily relied upon in the numbers of residential units that will be provided in Harworth during the plan period. This site, understandably given the issues around redeveloping such contaminated sites, has taken a number of years to come to fruition. Not only does this raise issues of delivery but how the required levels of affordable housing will be delivered. The colliery site owners have made a clear statement of intent by setting out that due to issues of viability they do not intend to provide affordable housing as part of their current application for the site. Dealing with affordable housing need the current strategy needs to increase the provision of affordable housing. The 2017 SHMA sets out a net need of 134 affordable units for the District. The delivery of affordable housing across the District has been poor and has exacerbated a significant shortfall. The level required has never been delivered and as can be seen below, has never reached 50% of the requirement across the District. The levels of completions in Harworth have been even more alarming from 2013.</p>	
REF366	Broadgrove	<p>Year Overall completions (District wide) Affordable completions (District wide) Harworth affordable completions % of affordable completions across the District 2017/18 551 57 52 10% 2016/17 462 64 4 7% 2015/16 338 7 0 0.02% 2014/15 241 24 0 0.99% 2013/14 249 14 0 0.05% The current policy framework has not worked, over the plan period, when considering the figures above. There is a stark difference between numbers of permissions and affordable housing delivery across the District. Between 2011 and 2035 the 2014-based household projections suggest that the average household size in Bassetlaw will fall from 2.3 to 2.2 persons per household. Applying the same proportional decrease to the average household size in Harworth, the average household size in the town would be 2.17 by 2035. As a result, there would be a need to provide around 200 additional dwellings to accommodate the additional households within the existing population alone as people live in smaller household groups (including children moving out of the family home, older people living alone following the death of a partner, increased levels of household breakdown and young people choosing to live alone). Linked to its role as an important infrastructure and service centre for the wider District, the Draft Local Plan recognises the importance of regeneration of the local centre and ability to attract national retailers. This will only be delivered with significant growth in population and ambitious housing numbers. The need to see a step change in housing delivery is also needed to provide housing numbers but also to ensure the delivery of the necessary infrastructure for to assist the economic growth. The delivery of improvements to the transport network, new education provision and other essential local services, as identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan will only be realised through significant additional housing growth. The level of housing proposed to be delivered in Harworth within the Bassetlaw Plan is too low. In order for the plan to deliver its Objectives and Vision, the housing proposed to be delivered in Harworth must be increased and new housing allocations identified. The site at Blyth Road also has the potential to provide a</p>	<p>The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy. A significant number of planning permissions have been granted in Harworth and Bircotes in recent years, which will result in the delivery of approximately 2000+ new dwellings. This is considered appropriate to meet Harworth and Bircotes needs over the plan period so it is not considered appropriate or necessary to allocate land in Harworth and Bircotes as the settlements already have an appropriate level of housing supply to drive and support the regeneration of the area. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment has been updated which demonstrates the justification for the housing and employment targets and the balance between the two. This increases the housing requirement over the plan period. By proposing growth in excess of the Standard Method this better addresses affordable housing and infrastructure capacity needs.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Spatial Strategy			
ST01	Bassetlaw's	link road between Blyth Road and Styrrup Road. This is a piece of infrastructure that was identified during the determination of the two planning applications as potentially bringing significant benefits to the distribution of traffic and alleviating pressures from other developments in the local area. This site could support and enable the delivery of this infrastructure. The proposed site is also in a more sustainable location than some of the recent housing commitments in Harworth and Bircotes. The site is within walking distance of the town centre and also the closest site to the new employment commitments to the south of the town, which make a logical, sustainable reason for allocating as a housing site.	
REF401	East Markham Parish Council	Unless Network Rail is willing to build new railway station at the Garden Village at Apply Head it will merely become an extension of housing into the Countryside. There is little evidence that BDC has applied this to existing developments within East Markham. There is little evidence of any attempts at regeneration in East Markham. East Markham PC does believe that BDC can deliver this.	Network Rail have given in principle support for the new railway station at the Garden Village. Local Plans and Neighbourhood Plans should be reviewed regularly to ensure they are delivering the right amount, type and mix of development. The new policies in the emerging Local Plan are seeking to deliver sustainable patterns of development of the right type and mix, including affordable housing and specialist housing for older and disabled people. East Markham PC are able to review their Neighbourhood Plan should they wish to have more influence over the type of development in their area.
REF475	Resident	Support of the overriding objectives of this Plan. Increasing housing and employment, while promoting healthy green living can only benefit Bassetlaw. A more thought out/deliverable approach to achieve the housing requirement should be considered. Creating a garden village will take enormous resource and funding. The towns in Bassetlaw are under-utilised with already improved transport links, they certainly support growth.	The new Garden Village is looking to the future, beyond the Local Plan period. The NPPF is very clear that we must plan for a minimum of fifteen years and look beyond this where possible. The Garden Village will be delivered in partnership with key infrastructure partners and stakeholders to ensure it can be delivered with the right infrastructure at the right time. The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy. One of the main objectives of the Local Plan is to support and improve the towns. A range of development in Worksop, Retford and on the Garden Village site will assist in this process through the connections via public transport and the highway network. Improved cycling and walking and public transport will be designed to enable easy access to existing facilities and services in each town.
REF486	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	In recent years, because we didn't have a five year land supply and up-to-date planning policies, not had full control over what gets built and where in Bassetlaw. With this Plan and a land supply that is at least eight years plus, we can take back control. Therefore, in the first, five year review period, let's try to get what Bassetlaw deserves. Need to make demands to achieve our aims for greener, more sustainable development. In regard to meeting our affordable housing ambitions, our infrastructure asks, our housing mix and quality, we should press our demands. Whilst 18 house builders commented about how we had under calculated our housing numbers, only five commented on affordable housing and just two on design issues. That's where their focus will be, unless shifted by us. Local people tell us at every Planning Committee, and it's in every Neighbourhood Plan that people want bungalows or smaller properties to downsize into. Yet the schemes we've had from developers in recent years, with one or two notable exceptions, don't reflect that. Let this plan give power to the wishes of local people in this regard. Welcome much of your description, especially emphasising the manufacturing base of local industry and Bassetlaw being a centre for large firms to locate to. What advantage is there in talking about Worksop as a former mining community? There's no mining heritage to exploit for tourism. Describing us as such, conjures up a sense of loss, a sense of past, good times that are unavailable now. Don't describe Retford as a former coaching stop, so why reference Worksop and its mining? It's been twenty five years since the last colliery shift, the merry-go trains with	It is important context that Bassetlaw's more recent history is referenced as that emphasises how far the District has progressed but also the extent of work still needed to be achieved to deliver the step change in the economy identified by the Council Plan. The draft plan is a very positive and ambitious Plan setting out a framework to deliver the spatial planning priorities for the District over the next 15 years or so. The Plan also identifies positive plans to regenerate Marnham, Cottam and other brownfield sites within our towns. Paragraph 5.1.57 acknowledges Bassetlaw's links to Doncaster-Sheffield Airport. As the Plan for Bassetlaw it would be inappropriate to promote the employment sites of another District. The purpose of this Plan is to promote the employment assets of Bassetlaw. Acknowledge that reference to Bassetlaw's businesses should be highlighted, although several are listed in the context. The role of Welbeck will be better reflected in the rural economy supporting text.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01 Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
		their marshalling yards have gone, Firbeck and Harworth are being built over, Shireoaks and Manton are greening over and Manton Wood takes over more of Manton pit. Mining has no meaning for large sections of the population and for those moving into Harworth, Shireoaks and Gateford. Be bold, ditch the reference to our mining past unless you can be positive about it. Talk about our proximity to Sherwood Forest as a benefit to our economy; why not mention our proximity to Doncaster-Sheffield airport, its Advanced Manufacturing Park and the AMP in Sheffield/Rotherham? Describe Worksop as the destination of choice for international companies such as Cerealto, MBA Polymers, Schulz, Laing O'Rourke and Irizimar. Can a case be made for arguing its strong on aerospace and defence sectors – Cinch, Eaton, Rockford, ICON aerospace and perhaps the businesses at Gamston if they are of any sophistication? Welbeck is a business as well as a heritage asset. 250 people are employed by the estate with a further several hundred hosted by the estate through its rented offices and units.	
REF489	Chesterfield Borough Council	Fully support the continuing use of the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw HMA grouping as an appropriate geography for establishing housing need. Support the housing requirement of 478 d/p/a as this would not result in a shortfall across the HMA. It is acknowledged that this is higher than both the LHN (307 d/p/a) and the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw Strategic Housing Market Assessment OAN Update 2017 (374 d/p/a including affordability uplift and to support baseline economic growth). The implications of this level of housing growth should be carefully monitored and discussed as part of regular Local Plan Liaison Meetings to highlight any unexpected unintended adverse effects on other districts housing delivery within the HMA and to inform the next round of Local Plan reviews. It is suggested that this could be included within the Monitoring Framework.	The Council will continue to positively engage with neighbouring authorities and authorities with the HMA to ensure that the implications of the spatial strategy are understood and impacts managed appropriately.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
1179100	Resident	Incredibly comprehensive document overall, however, what, if any, weight will be afforded by the Inspectorate in the matter of Appeals? It seems that even when BDC uphold their policies, the Appeal system overrules negating the policy in place. Further, what specific protection is being given to usable agricultural land and finally, how can the figures for rural growth be ratified with developments already granted since 2018. They do not marry up in some villages. Generally, a well thought out document with a bit of blue sky thinking in places, but clearly one intended to improve the economy and growth of the district.	Once the Local Plan is completed and is considered "sound" by the inspector, it will provide the opportunity for the Council to have an up-to-date Local Plan that is compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework and therefore affords full weight in local decision making. When that occurs, it will mean that the Council will have more power to make decisions that are supported by the most up-to-date policy. Rural monitoring has been updated to make it clearer which development contributes to the rural growth.
1180212	Resident	Lound residents has been working over the last 3 years (probably longer) to gather and analyse evidence, hold public consultations and other meetings in preparation for the submission of a Lound Neighbourhood Plan to Bassetlaw Council. Their work has been marked by a careful approach, retaining the confidence of residents, especially in the allocation of sites for new housing. Clear and what was regarded as secure information about the location of development sites has been circulated to village residents. The Plan is scheduled to be submitted to Bassetlaw Council in the next 2 weeks. The work completed has now been placed into question by a near doubling of Lound's target for new housing (42). The criterion used by Bassetlaw to calculate the new target is crude, taking no account of, for example, residents' views of the character of the village and adequacy of its existing amenities, transport links, the density of present housing provision together with the gain from large developments planned on North Road, for example, or any other important criteria. It seems that the government has set a target that Bassetlaw is chasing without regard for the implications in small rural communities. In Lound, this means that the work undertaken by the Neighbourhood Plan Committee including, crucially, residents' views about the type of housing wanted and where it should be located, has been cast into	Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE	
ST02 - Rural	Bassetlaw			
		<p>the air Confidence in Bassetlaw's approach to policymaking and their understanding of the time and difficulties of drawing up a Neighbourhood Plan has been diminished. It would be appreciated if Bassetlaw Council would not immediately enforce the new target for Lound, complicating the good work achieved so far. Sites for 21 houses, have been identified by Lound residents and placed in the Lound Draft Neighbourhood Plan. This is a sizeable number in a village that is basically organised around two roads, Town Street and Little Top Lane. If the character of either of these locations is changed by the needless imposition of new targets, damage will be done to the character of the village and to its residents. Please remove the obligation for Lound to revise its Neighbourhood plan, finalised within the last month. One approach would be to reassess progress with Lound's existing plan in 5 years' time. At that time, it would be possible to assess if new targets are necessary. Economic growth in Bassetlaw, population movements into or out of the area, whether sites like North Road have provided enough houses in line with overall need, and other important subjects could then be considered. That strategy would allow time for needed adjustments and avoid the present doubling of village targets when Lound has undertaken what was required by the Council in the very recent past. An alternative, practical solution is for Bassetlaw's overall small settlement target to be pooled. The inflated target for Lound could then be reallocated to villages wanting more development than their revised quota permits. That would be a fair and just way of developing an alternative policy, returning Lound to its original, planned target. Lound will deliver 21 new homes. To now require the village to develop sites for 42 houses just as a plan for 21 has been agreed is unwise and a policy that should be revised urgently.</p>		
1185614	Resident	<p>The increase from 10% requirement to 20% cap is a considerable increase for small rural settlements. For villages such as Lound this means an increase from 21 to 42. This increase will change the character of the village and undermines the views and wishes of the villagers as identified in the draft neighbourhood plan. Small rural settlements vary in size considerably, there is need for further consideration on the demands of a one cap fits all.</p>	<p>The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.</p>	
1188560	Resident	<p>The housing requirement increase from 10% to 20% is too many and that Bassetlaw's own figures demonstrate that this number is not required. The evidence collected by our Parish Council's Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group over the last 4 years shows that there is a general acceptance of 21 new houses (10%) but that a doubling of this is unsupportable. The number of houses required by your Draft Plan is 1090 in the SRS category, yet the 20% requirement shown in Policy ST2 will provide 2124 houses, a 100% over-provision. If many villages are already using the 20% requirement then there is no need for other SRSs to struggle to supply an unpopular increase in their requirement. In Lound the infrastructure, drainage, power supply, etc, will not support such a large increase. Our village has infrequent public transport that is essentially unusable, and thus new houses will depend on private transport. This is against several of the stated aims of the Draft Local Plan, i.e. to increase sustainability and to mitigate climate change. The Local Plan emphasises the provision of smaller/starter homes, which SRSs like Lound are unlikely to provide. Your Draft Plan Policy ST2 states that for Large Rural Settlements that 'Unless otherwise promoted through Neighbourhood Plans...' they will provide 20% growth. SRSs do not have this reference to Neighbourhood Plans, and this apparently diminishes the importance of Lound's Neighbourhood Plan. I propose that the requirement for a 20% increase within SRSs be reduced to 10% with a provision for more development if their Neighbourhood Plan supports this according to local needs. This will still provide your requirement and will produce a fairer result.</p>	<p>The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.</p>	
1189264	Resident	<p>One of the redeeming features of bassetlaw, particularly the north east section are its rural villages and communities as apposed to the poorly thought out and ugly urban centers like Worksop. People often move to these areas to escape the urban sprawl, over crowding and ugly new builds. It therefore seems counter productive to encourage new developments in these areas, simply to maintain the population. Simple solution; encourage more small businesses in the area, entrepreneurs etc and you will soon find people moving back into these rural villages to escape the rat race.</p>	<p>Noted. Thank you for your comment.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
1189654	Resident	<p>Lound is a small rural village designated as an SRS. To double its housing requirement to 20%, 42 in total clearly is not necessary and this is demonstrated in BDC's own figures. Our infrastructure would not support such a large increase and would cause environmental issues that go against a number of the aims of the Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Infrequent public transport which makes car usage necessary, a high volume of HGV traffic through the village to Charcon Industries and the Anaerobic Digestion Plant from early morning and through out the day, inadequate drainage systems which even now lead to flooding of some properties are but some of the existing problems the village faces. An increase as suggested of 20% is totally unfair on this village.</p>	<p>The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.</p>
1189633	Resident	<p>I have noticed that you state the requirement for houses in small rural settlements is 1090. Your allocation of 20% to each settlement means that you have increased your requirement (if that is what it is) by over 1,000 houses. There is no explanation for this increase which, to say the least, is unfortunate and surely the cause of confusion. This 'discrepancy', however, allows flexibility and the reallocation of housing numbers from village to village.</p> <p>Small villages that wish to remain small (there can be no objection to having small villages in Bassetlaw) should be permitted to transfer some extra numbers to settlements that want more than a 20% increase of housing numbers. If settlements wanting more than 20% are allocated extra numbers and others accept the 20% rise there is surely flexibility to leave Lound's commitment to 21 houses (a figure arrived at after 4 years of difficult work) to remain as its allocation. That would allow you to deliver your requirement of 1090 and probably more. After such a long period of sustained work I think it is very unfair to raise Lound's allocation. We do not have the infrastructure for 42 houses. Car numbers would be increased meaning a increase in C2 emissions, which is in conflict with the national planning policy that places sustainability as one of its 3 main principles. Bassetlaw's increases of 20% to each village is surely in conflict with its objective of sustainability. Villages do not have shops and other facilities. Each household is likely to have 2 cars and an increase of houses means a very large increase in journeys to towns with required facilities. This is undesirable.</p>	<p>The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.</p>
1189633	Resident	<p>Currently face the joint existential threats of climate and biodiversity collapse. Hoping to see a plan which reflected the need for housing to be located in areas which minimise the need to travel and maximise the ability to make trips by sustainable modes of transport. Highlight this in your plan, along with the fact that you wish to develop higher densities of development in the most accessible sites. See a lazy approach of just adding 20% to all rural settlements, with apparently little or no thought as to the points above. I live in Lound, and as a committed environmentalist I can confirm that it is impossible to travel effectively outside of the village for work (where you have to arrive not wet and not muddy) without use of a private car. Therefore, the placing of an additional 42 homes within the village will increase car travel in the district significantly. Challenge that this is in direct opposition to your aims of ST45. Our infrastructure would not support this volume of extra homes.</p> <p>Assuming, from the lack of care given to this process, that you have not visited Lound. Had you done so, you would know that in a number of places the road through our village is single track, so unable to support an increase in traffic. Our sewerage system is over capacity with the current number of homes. Support the construction of a small number of homes within Lound, if they were built to the highest possible environmental standards, and certainly should not be built with fossil fuel heating systems.</p>	<p>The majority of housing growth is being allocated to the main settlements where there is the supporting services and facilities. However, Bassetlaw is a largely rural District and many of our communities are small and have few services. In some of these locations there is a need for accommodation and employment and the Local Plan is providing a strategy that will support a proportionate level of growth subject to its size and level of existing services. Communities across the District are also developing Neighbourhood Plans to manage their growth in a way that will benefit them. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement" but the percentage of growth has been reduced to 5%.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
1189746	Residents	<p>Concerned that the Plan has changed so dramatically. We believe that this will have an extremely negative effect on our village, LOUND. We understand that the Housing Requirement for small local communities has doubled from 10% to 20% but that Bassetlaw's own figures do not support the need for this substantial increase. For our village specifically this means an increase from 21 more houses, which was accepted by our parish council, to a total of 42 houses. The impact of this on the village will be substantial. An increase of 42 houses is likely to result in 84 more cars since the bus service is infrequent and expensive. The local plan emphasises the need for small starter homes but the cost of any home in this village would be above the starter home price band. The roads in and out of the village are poorly maintained and Chainbridge Lane is already subject to frequent heavy commercial traffic to Charcon and the autodigester at Sutton Grange. The main village street, Town Street, is very narrow with narrow pavement. Street parking already causes problems for buses, agricultural vehicles etc. There are no facilities in the village apart from a public house so residents have to travel for all amenities ie. schools, shops, medical care etc. Welcome new residents to the village, especially young ones, to increase the diversity of the population but it must be on a sustainable basis, in proportion to the overall infrastructure of the village as it is at present.</p>	<p>The majority of housing growth is being allocated to the main settlements where there is the supporting services and facilities. However, Bassetlaw is a largely rural District and many of our communities are small and have few services. In some of these locations there is a need for accommodation and employment and the Local Plan is providing a strategy that will support a proportionate level of growth subject to its size and level of existing services. Communities across the District are also developing Neighbourhood Plans to manage their growth in a way that will benefit them. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement" but the percentage of growth has been reduced to 5%.</p>
1189759	Resident	<p>See that each small rural settlement which includes Lound had had its housing requirement doubled from 10% to 20%. Where has this figure come from and how can it be justified in such a small village. In Sutton cum Lound many of the new properties are not selling so in my opinion demand is not there! How can the villages small infrastructure support 40+ properties. It was challenging enough for 20 I would refrain from this and revert back to 10% which might just meet the needs of the local area. Other villages where they are building are not selling so supply is greater than demand coupled with the increased environmental impact on our villages and others</p>	<p>The majority of housing growth is being allocated to the main settlements where there is the supporting services and facilities. However, Bassetlaw is a largely rural District and many of our communities are small and have few services. In some of these locations there is a need for accommodation and employment and the Local Plan is providing a strategy that will support a proportionate level of growth subject to its size and level of existing services. Communities across the District are also developing Neighbourhood Plans to manage their growth in a way that will benefit them. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement" but the percentage of growth has been reduced to 5%.</p>
1190131	Resident	<p>Not happy about the fact that the housing requirements has doubled from 10% to 20%.As a village we were quite prepared to look for a 10% increase but 20% will totally alter the character of the village. People move to a village because they want a small close knit community and don't expect to see this increase by such a large mount. Although I would like to see housing for first time buyers and young families I am concerned that such a large increase of properties will overwhelm the school . I suggest the percentage be reduced to the original figure.</p>	<p>The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.</p>
1190145	Resident	<p>Feel very strongly that the proposal to increase Lound's Housing Requirement from 10% to 20% is totally unacceptable. Our Parish Council's Neighbourhood Plan Committee has worked with parishioners who have generally accepted the addition of 21 houses. However, doubling this number would be unsustainable as the infrastructure would not support the increase - drainage, public transport etc.</p>	<p>The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.</p>
1190215	Resident	<p>It is proposed that each Small Rural Settlement (SRS), into which category Lound falls, has its Housing Requirement doubled from the previous 10% to 20% of its size in 2018. I think this is too many and that Bassetlaw District Council's own figures suggest that this number is not required. Suggest that the requirement for a 20% increase within SRS's be reduced to 10% with a provision for more development if their neighbourhood plan supports this according to local needs.</p>	<p>The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassettlaw			
1190489	Resident	<p>Have followed the ongoing discussions and played an active part in meetings relating to the proposed development affecting our village, Lound. It is with significant concern that we have learned of the proposed changes, effectively doubling the housing requirement for the village. This appears to be a contradiction to the Council's own figures which demonstrate that this number is not required. We are particularly upset by the apparent lack of respect for the years of work done by the team of volunteers on behalf of Bassettlaw Council in establishing and developing Lound's Neighbourhood Plan. Was all of this work completed in vain? Accepting the need to contribute to the wider development and supply of homes nationally, believe that from the evidence collected by our Parish Council's Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group over the last 4 years, there is a general acceptance of 21 new houses (10%) Cannot understand or accept that doubling this is realistic. Understand that the number of houses required by your Draft Plan is 1090 in the SRS category, yet the 20% requirement shown in Policy ST2 will provide 2124 houses, a 100% over-provision. If many villages are already using the 20% requirement then there is no need for other SRSSs to struggle to supply an unpopular increase in their requirement. Fail to identify how the village of Lound could support the revised target. Lound's infrastructure, drainage, power supply, etc, will not support such a large increase. Our village has costly, infrequent public transport that is essentially unusable, and serves only to encourage increased dependency on private transport and defies the stated aim of the Draft Local Plan, i.e. to increase sustainability and to mitigate climate change. A provision of smaller, starter homes is highly unlikely. Given the Council's Draft Plan Policy ST2 states that, for Large Rural Settlements, 'Unless otherwise promoted through Neighbourhood Plans...' they will provide 20% growth. SRSSs do not have this reference to Neighbourhood Plans. We would strongly suggest that the requirement for a 20% increase within SRSSs be reduced to 10% with a provision for more development if their Neighbourhood Plan supports this according to local needs. This will still provide your requirement and will produce a fair result.</p>	<p>The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.</p>
REF024	Resident	<p>It is unacceptable after the village steering group has undertaken a lot of work based on the councils original premise,to then revise the local plan to basically double the number of houses expected to be built in Lound. It will significantly damage the way of village life and although we were willing to accept some change as inevitable,to double the numbers is unacceptable.please register my objection</p>	<p>The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.</p>
REF031	Residents	<p>See that it is proposed that each Small Rural Settlement (SRS), into which category Lound falls, has its Housing Requirement doubled from the previous 10% to 20% of its size in 2018. This is too many and that Bassettlaw District Council's own figures demonstrate that this number is not required. The evidence collected by our Parish Council's Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group over the last 4 years shows that there is a general acceptance of 21 new houses(10%) but that a doubling of this is unsupportable. The number of houses required by your Draft Plan is 1090 in the SRS category, yet the 20% requirement shown in Policy ST2 will provide 2124 houses, a 100% over-provision. If many villages are already using the 20% requirement then there is no need for other SRSSs to struggle to supply an unpopular increase in their requirement. In Lound the infrastructure, drainage, power supply, etc, will not support such a large increase. Our village has infrequent public transport that is essentially unusable, and thus new houses will depend on private transport. This is against several of the stated aims of the Draft Local Plan, i.e. to increase sustainability and to mitigate climate change. Do not have a school or shop to support a growth of 40 plus additional households. The Local Plan emphasises the provision of smaller/starter homes, which SRSSs like Lound are unlikely to provide.Your Draft Plan Policy ST2 states that for Large Rural Settlements that 'Unless otherwise promoted through Neighbourhood Plans...' they will provide 20% growth. SRSSs do not have this reference to Neighbourhood Plans, and this apparently diminishes the importance of Lound's Neighbourhood Plan. The requirement for a 20% increase within SRSSs be reduced to 10% with a provision for more development if their Neighbourhood Plan supports this according to local needs. This will still provide your requirement and will produce a fair result.</p>	<p>The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassettlaw			
REF032	Residents	<p>As a resident of Lound, Retford, express my strong objection to the housing requirement for Lound which is outlined in the above draft Plan. Over many years, our village Council and representatives have taken very seriously the responsibility to consult residents and formulate their views, latterly in specific response to the BDC Local Plan, January 2019. Evidence clearly indicated a general, if reluctant, acceptance of 21 new houses in line with the Plan. In less than 12 months, this has been doubled, contrary to all residents' opinions about the nature of requirements in their village, particularly ignoring the basis on which the draft Lound Neighbourhood Plan 2020 is based. Response to a Residents' Survey in 2016 clearly indicated that the people believed little, or indeed, no new housing was needed in Lound and that any development should be based on encouraging sustainable, low-cost housing for families and pensioners. If you genuinely do take resident views into effective account, it is clear that the new figure, in ST2 of the above Plan, of 42 new houses, is unsupportable, unfair and unrealistic.</p>	<p>The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.</p>
REF034	Residents	<p>See the housing requirements has now doubled from previous 10% to 20% this is far to many for a small village like lound. And would completely spoil the village. We have a very infrequent public transport to the village meaning new houses will depend on private transport. Would like no more than the 10% increase for the village off lound</p>	<p>The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.</p>
REF038	GPS Planning and Design Ltd.	<p>As Bassettlaw is predominantly a rural District, support the positive and proportionate distribution of housing growth spatial strategy approach to rural development advocated in the Draft Bassettlaw Local Plan. This seeks to deliver a minimum of 1090 dwellings of the District's housing requirement over the Plan period for the Small Rural Settlements, with proportionate growth of 20% per Parish settlement. Welcome the encouragement given to Neighbourhood Planning Groups and the local communities to allocate sites to meet their housing requirement themselves. Agree that Scrooby should rightfully be included in the list of settlements contained in Policy ST2: Rural Bassettlaw where growth is supported. Whilst we concur that there should be minimum housing requirement set for each of the rural settlements, a precise quantum 'cap' for housing growth, in the case of Scrooby at 29 units, is far too restrictive.</p>	<p>The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Scrooby will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.</p>
1190900	Residents	<p>Reluctantly agreed to accept the requirement of new housing in Lound, one of the designated small rural settlements, but the target for homes in the amended draft BDC plan has been doubled from 21 to 42 new homes. This will completely change the character of the village. It is also not feasible on the grounds of the limited infrastructure of the village i.e utilities such as power supply and drainage as well as limited public transport facilities. The number of houses envisaged is also an over-provision on the number stated in your own plan. This is not Nimbyism but common sense and in any case, surely the real need is for starter homes for young people which is unlikely to be needed in a small village. Surely, it also makes sense to use existing brown-field sites and not to further impinge upon greenfield areas unnecessarily? With the continuing closure of factories and shops, couldn't buildings be converted and areas previously used for commerce be utilized? Builders of course need an incentive to clean up such areas as it is currently cheaper for them to build on "virgin" land. Support the 10% increase but not the 20% increase in new homes.</p>	<p>The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.</p>
1191130	Residents	<p>Having read the above plan, especially the requirement for SRS housing increase from 10% to 20% think that this is too much for Lound and that BDCs own figures show this increase is not required. The facts gathered by our Parish Council's neighbourhood Plan steering group over the past 4 years shows there is a general acceptance of 21 new homes(10%)but a doubling of this unsupportable. The number of houses required by your Draft plan is 1090 in the SRS category,yet the 20% requirement stated in ST2will provide2124 houses,a 100% over-provision. Your BRC states that many villages are already using the 20% requirement so there should be no need for other SRSs to struggle to supply an unpopular increase in their requirement. The Lound infrastructure will not support such a large increase.The village bus service is infrequent and really unusable so any increase in families will have to depend on private transport The national average number of cars per household is 1.88 so therefor almost 80</p>	<p>The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassettlaw			
		more cars will be in Lound. This goes against the aim of DLP to increase sustainability and to mitigate climate change. Suggest that the requirement for a 20% increase within SRSs be reduced to 10% with the provision for more development if Neighbourhood plans support this according to local needs. This in my opinion would be much fairer.	
1191848	Barnby Moor Parish Council	A village the size of Barnby Moor to have an increase of 23 dwellings will mean these properties being built on good farm land.	Barnby Moor has remained a small rural settlement but the level of growth has been reduced to 5% dwellings in the revised version of local plan.
REF067	GR Planning and Architectural Design Ltd	Support for Section 5.2 and Policy ST2. This identifies the importance of the contribution that new rural housing can make to the broader sustainability of villages and that all rural settlements have a role to play in achieving this objective. The draft policy is consistent with Government Guidance as contained within the National Planning Policy Framework that supports sustainable development that will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. In recognition of the well established planning principle that any new development should respect the identity and distinctiveness of the settlement it is important to relate the size, scale, form and character of new development to that of the settlement in which it is located. In order to identify settlements that could accommodate new housing whilst satisfying these requirements the Council's Spatial Strategy 2019 assessed all 103 settlements in Rural Bassettlaw. Settlements that could not satisfy the identified requirements either because they were too small or too dispersed were not identified as being able to accommodate any new housing development and will be classified as being in the countryside. Styrrup is identified as a settlement that is capable of accommodating new housing development in accordance with the agreed principles. In order to protect rural settlements from excessive development that would not be proportionate to the size and scale of existing settlements and as a result would be harmful to local identity and distinctiveness the Draft Local Plan proposes that the amount of new housing development should be limited to 20% of the existing number of dwellings. There will be the opportunity for local communities to increase the percentage of growth through the inclusion of 'exceptions housing' referred to in the policy. This provides flexibility to allow the local community to choose how they plan for growth, with options to determine the most appropriate location and type of housing in accordance with the overall spatial strategy. The emphasis is therefore clearly on the need to make provision for the future controlled growth of rural settlements. Draft Policy ST2 entitled "Rural Bassettlaw" states that: C. Small Rural Settlements. Residential development in the Small rural settlements within the Parishes listed below, will, collectively accommodate a minimum of 1090 dwellings of the District's housing requirement. Parish. Base number of dwellings 20% housing increase August 2018 in dwellings to 2037 Styrrup 131 26 D. Identifies 6 criteria that new housing development within Small Rural Settlements should satisfy: 1. Proposal should not increase number of dwellings by over 20% 2. Site should be within settlement boundary identified in Neighbourhood Plan - there is no Neighbourhood Plan for Styrrup. 3. A single proposal should not exceed 10 dwellings. 4. There should be no conflict with existing character and built form. 5. It should not lead to coalescence with neighbouring settlements. 6. Must comply with Nottinghamshire Minerals local Plan. E. Deals with Rural Exceptions Section 5.2 and Policy ST2 is therefore supported and recognises National Planning Policy that aims to enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. It is a positive policy that reflects a spatial growth strategy that should be commended.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
REF068	Resident	Concerned by the proposals within the 2020 draft version of the Local Plan to target Small Rural Settlements (such as Lound) to increase their Housing Requirements to 20% of their current size. A target of 10% growth, as required by the 2019 draft, was feasible (though unpopular in Lound) but the higher figure is neither fair nor sustainable in many SRS. They simply do not have the infrastructure or suitable tracts of land to support your proposals without adverse effect. Would urge you to reword the emerging Local Plan to target 10% growth in SRS, though allowing flexibility to those communities which demonstrate a need for higher growth through their Neighbourhood Plans.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
1192465	Resident	Do not beleive that doubling requirements for SRS is sensible A, As per Bassetlaw plan its not required B, Local infrastructure is not sufficient C, No areas big enough to support building of first affordable homes so we get more developments of large expensive homes that as seen in local villages do not sell.	The Local Plan has revised its settlement hierarchy for the rural Bassetlaw through Policy ST2. This policy has split the rural settlements into 3 tiers based on there size and the level of services and facilities. Growth has then been distributed accordingly.
REF082	Residents	Lound, as a small community, is unusual in hosting two very traffic heavy industrial elements. The A.D. Plant at Walters' farm, while being a welcome addition to the generation of cleaner electricity, is also a very heavy road user. Tractor and trailer traffic, at the X roads heart of the village, is often continual. Leaving aside air pollution and noise this can represent a barrier to smooth traffic flow along Town Street. Additionally, the second site Charcon, which produces concrete products, also necessitates the passage of much lorry traffic. There is rarely a quiet period in any day, partly because this business is a significant employer and the enterprise generates a considerable amount of service traffic. Unsurprisingly most of the employees use cars to get to site. All this amounts to a noisy and busy village at its core X roads. Suggest this be properly surveyed to establish current road use before the proposed increase to 20% in your plan.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
REF084	East Markham Parish Council	Object to Policy ST2 and ST2E. It is outrageous that the ST2 policy is rendered irrelevant by ST2E which allows for the 20 per cent growth limit to be set aside. There is considerable public disquiet in East Markham regarding damage being done by the overdevelopment of this village. And the current wave of house building of over 100 homes has barely even begun. Speaking as a Parish Councillor and someone with a 100 year family connection to East Markham, have never known a time when so many complaints - formal and informal - have been made about the state of our village. Object to any further growth in housing in East Markham. In the past 6 months East Markham has experienced ... • Raw sewage on High Street pouring from public drains • Raw sewage on Church Street pouring from public drains • The months long and ongoing closure of Priestgate over the A1, increasing traffic problems in the village. There are no confirmed plans to ever reopen this vital entry/ exit road into the village • Multiple recent car crashes on Farm Lane, leading to the Mark Lane/ Priestgate crossing • The introduction of double yellow lines and announced plans for further double yellow lines in the village to deal with parking and traffic chaos. Double yellow lines in a village !!!!! • Repeated closure of Mark Lane, for days at a time, meaning that 2 of the 4 roads from the Mark Lane/ Priestgate crossing were closed • Severe parking/ congestion problems on Farm Lane leading to the Mark Lane/ Priestgate crossing, especially at school drop/ collection times • Multiple residential addresses flooded on Low Street/ York Street • Agreement to increase the size of our primary school • Severe parking/ congestion issues adjacent to the primary school, already - which will only get worse Going back 20 years, East Markham used to have 4 main car routes in and out of the village - it now has just 2. More and more houses keep getting approved before the real world impact of 100 already approved/ under construction has even been experienced. Despite all this, there are no plans for any infrastructure improvements in East Markham whatsoever. Lives have been devastated by flooding. Fear that one of our traffic accidents will soon see serious harm done to a child. Over 100 new houses already have planning permission in East Markham. The Mark Lane/ Priestgate crossing will become profoundly dangerous when these new houses, the majority of which are clustered around this junction, are built. Unlike Worksop, East Markham has practically no social amenities. No supermarket, Dr, leisure centre, coffee shops, restaurants, youth clubs, library, hospital, car park, pedestrianised areas, proper bus service, sources of material numbers of jobs, taxi firm yet we now have dangerous congestion, chronic parking issues, residential flooding and sewage running in multiple streets.	East Markham has seen a significant level of growth over the past ten years - largely down to infilling and the redevelopment of existing sites such as the old poultry factory off Mark Lane. At the same time, the village has also lost some vital services and facilities. Since 1st April 2018, the level of planning permissions for homes have counted towards meeting the proposed growth figure for the village as identified in the Local Plan. The revised Local Plan has also reduced the level of growth in line with other small rural settlements and following responses from the previous public consultation to 5%

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassettlaw			
1193046	Lound Neighbourhood Development Plan	<p>As a resident of LOUND, & a member of their Neighborhood Development Plan (NDP), am concerned about the proposed increase in the Housing Requirement (HR) for the Small Rural Settlements (SRS) being raised to 20%. Lound NDP worked in good faith on the 10% HR that was part of the dBLP 2019. Our consultation process has given us a yield of possible sites for new dwellings that hardly reaches 10%. Looking at your outline for SRS, BDC states that it needs 1090 new dwellings whereas the individual allocations village by village comes to 2124. So which is the operative figure? Does BDC have any idea as to the likely yield from these proposed HR allocations or is it simply a matter of "Hoping for the best?" In any case, you would do better to site your HR for Social housing nearer to the hubs that provide the services that these new residents will need. I am therefore against this proposed increase in the HR for SRS to 20%. Note on p36, in the section on Large Rural Settlements (LRS), there is a place for Neighbourhood Plans to play a role in deciding the how the HR is delivered. In the paragraph dealing with SRS, there is no such provision. PLEASE could you add such a clause making reference to NP as this would give BDC the necessary discretion to allocate more new dwellings to SRS that are planning for more, & those SRS such as Lound, which require much fewer new dwellings can have a lower figure. Would BDC consider organizing WORKSHOPS for SRS so that you can work out a consensus that better fits the varied requirements of all the different settlements. This would have the added bonus of allowing your stakeholders to better draft your plan with you, this would thus ensure that your are more likely to reach your overall target for new dwellings.</p>	<p>The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.</p>
1193046	Lound Neighbourhood Development Plan	<p>Would BDC also consider developing the sites of Ranby Prep School & Eaton Hall also as sites for new housing developments?</p>	<p>No sites within Small Rural Settlements will be formally allocated for development in the Local Plan. However, Neighbourhood Plans can allocate sites for development at a local level if the community support proposals.</p>
1193061	Resident	<p>States that Neighbourhood Plans, once agreed have the same planning status as the Local Plan. In creating Lound's Neighbourhood Plan the Steering Group followed advice provided by BDC before the publication of the draft Local Plan. The housing requirement was then 10%. The Neighbourhood Plan is now almost ready for submission and on that basis stands a good chance of acceptance by residents. An increased requirement to 20% will not be accepted. Lound's NP must not be judged on the basis of the, yet to be agreed, Local Plan. It must be judged alongside all previously agreed plans. The vision for Small Rural Settlements (SRS)s is for small scale development to support local community objectives to meet local housing needs and sustain village services. Increasing the housing requirement to 20% will not deliver this vision. Lound residents are prepared to accept 10% (21 houses) - 20% would place too great a strain on existing infrastructure (drainage, power supply, broadband accessibility, roads and the very infrequent public transport. The original 20% cap has now evolved into a 20% requirement. BDC states that the target for houses for SRSs is 1090. A 20% target will provide 2124 houses. Some villages are already taking up the 20% target, so there seems little need for Lound to increase its target. Lound village has a public house and a village hall. It shares a church and a school with Sutton cum Lound. There is no shop and poor public transport (one hourly bus to and from Retford except Sunday. A 20% housing requirement would mean an increase in the number of cars, there is already a huge parking problem. The Local Plan emphasises the importance for smaller homes. these homeowners would be likely to need jobs and would be dependant on public transport. An increase in the housing requirement for small rural settlements is unacceptable. In Lound, the infrastructure would not support such an increase. Public transport is infrequent and therefore unusable so such an increase would result in an increase in private transport - against the stated objective of mitigating climate change. Drainage is already overloaded. Superfast broadband is available to only a few.</p>	<p>The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
1193162	Resident	<p>There is no way that many of the smaller, rural villages can sustain a growth of 20% unless there is significant investment in the infrastructure supplying that area and in the Local Services that support the community. In Lound, the Superfast internet is already well under the 'guaranteed' speed that Ofcom specify and an additional 20% of housing will further slow this speed down to an unacceptable level for modern life. The roads to Lound cannot reasonably cope with the increase in traffic that 20% more properties will bring as the LGVs already driving through Lound are a large enough hazard. The proposals for new roads to be provided a very close distance from the main Mattersey to Sutton road will result in an unacceptable road hazard. It is also the case that the plan does not allow for the increase in population through extending existing properties which should be another way in which a rural village could increase its population. By allowing homeowners to create additional bedrooms and/or annexes will also allow for an increase in population and this should form part of any plan. Any increased growth should also be accompanied with a pro-rata increase in services such as GP and dental places, hospital beds, etc. Ill thought out and to impose a fixed increase of houses will lose character in rural communities.</p>	<p>The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.</p>
REF087	Resident	<p>Objection to the proposed 100% increase in the Housing Requirement of Small Rural Settlements, such as Lound. Been involved in producing a draft Neighbourhood Plan for Lound which met the conditions of the 2019 vBDC Local Plan, despite some local objections that it was too ambitious. Extensive surveys and consultations with parishioners, landowners and planning professionals, helped compile a draft NP which was realistic and deliverable. It was a compromise between strong local voices for no new building and providing our contribution to Bassetlaw's need for additional homes. Very careful consideration had been given to the infrastructure of Lound, which has severe limitations. No doubt several other SRSs face similar issues. Doubling the new build in Lound, and other SRSs, would be highly detrimental to the character and defining features of its built form and surroundings. An examination of the new Housing Requirement figures shown in Policy ST2, shows that an increase from 10% to 20% of SRSs would create an over-provision exceeding 1000 new dwellings, so it is as unnecessary as it is unsustainable. Policy ST2 states that for Large Rural Settlements "Unless otherwise promoted through Neighbourhood Plans" they will provide 20% growth. No such provision is afforded to SRSs, suggesting there is less importance to their Neighbourhood Plans. This should be rectified. SRSs should be targeted to provide 10% growth within the period of the BDC Local Plan, with those communities which have a desire to grow at a higher rate being encouraged to demonstrate their needs through Neighbourhood Plans. Frequent reviews are built into NPs to ensure they will fulfil their purpose.</p>	<p>The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.</p>
REF094	Resident	<p>The Lound steering group have worked extremely hard over the last 3 years, with the villagers to submit a Lound Neighbourhood Plan to Bassetlaw. After many long hours of consultation and meetings, it was decided that a minimum of 21 new houses should be considered. Am opposed to any further increase in new houses in the village. Lound is a very small rural settlement, with few amenities. There is already a long-standing problem with drainage issues and a sewage plant at capacity. Extra housing would create an even greater problem for existing residents. Find it astounding that BDC now have revised the number of new homes to 42! This will have a great impact on the character of our lovely small village. Understand the village steering group and Parish Councillors have rigorously protested with Bassetlaw officials, regarding this increase of new housing. Hopefully BDC will take notice of the village views and concerns. Hope you will revise your policy and accept the housing volume laid out in Lound's Neighbourhood Plan and not push forward with more unwanted housing in the village.</p>	<p>The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.</p>
1194092	Resident	<p>Do not agree that Lound could sustain a doubling of a further 21 houses being built in this small rural community: Lack of frequent public transport does not support first time buyers/smaller starter homes. There are very few local jobs or industry, hence own transport would be essential. Poor road networks do not support any increase in traffic. Have been negotiating for many years to obtain speed restrictions in & out of the village, as yet without success. The infrastructure in Lound ie, current drainage, water & electricity supply would not support such a large increase. Parish Council has spent the last 4 years collecting evidence to produce its Draft Neighbourhood Plan with a general acceptance of a 10% increase & a doubling of this is not supportable at this time.</p>	<p>The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
1194094	Resident	See that it is proposed that each small Rural Settlement (the category into which Lound falls), has its Housing Requirement doubled from 10% identified in 2018 to 20% in 2020. This increase is not required especially as Bassetlaw District Council's own figures predict a 3.7% population growth. The infrastructure in Lound would not support such a large increase. Drainage is already stretched, public transport limited, poor internet and mobile phone connection and there is no school or shop. I believe that a 20% increase in housing is not sustainable and should be reduced to 10% which would fulfil your area requirements.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
REF114	Ranskill Parish Council	There appear to be discrepancies between figures stated in the Plan relating to Smaller Rural Settlements. Para 5.1.32 it states, "a minimum, combined, housing requirement of 1090 is proposed for the Small Rural Settlements". However, the 20% requirement stated in Policy ST2 will provide a total of 2,124 homes over 100% more. Please can this be clarified. The Parish Council are concerned that a blanket approach has been taken to housing allocation outside of the main towns. The Plan states that "Large Rural Settlements will be the main focus for development in rural areas". However, they are only required to take the same 20% growth as the Smaller Rural Settlements, regardless of the fact that these Larger Rural Settlements have far more in terms of infrastructure (a fact acknowledged in para 5.1.28 of the Plan). Smaller Rural Settlements, according to page 33 para 5.2.6, are only required to have "at least one of the following: a Primary School, Doctors Surgery, a community centre and a convenience store, a church or public house". A Smaller Rural Settlement with just a church and a village hall is being asked to support the same percentage increase in terms of dwellings as a Larger Rural Settlement and at the same time take a more than 50% cut to the CIL money provided by developers to improve infrastructure and facilities for residents.	The revised Bassetlaw Local Plan now includes a revised approach to Rural Bassetlaw by reducing the growth percentage for Small Rural Settlements to 5%
REF118	Lound Parish Council	Lound Parish Council objects to an arbitrary uplift of 20% housing growth being applied to all Small Rural Settlements (SRS) as detailed within the Draft Local Plan policy ST2. Many areas lack the infrastructure to support such an increase, some are listed by Bassetlaw District Council as Areas of Conservation; as having Heritage assets or; as Areas of SSSI and, as such, special considerations should have been taken into account. Additionally, each small rural village should be individually assessed in detail and further diversity applied to the housing growth requirement to protect heritage assets, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Conservation areas, (or equivalent), areas of greenspace, greenbelt, Nature Reservations and the surrounding biodiversity. The current methodology of imposing an arbitrary increase demonstrates a clear lack of understanding of the area, of rural life and of local requirement.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
REF119	WH Bett and Sons	As a resident of Darlton, it should have the opportunity of some new housing so that the village does not become stagnated. Share the same view for Ragnall. These very small, rural villages appeal to a lot of people and it would be good to give a few more people the chance to live in these villages.	Growth in rural Bassetlaw through Policy ST2 and through the development of Neighbourhood Plans.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
REF120	Residents	<p>The residents of Lound, a Small Rural Settlement, came together and there was a general acceptance for 21 new properties to be built. An increase of 10% of Lound's present size, still maintaining its Small Rural Settlement feel in which the residents of Lound choose to live. It has now been proposed that the 21 properties be increased to 42, this seems to be a vast increase of this Small Rural Settlement. The infrastructure in Lound is already under strain. Surface water and sewerage in particular cause flooding in and around various properties with in the village. Any further building would increase these problems, the present systems being somewhat out of date. This will only become worse with the present climate change situation, together with infrequent public transport, poor internet connection and other amenities, the village would not be conducive to small/starter homes. Lound put together a Neighbourhood Plan in which made Small Rural Settlements exempt from complying with the 20% growth of Large Rural Settlements. This makes a nonsense of all the hard work and consultations that people have put in, to protect this Small Rural Settlement. It appears to me that with all the proposed projects in and around Retford the Draft Plan ST 2 more than reaches its requirement and this Small Rural Settlement should be recognised as just that, and left with a 10% increase in housing and not 20% as is now being proposed.</p>	<p>The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.</p>
1194599	Residents	<p>20% regrowth for rural growth is to high and not what was agreed and approved by the NDP steering group. As a resident do not wish to see anymore new builds in our rural community. Bassetlaw have met their quota on new builds already. I move to this area to get away from the hussle and bussle of daily life not to be crammed back into another.</p>	<p>The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.</p>
1194662	Residents	Support up to of housing capped to 20% allocated to Rural areas	<p>Noted. Thank you for your comment.</p>
REF124	Bolsover District Council	<p>Bolsover District Council supports the aims of the draft Bassetlaw Local Plan to deliver sustainable development and meet the employment and housing needs arising in the district within the district. However, there are a number of areas where we would welcome further clarification/ discussions under the Duty to Co-operate as the Publication version of the Plan is developed. These are: Discussion of how the employment land requirement figure has been reached; How this has impacted on the proposed housing requirement; & How and where the proposed housing requirements for the small rural settlements of Cuckney, Holbeck, and Nether Langwith abutting or close to the boundary with Bolsover District are to be met. It is anticipated that the first two elements above would feed into a refresh of the Joint Housing Market Area (HMA) wide Statement of Common Ground (SoCG).</p>	<p>The matters raised will form part of future discussions relating to the Statement of Common Ground.</p>
REF133	Consultant	<p>Support Section 5.2 and Policy ST2 . This identifies the importance of the contribution that new rural housing can make to the broader sustainability of villages and that all rural settlements have a role to play in achieving this objective. The draft policy is consistent with Government Guidance as contained within the National Planning Policy Framework that supports sustainable development that will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. In recognition of the well established planning principle that any new development should respect the identity and distinctiveness of the settlement it is important to relate the size, scale, form and character of new development to that of the settlement in which it is located. In order to identify settlements that could accommodate new housing whilst satisfying these requirements the Councils Spatial Strategy 2019 assessed all 103 settlements in Rural Bassetlaw. Settlements that could not satisfy the identified requirements either because they were too small or too dispersed were not identified as being able to accommodate any new housing development and will be classified as being in the countryside. Misterton is identified as a Large Rural Settlement that is capable of accommodating new housing development in accordance with the agreed principles. The specific site in question has been allocated in the past for residential development including the Bassetlaw Local Plan Consultative Draft 1993 in which it was designated as H77 and referred to as Old Forge Road with an area of 1.78Ha. In order to protect rural settlements from excessive development that would not be proportionate to the size and scale of existing settlements and as a result would be harmful to local identity</p>	<p>All settlements will be subject to strict design policies either through the Local Plan or made Neighbourhood Plans for those areas. The Council is also producing a Design SPD to provide more detail on certain parts of the District. This will be closely linked to other SPDs and the Local Plan.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
		and distinctiveness the Draft Local Plan proposes that the amount of new housing development should be limited to 20% of the existing number of dwellings. There will be the opportunity for local communities to increase the percentage of growth through the inclusion of 'exceptions housing' referred to in the policy. This provides flexibility to allow the local community to choose how they plan for growth, with options to determine the most appropriate location and type of housing in accordance with the overall spatial strategy. The emphasis is therefore clearly on the need to make provision for the future controlled growth of rural settlements.	
REF133	Consultant	Misterton has a neighbourhood plan in which the particular site in question (see plan below) is not allocated for development. However the site falls clearly within the heart of the settlement and its development for residential development would be entirely consent with surrounding housing. Policy 5 of the Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges that there might be suitable development opportunities within the settlement boundary in addition to the specific allocations. Policy 5 states:- " Proposals for residential development within the development boundary will be supported subject to the following criteria: a) They would not cause unacceptable harm to the residential amenity of properties in the immediate locality; and b) They would be consistent with the character and appearance of the immediate locality; and c) They would provide suitable vehicular access. Proposals for residential development outside the development boundary will be supported where the accord with the principles included within Policy DM3 of the Bassetlaw District Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development Management DPD." Section 5.2 and Policy ST2 of the draft Local Plan is therefore supported and recognises National Planning Policy that aims to enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. It is a positive policy that reflects a spatial growth strategy that should be commended. Furthermore the development of the site shown edged red in the plan below is consistent with the principles embodied within Policy 5, entitled Windfall Sites, of the Neighbourhood Plan.	Thank you for your comments.
REF136	A and D Architecture	3) Policy ST2 should be similarly modified and include new sub-section E as follows: "E The Council values the role the park home sector plays in the housing market offering an affordable alternative to mainstream housing for many people, often over the age of fifty, in mainly rural and semi-rural locations and will support applications for the development of new Park Home static caravan sites."	The Housing and Economic Development needs Assessment 2020 identifies no need for Park Home development. There is no need for this type of housing to be specifically referred to in Policy ST2.
1195111	Resident	20% is too greater number of properties. This equates to 70 dwellings, the infrastructure cannot cope. The impact to water levels. Carbon zero environment, how this be achieved, no bus service, no trains, no medical centre in the village, little in the way of shops.	The revised Bassetlaw Local Plan provides a re-classification of settlements and the level of growth according to their size and service provision.
1195161	Resident	An available residential site at Gringley Road Misterton has been put forward since 2008. In the Misterton Neighbourhood Plan it was identified as NP03 Policy 9. This site should be added due to:- It was the democratic decision of the community, BDC supported "the development boundary will not be a consideration in the new local plan and Gringley Road has recently had permissions granted outside the said development boundary", The Minimum Housing Requirement is already out of date following planning approval on NP02 Policy 8 in the Misterton Neighbourhood Plan which had been identified as allocation for 12 dwellings but was approved for 4 dwellings showing a shortfall of 8 from the Housing Provision. ADD SITE TO ALLOCATION	Misterton is considered a Large Rural Settlement due to its size and level of services. The Local Plan is supportive of the recently adopted Misterton Neighbourhood Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan allocates sites for development and the Local Plan does not seek to allocate any further sites within the village.
1195187	Resident	The plan is a blanket development of 20% that is not sustainable in some areas. The strategy is for a blanket increase in housing of 20% where some of the outlined communities cannot support this. As question 1, some communities can expand well beyond 20%, some cannot.	The revised Bassetlaw Local Plan provides a re-classification of settlements and the level of growth according to their size and service provision.
1195216	Resident	20% is too high and will drastically change the nature of these villages. Where is the evidence that these homes are needed?	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassettlaw			
REF149	Resident	<p>Object to an arbitrary uplift of 20% housing growth being applied to all Small Rural Settlements (SRS) as detailed within the Draft Local Plan policy ST2. The village of Lound falls into this category. This demonstrates a clear lack of understanding of the area, of rural life and of local requirement. Refers to The National Planning Policy framework (NPPF) section 15 details. Lound Village is a conservation area and therefore as a non-designated asset. It has a number of listed buildings; it has areas registered as designated sites of Special Scientific Interest and is surrounded by Nature Reserves. Yet all this has not been identified within Bassettlaw's Green Gap Report or within the New Settlement Study Methodology. The village cannot support a 20% housing growth uplift without serious impact on the aesthetics of the village, its wildlife or without the loss of Greenspace /Greenbelt, agricultural land or natural environment. Imposing such an increase will be disastrous. Our village has narrow streets which are not designed to take large traffic volume. The water treatment plant is already at maximum capacity and lorries are driving to the plant numerous times a day to empty this facility already causing damage to the road, the hedges and subsequently wildlife on a daily basis. In addition: Policy ST45 Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation has not been taken into consideration. Lound does not have a school, or shop and an infrequent bus service but does have green fields, woodlands and tranquility that sustain a variety of wildlife and fauna which you are wanting to destroy by building on green belt areas, which Teresa May, when in office, stated should be protected at all costs.</p>	<p>The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.</p>
REF150	Resident	<p>It has been suggested previously that sites identified as part of the 2017 Land Availability Housing Assessment will be considered as part of this new plan process. This previously identified 5 sites in Clayworth, all of which were not considered further, as at that time, the previous Local Plan process did not identify the village as suitable for growth. It would appear unlikely that Clayworth would have suitable sites to accommodate even the minimum proposed housing requirement of 14 units, without contravening the Local Plan policies. Would expect that the Council seeks to apply its own proposed policies as part of the site allocation process i.e. now, rather than relying on them to protect settlements from unsuitable development post-allocation. Highways This is of relevance to Clayworth given it is served by only a single B road (B1403) which runs from Hayton through the village then up to Gringley on the Hill, alongside an unclassified road from Drakeholes through the village to Wheatley. The addition of 14 to 28 new dwellings would add significant pressure on the road network, within and surrounding Clayworth, which it is entirely unable to accommodate. This should be considered as part of the housing numbers allocation process.</p>	<p>Clayworth is considered a small rural settlement due to its size and level of services. This enables a small level of growth in the village over the plan period subject to it meeting other relevant policies in the Local Plan. But the Local Plan does not allocate sites in the the Small Rural Settlements. Their growth is more appropriately managed through Neighbourhood Plans or through appropriate planning applications. Clayworth could also look to produce a Neighbourhood Plan to manage this development in a way that is acceptable to the community.</p>
REF159	Lound Parish Council	<p>Have been using the Requirement of a 10% increase in our housing stock. During our consultations with the members of the village we found that the majority thought that little or no development was desirable and thus have produced a plan that meets with that response but which also allows for development to meet the Requirement. Now, find that each Small Rural Settlement (SRS) will have a Requirement of 20%, a 100% increase of the previous Draft Plan. This will go against the desires of the village and will negate over 4 years' work, wasting Local and Central Government Public funds, and innumerable hours of volunteers' time. The number of houses required by your Draft Plan to be provided by SRS is 1090, yet the 20% requirement shown in Policy ST2 will provide 2124 houses, a 100% over-provision. If many villages are already using the 20% requirement then there is no need for other SRSs to struggle to supply an unpopular increase in their requirement. The current methodology of imposing an arbitrary increase demonstrates a clear lack of understanding of the area, of rural life and local needs. In Lound the infrastructure, drainage, power supply, etc, will not support such a large increase. Our village has infrequent public transport that is rudimentary, and thus new houses will depend on private transport. This is against several of the stated aims of the Draft Local Plan, notably ST45 1a and 1c, i.e. to increase sustainability and to mitigate climate change. Lound Village is listed as a conservation area and therefore as a non-designated asset. It has a number of listed buildings; it has areas registered as designated sites of Special Scientific Interest and is surrounded by Nature Reserves. Yet none of this has been identified within Bassettlaw's Green Gap Report or within the New Settlement Study Methodology. The village cannot support a 20% housing growth uplift without serious impact on the aesthetics of the village and its wildlife or</p>	<p>The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
		<p>without the loss of Greenspace/Greenbelt, agricultural land or natural environment. Imposing such an increase will be disastrous. The Local Plan emphasises the provision of smaller/starter homes, which SRSs like Lound are unlikely to provide. Your Draft Plan Policy ST2 states that for Large Rural Settlements 'Unless otherwise promoted through Neighbourhood Plans...they will provide 20% growth'. SRSs do not have this reference to Neighbourhood Plans, and this obviously diminishes the importance of Lound's Neighbourhood Plan. Where these plans have been assessed and approved by the local authority and are supported by the local community through a referendum, they should be given the same importance as Neighbourhood Plans for Large Rural Settlements, and their influence should be reinforced in the process of the determining of planning outcomes. The requirement for a 20% increase within SRSs should be reduced to 10% with a provision for more development if their Neighbourhood Plan supports this according to local needs. This will still provide your requirement and will produce a fair result.</p>	
1195333	Resident	<p>The 20% increase in housing is too large. When the Neighbourhood Plan was first mooted it was considered that in rural villages there would be a 10% increase in housing. This, in itself, led to some resistance from the residents in Lound but after some public meetings it was agreed that there should be approval for 21 houses, ie 10%. However, the latest draft local plan now states that 20% more housing should be provided. Double what was originally suggested and which I think will put unnecessary stress on the infrastructure and change the nature of rural villages</p>	<p>The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.</p>
1195356	Resident	<p>These areas are rural for a reason. People buy homes here to be rural not be linked to the next village or town. If they wanted to live in a town or village they would buy homes there . Made rural.... leave it rural</p>	<p>the majority of growth has been directed to the larger settlements and settlements in the rural areas. The majority of the countryside is being protected.</p>
1195365	Resident	<p>Building 20% worth of extra houses on Lound would not be realistic and would damage the village in terms of its character. Also the infrastructure only just about supports the residents now. We moved to the village because it was quiet and rural and would hate to see this destroyed. If this happened we would most likely have no choice but to move and find somewhere else akin to Lound as. The bassetlaw District council own figures demonstrate that this number is not required?</p>	<p>The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.</p>
REF175	Resident	<p>Raise concerns regarding the Housing Requirement being imposed on Lound in the draft Local Plan. The village of Lound is a rural community with limited infrastructure. The increased Housing Requirement figure of 20% is far too large and will be severely detrimental to the rural nature of the village. Lound's Neighbourhood Plan has identified support for reasonable growth of 21 homes. This figure represents significant growth for such a small village however the proposal to double this through the introduction of a 20% increase is ridiculous. Understand that the 20% requirement will actually provide more than the 1090 new homes that you wish to generate from the Small Rural Settlement category and that you already believe that some villages will perform at 20% anyway. There is no need to enforce additional housing requirements on other settlements, especially when this risks undermining an emerging Neighbourhood Plan. The Housing Requirement figure must be reduced back to 10%. This will meet your own requirements and allow the Lound Neighbourhood Plan to continue to be supported in its delivery of positive housing growth in the village.</p>	<p>The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.</p>
1195879	Hamlin Estates TwelveTwentyOne Planning Services	<p>The 20% cap for identified Small Rural Settlements is counter-intuitive and contradictory to the requirement for these to provide a 'minimum' of 1090 dwellings. This 'cap' should be either removed or it should be made clear that the 20% targets are 'around the minimum level of housing delivery required'.</p>	<p>The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassettlaw			
1195884	Resident	Disagree with good agricultural land being taken out of use for housing. The brownfield sites should be developed first and scrubland not used for agriculture. Also further development at Oldcotes and Styrrup is not really feasible as any development at Oldcotes, firstly would be outside the parameters of the village and the nearest amenities being at Langold or Harworth and at Styrrup would be like a separate settlement. There is no employment as such in either place.	The Local plan has allocated a number of brownfield sites and encourages the redevelopment of these over the plan period but there is not enough to meet available sites to meet identified needs. So some greenfield land is required. Styrrup and Oldcotes are considered separate settlements in Policy ST2. In addition, the Langold Neighbourhood Plan identifies a "green gap" between itself and Oldcotes to help maintain the level of separation.
1195911	Asbury Planning Limited	Support the principle of organic growth up to 20% in the Small Rural Settlements, concern lie with ensuring that delivery of the housing actually occurs within these settlements since policy ST1 indicates that the minimum provision of 1090 dwellings will only come forward on nonallocated sites or sites to be allocated in Neighbourhood Plans. Figure 7 sets out options for delivery ranging from complete organic growth (no allocations) through to all growth delivered by Neighbourhood Plans. At what point will the respective Neighbourhood Plan groups have to commit to either of the 5 options set out in Figure 7 so that landowners can respond accordingly with submissions to an NP review or planning applications to BDC. Unless clarity and timescales are set out there is huge potential for confusion, delay and conflict and for anti-development communities to potentially stall logical development opportunities. Clarification needs to be given confirming what the base number of dwellings as at August 2018 actually comprises in terms of unimplemented dwelling commitments (outline and full) granted prior to August 2018 and whether they form part of the base supply or part of the 20% growth allowance. This clarification of a cut-off point between current base dwelling supply and future growth is critical if this policy is to be considered effective and positively prepared in the tests for soundness.	The housing numbers and distribution has been revised in the latest version of the Local Plan in response to comments through the previous consultation period and the latest evidence base. Those numbers still include growth in our rural communities and the allocation of sites within the larger settlements across the District. See revised Policy ST1. The rural monitoring framework has been revised to provide more clarity for users on the points identified.
REF183	Resident	For Clayworth have concerns with the Council's rationale for taking a 20% blanket housing growth allocation across smaller settlements, which does not take into account their relative status i.e. whether they are Conservation Areas or not. Have concerns that this allocation does not take into account the ability of each settlement to practically accommodate this number of new dwellings due to the lack of specific housing site allocations for these smaller settlements (outside of Neighbourhood Plans). This leaves these smaller settlements open to the potential for speculative development by land owners who wish to press a case against the other policies within the plan. Whilst it could be said that the policies aimed at protecting the character and form of Conservation Areas could be used as a form of protection against unwanted development, the simple fact that the Council has declared that villages such as Clayworth could accommodate these means that there is a risk that in the push to achieve the housing targets, developers will seek to work around rather than with policies aimed at protecting this status.	Clayworth is considered a small rural settlement due to its size and level of services. This enables a small level of growth in the village over the plan period subject to it meeting other relevant policies in the Local Plan. Clayworth could also look to produce a Neighbourhood Plan to manage this development in a way that is acceptable to the community.
1195921	Resident	Building 20% worth of extra houses on Lound would not be realistic and would damage the village in terms of its character. Also the infrastructure only just about supports the residents now. We moved to the village because it was quiet and rural and would hate to see this destroyed. If this happened we would most likely have no choice but to move and find somewhere else akin to Lound. The bassettlaw District council own figures demonstrate that this number is not required?	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
REF194	Clarborough and Welham Parish Council	Further concern is the way that the Local Plan sees the allocation of sites which were granted planning consent before the August 2018 deadline. Many of these sites have not been built, therefore, no houses. If the Plan is genuinely looking for extra builds then these, surely should count towards any allocation. A further problem, that of 'legal starts' also denies the part which previous consents can count towards required numbers. Have one such site which has 'legal start' applied to it. This was granted Consent around 2005 and was started. These houses are not being built, why is the planning permission not rescinded and perhaps the land opened for new proposals to be brought forward. The site in question is both unbuilt and a blight on the Parish with overgrown hedges and land.	The Local Plan allows for developments since 1st April 2018 to be counted towards the rural housing requirement. 2018 is the base date for the plan period and is also largely when Neighbourhood plans have been proposing sites since.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassettlaw			
REF194	Clarborough and Welham Parish Council	Want to ensure all housing development and business development is consistent with the vision and policies set out in the Clarborough & Welham Neighbourhood Plan. Want to ensure all development retains the character of our Parish and the two separate villages. It is not convinced that some of the proposals of the 'Draft' Strategic Plan allows this to take place in a way which is beneficial to our Parish.	The Local Plan supports developments that are of high-quality design. Further detail on design will be produced through a Supplementary Planning Document
1196000	Resident	Whilst the intended cap of 20% housing increase seems sensible in principle, there is no obvious consideration that this may be appropriate for some villages, but not others. It may be that the available suitable land in one village, for example, would warrant a higher proportion of housing increase than in others. On the face of it, the 20% increase therefore seems arbitrary, and takes no account of the specific requirements/capacity of the various communities. This links into a further concern about the increases in housing. For some villages the increases may mean that it might be appropriate to provide additional services and resources - e.g. shops, transport infrastructure, healthcare. A more cynical view taken of the 20% cap might be that this means the allocation of additional services will be less of a requirement, even though the spread of housing may be better served by having greater numbers in certain locations over others.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
1196060	Resident	only support in line with neighbourhood plan of 20% increase for each community not a disproportionately large housing project as proposed in ST5	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF198	Consultant	Para 5.1.32 This proposes a 20% cap per parish as though it were a "one size fits all" policy. It is not. Mattersey and Mattersey Thorpe have engaged, researched and produced a document embracing and promoting residential development. They have done the legwork and found that to maintain the villages' viability, including its existing services and with a hope to advance service provision, a constant number of families need to be consistently attracted to the village. This is something that appears lacking with this 20% cap justification and most certainly is lacking in many Neighbourhood Plans where control is the main theme.	Mattersey and Mattersey Thorpe have produced a Neighbourhood Plan and have appropriately planned for growth as identified in the previous version of the Local Plan. The NP can be reviewed in time if the community wishes to do so.
REF199	Standcliffe Homes Ltd Cushwake	Have concerns however regarding the proposed Spatial Strategy, particularly in respect to Rural Villages. Support the objectives of sustainable development and recognise that a balanced approach to growth should be adopted in order to achieve this, the approach taken to large and small rural settlements is not fully evidenced; this undermines the soundness of the Plan.	The spatial strategy has been reviewed in the latest version of the Local Plan. This has also updated the proposed settlement hierarchy and the distribution of growth.
REF199	Standcliffe Homes Ltd Cushwake	Large Rural Settlements are in the same category as Main Towns and there is provision for allocations in these categories of settlement, which we concur with. The policy also allows for appropriate forms of development within their settlement boundaries. It is considered that in order to allow for greater flexibility provision should be made for sustainable development adjacent to settlement boundaries where there is clear evidence that the Council do not have a 5 year supply of housing land or they are failing to deliver the required amount of housing per annum. The table included with Policy ST1 also defines which settlements fall into each category. The background paper on the revised spatial strategy stated that: 'The role of each level of the strategy reflects population size, their location in respect of other settlements and the range of services present and their ability to expand to accommodate the needs generated by new development'. Policy ST2 sets out the number of dwellings in each settlement rather than the population size and in the evidence base there would not appear to be any analysis of the population size of the rural settlement has been undertaken. In the most recent 2018 population estimates, Blyth has a population of 1,214 (a reduction in population since the 2011 Census) and Shireoaks has a population of 1,394 representing an increase. Shireoaks has been identified as a 'Small Rural Village' whereas Blyth is categorised as a 'Large Rural Settlement', despite the fact that Shireoaks supports a larger number of dwellings. Although Shireoaks does not have a medical centre it supports all of the other facilities listed at paragraph 5.2.5 of the draft Local Plan. It also benefits from a railway station with good connectivity to Lincoln, Worksop and Sheffield. In addition, there is an industrial estate within the settlement that supports a number of businesses, thereby providing employment opportunities for residents of Shireoaks and the wider area.	The level of growth per settlement is based on the number of dwellings as of 1st August 2018 and the number of services and facilities. The revised Local Plan has provided an update to policies ST1 and ST2 and the justification reflects those changes. Large Rural Settlements are not in the same category as Main Towns. Main Towns are in the top tier of the hierarchy so are expected to take more growth proportionate to their position in the hierarchy and sustainability credentials.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassettlaw			
REF199	Standcliffe Homes Ltd Cushwake	<p>Draft Policy ST2 should be reworded. B. Unless otherwise promoted through Neighbourhood Plans or through a masterplan framework agreed with the Council, residential development in Large Rural Settlements within the Parishes identified below or in the case of Cottam within the redline boundary identified on the Policies Map, will collectively accommodate a minimum of 1764 new dwellings of the District's housing requirement</p> <p>.....The scale and density of development proposed should be appropriate to the character, shape and built form of that part of the settlement and should not normally exceed 1 hectare in size should conform to the principles of sustainable development Small Rural Settlements C. Residential development in Small Rural Settlements within the Parishes listed below, will collectively accommodate a minimum of 1090 dwellings of the District's housing requirement Parish Base number of dwellings, August 2018 20% housing increase in Dwellings to 2037 Shireoaks 645 129 Unless otherwise promoted through Neighbourhood Plan or Part E of this policy applies, additional development in Small Rural Settlements over the plan period will be supported provided that all of the criteria below are satisfactorily met, and the proposal is consistent with other policies in this Plan: 3. A single proposal should not exceed 10 dwellings, unless it can be demonstrated that it will provide a community benefit, including affordable housing or open space provision As drafted Policy ST2 is not positively prepared and is unsound as it lacks flexibility to deliver the long-term strategic growth of the District.</p>	The level of growth per settlement is based on the number of dwellings as of 1st August 2018, its population and the number of services and facilities. The revised Local Plan has provided an update to policies ST1 and ST2 and the justification reflects those changes.
1196242	Resident	As a rural district, should be looking to protect and keep as many of our rural communities and small towns/villages as they are. Nature is great for people wellbeing and we need to make sure we protect that.	Thank you for your comment.
REF206	Resident	Ragnall The proposed plans will effect our village mainly the volume of traffic ,at the moment it is terrible heavy vehicles day and night ,the road has been surfaced but it will need doing again.The crossroads is an accident waiting to happen they are dangerous and traffic going down into and out of Dunham do not exceed the speed limit it needs reducing .My son was killed on that road 3 xmas ago how many more families have to go through the pain of losing a loved one.I wrote to the highways about my concerns but they did not even reply to my letter ,we are a forgot on village something needs to be done .	In terms of the growth of sites in the area. Highways safety is an important part of traffic management for new development. Further traffic assessment has been undertaken on those roads to look at capacity and also highway safety. The work also looked at what mitigation is needed. This work will be developed further through the masterplanning and planning application process for sites so that it includes the most up to date information about a sites proposed uses, the level of growth and its proposed access points etc...
REF214	Oxalis Planning	Disagree with the 20% cap on growth proposed at paragraph 5.2.8 in the supporting text for Policy ST2, which is formalised within the Policy itself. The proposed 20% cap for the number of dwellings to be delivered in the Large Rural Settlements will be restrictive in the long term. The cap may become an issue if anticipated delivery elsewhere slips behind schedule requiring the Council to look towards the Large Rural Settlements for additional housing growth. In this context, the concept of an arbitrary cap appears unnecessarily restrictive and it should be revised or removed to ensure that the Plan is supportive of sustainable growth. 20% could be used as a guiding figure, but it should not be used as an inflexible cap on development. The Plan period covers 17 years and therefore the Plan needs to include the capacity to respond to any possible changes and challenges which the District may face over the entire lifetime of the Plan.	The majority of growth in the large rural settlements has now been accommodated either through planning permissions or through the allocation of sites through Neighbourhood Plans. The 20% or 5% threshold is a significant level and this growth is supported by existing infrastructure and is therefore seen as deliverable. It is noted that additional development above the % requirement may be supported if there is need for additional growth or though the review or development of a Neighbourhood Plan and there is community support.
REF215	Trustees of H S Wallis	There is a clear need to resolve the disparity between ST1 and ST2 and surely that must be in the favour of ST1 as far as housing is concerned if the "Strategic Objectives" set out at Section 4.2 are to be achieved. Draft Policy ST2 as it stands sets out the approach to distributing the numbers of dwellings needed in LRS's up to 2037. The number for Blyth is 111 using (correctly?) a rate of increase of 20% from base number of 553 and base date of August 2018. Since the Draft Local Plan does not appear to be making any housing allocations in "North Blyth and IF the Draft Blyth Neighbourhood Plan is correct in policy terms in seeking to apply the 20% limit, this appears to result in no more than a further 8 dwellings to be permitted for the remaining plan period i.e. a further 17 years !!! At 2 dwellings per year for the next 17 years that will not help to deliver the step change sought by the Local Plan nor provide the sort of choice in the housing market that Policy ST1 and National Policy seek. However, Policy ST2 seems to recognise that there will be other housing development in these settlements and indicates that they will be on sites not normally larger than 1 hectare so long as they meet	Policy ST1 and ST2 have now been revised following the feedback from public consultation. The revision hopefully provides a clearer link between the policies.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassettlaw			
		"...local housing needs..." Interestingly because of its shape and other limitations the subject site in "North Blyth" has a net developable area of around 1 hectare.	
REF217	Resident	Concerned about the approach taken to the allocation of houses for Smaller Rural Settlements and the fact that these SRS of which Lound is one, are required to take the same increase in housing as the Larger Rural Settlements (20%) regardless of the fact that they have far fewer amenities and facilities, a fact which you yourselves acknowledge in the Plan. In the latest version of the plan Lound has had it's housing requirement doubled from 10% to 20%. This is too many in a village where the only amenities are a small village hall and a pub. There is also a discrepancy in the figures given in the Plan regarding SRS - on page 27 it states that a minimum housing requirements of 1090 is proposed for SRS and then in policy ST2 the figures provided give a total of 2,124 - a 100% over-provision. So why is there a need for Lound to have it's requirement doubled? The requirement for a 20% increase should be reduced to 10% with a provision for more development if a Neighbourhood Plan supports this according to local need.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
REF222	Notts CC	Minerals and Waste Part D, 6 of the policy states that any non-mineral development proposal in a Mineral Safeguarding Areas will need to meet the requirements set out in the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan. This is in line with the Publication Version of the Minerals Local Plan and is welcomed by the County Council.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
1196532	East Markham Parish Council	At the last census, (2011) East Markham had 490 dwellings, this had increased to 524 by August 2018 representing a rise in Housing stock of 5.7%. In contrast, Clarborough and Welham (also defined as a small rural settlement within the plan) has since an increase in dwellings from 480 in the census to 495 by August 2018. This represents an increase of 3.1% in their housing stock. Since April 2018 East Markham has seen applications for a further 35 residential properties reflecting the rapid change in our village with little thought to overall design and planning. The increase in dwellings over the last 9 years has produced a lot of pressure on narrow village roads. Recent construction of dwellings on Beckland Hill and High Street have seen congestion on the village's roads with little apparent thought given to the infrastructure of the village. East Markham PC requests that BDC view each application in the wider context of development in the village rather than on an individual basis. At the time of writing there are 59 houses either being developed or approved around Mark Lane / Beckland Hill. Little apparent thought appears to have been given to the impact that these 3 separate developments will have on roads and drainage in this area. East Markham PC has concerns about the ability of the Council to adhere to the notional 20% cap within the lifespan of the plan. East Markham parish council believes that recent development already has had an adverse impact on the character and amenity of the village. The proportionate cap of 20% has been in existence for some time but there is little evidence that BDC has taken character and amenity into consideration.	The Local Plan has considered existing commitments for each settlement from 1st April 2018. This takes into account some existing planning permissions and completions. This will be monitored through the Council's Rural Monitoring Framework. In addition, the impact of new development on local character is important and the design policy in the Local Plan will be supported by a more detailed "design supplementary planning document". However, if the PC would like to undertake more localised work on its local character, then a review of the made Neighbourhood Plan could support this through the production of a character assessment for East Markham.
1196544	Resident	Disagree with ST2. Many other aspects of the plan are really good.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
1196544	Resident	Strong objection to your plans which could see the building of over 40 new dwellings in Lound. My main reason is that there is no infrastructure to support new dwellings. We have a very infrequent bus route. We have no schools or nurseries, no doctors surgery, no dentist, and no shops. The people who live in Lound rely on driving a car. If a family move in, and one partner is working, the other partner will also need a car in order to get around. Thus you will be increasing the number of cars needed on the road, and pollution. Compare this to building homes in areas where there are already facilities and good eco friendly transport links. My husband and I have shared a car for decades. On moving to Lound in 2019, we found we needed to purchase another car, so that we could go about our normal lives. I know of one mature lady, not a driver, who used to live in Retford, and access many activities and the shops. She regrets moving to Lound as she now finds it very difficult to access her activities, causing a sense of isolation. Your policy seems like a very general one size fits all plan which is actually not a plan. It is not thought through, there is no logic to it. It does not consider the impact on the environment and the need for infrastructure which will enable people to live well. There must be many areas with necessary facilities and links which could easily have room for new homes, where people could join communities and lead fulfilled lives. Unless you intend to build more facilities and substantially improve transport links, Lound is not such a place.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassettlaw			
1196559	Resident	Regards to the Housing Quantities there appear to be discrepancies at Bothamsall. The document lists 114 dwellings. However, within the PARISH there are 105 that I am aware of, with only 75 being within the settlement. Not been able to get a concrete answer as to where the 20% extra are to be located. In the first consultation I was advise that the extra housing was to be within the 'settlement', i.e. in the VILLAGE of Bothamsall, not the Parish. If this is the case then the 20% should be of the 75 dwellings within the settlement, not the number in the Parish. If the location of the housing is to be withing the PARISH, then the 20% should be of the 105 (not 114 as listed in the Document).	Noted. The number of dwellings for Bothamsall and the parish have been checked with our Council Tax department and updated. There are 102 properties in the parish and only 74 within the village of Bothamsall and therefore it has been removed from the list of Small Rural Settlements.
1196642	Resident	The 20% cap on rural developments does not make sense. It is far too permissive. The caveat (pg 25) "Whilst Large Rural Settlements will be the main focus for development in rural areas, proportionate growth to a maximum of 20% per Parish settlement - as identified by the previous two draft Plans 5,7- will be supported where it will not have an adverse effect on the character or amenity of the settlement." No confidence this will be adequately monitored and when unsupported development to this extent has taken place, it will be too late. Strongly support a lower cap, say 10% and exceptions to be made where it is clearly demonstrated that there are sufficient local amenities including transport to properly support and maintain such growth. Most of the rural communities have inadequate resources, particualrly for young growing families, support the main thrust of the policy to develop amenities and housing in areas where they will clearly delivery quality living and good value for money. Some rural communities should expand by up to, and in some cases, more than 20% but these need to be carefully selected for their potential to have the wider investments needed.	Policy ST2 have been revised and a new distribution of growth identified. The Policy does provide a monitoring framework which is updated monthly to provide a robust basis for monitoring the policy and also includes any made Neighbourhood Plans.
1196674	Resident	Live in Ranby Village and am opposed to any further housing development within the village due to the infrastructure i.e. roads, drainage, walkways etc, in my opinion is unsuitable for any further development. Have inadequate drainage for the amount of houses currently and frequently have flooded roads and blocked drainage. Footpaths are narrow and some places nonexistent and poorly maintained with inadequate street lighting. It is my belief that any further development in the Ranby Village would put extra strain on the already weak infrastructure that is currently in place. Any further development would also increase air pollution due to extra traffic in the area along with disturbing wildlife and the natural beauty of the village.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF239	Consultant	Oppose the proposal to build 51 dwellings in the village as we do not believe that it is fair to allocate the whole parish's commitment to the building plan to one village alone. Ranby has only 89 dwellings currently and therefore an increase of a further 51 would mean a 57% increase. • The village has very few facilities which do not require, or would benefit from, a further increase in population • The village dwellings are predominately heated by means of oil, a fossil fuel, and any additional houses are likely to be on the same • There are already parking issues around the school which is situated on one of only two 'main' roads in Ranby. • There are no employment opportunities in Ranby and therefore any new residents will be commuters to Worksop, Retford or much further afield impacting on noise, air pollution and generating a greater carbon footprint for the area. • The village already has two areas which regularly flood. Further buildings and hard surface areas will only increase the flooding and impact the local residents • The village has only limited broadband and further users would again impact on the current local residents. The potential solution would be to allocate the whole of the parish's allocation to the proposed Garden Village east of A1/A57. The Garden Village is expected to be for 4000 dwellings and all the infrastructure to support that population will be provided at the same time with employment being potentially provided by the industrial estate to be built nearby. The environmental issues could be planned for making all of the dwellings carbon neutral, provide electric car charging points and proper drainage to deal with climate change.	The housing requirement for the Small Rural Settlements has been updated following consultation. In addition, the spatial strategy and District housing distribution has also changed. See ST1.

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

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
1196689	Resident	The parish of Babworth is a large rural parish with about 250 homes. It is unrealistic to arbitrarily add 20% and expect all 20% (Or 50) to be added to Ranby village that has less than 100 houses. .	Policy ST2 have been revised and a new distribution of growth identified. The Policy does provide a monitoring framework for the rural growth distribution and also includes any made Neighbourhood Plans.
REF247	Babworth Parish Council	Applaud the vision of an ambitious, innovative and positive planning framework for addressing the District's housing and economic needs and other social and environmental priorities by 2037. Concerns reagrding the implementation of the Local Plan and am seeking clarification on a few of the finer points with the Parish of Babworth. With regard to the small rural developments, Ranby has been assigned 51 new homes, based on 255 existing dwellings. There are two errors herein: 1. Ranby is not a Parish, according to the Bassetlaw website: " Babworth is a village and civil parish... In addition to the village of Babworth the parish also includes Ranby". Assume that the document will be corrected so that Babworth is included in the Plan? 2. There are - 100 dwellings in Ranby. How the figure of 255 dwellings was calculated? Have the authors calculated all the dwellings in the Babworth Parish (including Ranby) and assigned this total to the village? If this is the case, the Bassetlaw Local Plan is in breach of its own policy of "proportionate growth to a maximum of 20% per Parish settlements". Assigning the full 20% of dwellings to Ranby is not proportionate.	Ranby is classed as small rural settlement and will now only receive 5% growth in line with the revised policy. Babworth is considered too small to receive any "planned" growth. However, through the production of a Neighbourhood Plan, it is down to the community to decide how the 5% growth is distributed. The number of existing dwellings assessed to apply the growth is for the whole parish and not just Ranby village. Therefore the figure of 255 is correct as of 2019.
REF249	Pegasus Group	Langold is considered to be a sustainable settlement suitable for future residential development. The Council's Sustainability Appraisal (January 2020) at Table A.3.1 identifies Langold as functionally linked with the settlement of Carlton in Lindrick. It is recognised that these settlements have a good range of services, facilities and employment opportunities. At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The identification of Langold as Large Rural Village is therefore supported and considered appropriate. It is considered that the housing figures provided within the consultation document should not be seen as a cap for development, instead it is important that the Council identify opportunity sites such as our clients as discussed in Section 6.	Planning permissions in Langold more than meet the proposed 20% level of growth in the settlement and therefore any additional development would need to be justified. The emerging Langold Neighbourhood Plan has included a policy to support infilling within the proposed development boundary of the settlement.
REF259	South Leverton Parish Council	The proposed cap for new build housing of 20% of existing houses in the designated parish area. At recent neighbourhood plan meetings with BDC representatives we were given a new build directive to include for a minimum of 10% of existing houses in the designated parish area with a cap of 20% of existing houses in the village area. We interpret this new single criterion as BDC proposing to double the minimum option for new builds to be included in neighbourhood plans. Village Existing Parish New builds Dwellings (20%) Dunham 184 37 East Drayton 105 21 Treswell with Cottam 99 20 South Leverton 212 42 North Leverton 465 93 Sturton le Steeple 213 43 Sub-total 1278 256 Add in; - Cottam station site 0 450 Total 1278 706 Ratio of new builds to existing dwellings is 55.2%. This is a gross violation of the BDC declared cap of 20%. In addition, it is argued that account should also be taken of the 90 log cabins accommodation BDC have granted planning for on the Sundown site. This will increase the adverse impact on increased road traffic through these villages. Hence there is a potential for 796 new builds. The increased number of new builds ratio to existing houses then becomes 62.3%. Bearing in mind that each new build family would drive between one and three vehicles, it is reasonable to suggest there would be an increase of some 1500 additional domestic vehicles travelling through these villages. What action could be taken to resolve this issue? BDC could lobby national government to provide funds and authority to construct suitable new roads which would provide bypass routes around these villages. The realism of such a consideration is questionable, and at least very long term before any conclusions would be announced. The immediate pragmatic solution would be for BDC to abandon their proposal to develop the Cottam power station site for housing.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. This include the percentage growth requirement and the list of settlements that classify. See Policies ST1 and ST2. Log cabins are visitor accommodation so cannot be counted in the housing growth.
REF262	West Stockwith Parish Council	For clarity, there is some confusion about the numbers of houses within West Stockwith listed in the "Base Number of Dwellings" at the survey date. Can you confirm whether these numbers include North Carr Road and Heckdyke, or have they been included elsewhere? Additionally, since West Stockwith was not included in the original site allocations exercise, can you confirm if any land has been identified as possible housing sites for the council to consider?	The number of dwellings includes all dwellings within West Stockwith parish boundary on 1st August 2018.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassettlaw			
1196914	Resident	why does new housing need to be built on good grade 3 agricultural land. why build in green belt taking good grade 3 agricultural land out of food production	The Council prioritises the redevelopment of brownfield land and includes available suitable sites in the Local Plan. But there are not enough areas of brownfield land in sustainable locations to meet identified housing needs, so the Local Plan has to look at the release of greenfield land for future development.
REF275	Consultant	Appreciate the importance for growth in rural locations and villages, cannot understand the reasoning for the plan to exceed the requirements of villages and rural areas with no clear evidence base for the actual needs. This evidence base is fundamental in the future planning and strategy ensuring the future prosperity of the district. It is for the above reason that we oppose the approach taken in ST2. It is not clear how the local plan has arrived at these apportionments or indeed the method of selecting the appropriate sites. It is appreciated that the hierarchy may not need to rigidly adhere to, having some evidence is imperative. This plan fails to demonstrate this.	The Local Plan has taken the approach to support some growth in rural communities - especially those where there has been very limited development and there is now a need for some additional growth. 80% of Bassettlaw is considered rural and settlements have lost a number of local services and facilities and there has been an undersupply of affordable or low cost housing in these areas. In addition, a number of communities in the District have produced a Neighbourhood Plan to support and encourage new development with the aim to support local housing need and local services and facilities.
REF276	Councillor, Bassettlaw District Council	Small Rural Settlements (SRS) are required to accommodate a minimum of 1,090 dwellings of the District's housing requirement. This requirement is mentioned in Policy ST1 and detailed in Policy ST2. Policy ST2 shows the 20% housing increase applied to the base number of dwellings (those that paid council tax as of August 2018). The sum of the uplift of 20% across the parishes totals 2,124 dwellings rather more than the required 1,090 dwellings hence some scope for paring the overall requirement back to around 10%. The imposition of a broad brush uplift across the SRS's and indeed the large Rural Settlements is arguably the poor man's approach to allocating against housing needs. What is required is a housing needs assessment based on an assessment of the actual requirements and characteristics of a Parish taking into consideration the individual circumstances, the existing infrastructure, schools, shops (none in Sutton Ward) and impact on areas of natural beauty and historical interest. Failing a more rigorous and realistic approach to assessing housing needs an across the board uplift of around 10% does seem to fit the bill of those parishes that have existing or emerging Neighbourhood Plans.	The spatial strategy and housing distribution for the District has been reviewed and changed in the most recent Local Plan. See updated Policy ST1 and ST2.
REF277	Babworth Parish Council	The Council's wider approach to planning for the rural area is also flawed. A sustainable approach to planning for the rural area and its settlements is to establish the development needs of those villages and apportion an appropriate level of development where those needs arise. Do not support the level of growth apportioned to the villages and rural area which has not been evidenced based and does not reflect the levels of growth which are actually required to support the rural area. Such an evidenced based approach is vital to understanding, and planning for, the future health of rural settlements. With specific regard to Babworth, the Parish is a large rural parish comprising predominantly a farming based community. The parish has circa 250 homes within the parish boundary and the largest settlement is Ranby. Policy ST2 of the Local Plan subsequently seeks to allocate 51 dwellings towards Ranby on the basis of that comprising a 20% uplift to the settlement's size, this is factually incorrect, as Ranby Village has c.78 Dwellings which would total 15 dwelling uplift at 20%. This allocation is still too high as Ranby has very limited services and any increase in settlement size would lead to more traffic and pollution as car travel is the main form of travel. It is the Parish's view that proposed allocation is entirely unjustified and does not reflect the size or function of the village. It is not an appropriate level of growth for such a small, rural village. The development needs of each individual village should be properly assessed, evidence-based and then carried out sustainably. Building another 15 houses in Ranby village would be disproportionate. Ranby village has green fields and open spaces amongst the houses, and the character of the village would be severely compromised by inappropriate levels of growth. Whilst some Rural Settlements will require small-scale and sensitively located development to support local needs and to support local services and facilities, we consider that the level of development being proposed across both the large and small rural settlements is	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Ranby will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
		arbitrary (in particular a proposed 20% growth target for the small rural settlements) and will cause harm to the overall sustainability of the district.	
REF281	Notts Campaign to Protect Rural England	Support the criteria at D. and E. They are suitable for achieving the right balance between meeting local housing need (rather than just market demand) without overwhelming existing settlements and damaging their character. The policy and the criteria allow enough flexibility to provide affordable housing while seeking to ensure this is done with the support of the community. The requirement for pre-application community consultation at E. is particularly welcome in this context.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
1197063	Resident	The requirement for a 20% growth figure for small rural villages is too high. The Local Plan has not taken into account the impact of this increase in small rural settlements, or the impact that their combined growth will have upon each other. Many small villages are interlinked by roadways, Sutton cum Lound for example is a direct route from several small villages into Retford and adjoining A1. Increased growth in the surrounding villages of Lound, Mattersey, Ranskill will have a correlated impact upon the village in terms of increased traffic through the village. The cap is set at 10% for villages who do not have a 'made' Neighbourhood Plan.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Small rural settlements will remain but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
REF288	JVH Planning	Object to Policy ST2, on the basis that the proposed allocation for the larger villages is already met as is the proposed allocation number for the smaller villages. The Policy goes onto say that once the allocation requirements are met only exception sites will be allowed. There is therefore a clear problem with the Plan as drafted, it is unworkable. There is a mismatch between the overall level of requirements and commitments for large and small rural villages and the numbers set out in the Plan as a 20% target.	Policy ST2 have been revised and a new distribution of growth identified. The Policy does provide a monitoring framework for the rural growth distribution and also includes any made Neighbourhood Plans.
REF289	Lichfields	Broadly support the draft Local Plan, concerned that it unduly restricts the potential for growth within Bassetlaw's Small Rural Settlements; an area of the district where housing delivery has, historically, been strongest and where individual settlements have varying capacity to be able to accommodate new growth. Accordingly, the 20% growth cap for Small Rural Settlements is considered to be unsound and should be removed from the Local Plan. We trust that the above representation is helpful and will be taken into account in the further preparation of the Bassetlaw Local Plan.	The level of growth in the revised policy ST2 is based on up-to-date evidence and feedback from the community. The policy support some growth in the rural areas where it has previously been resisted.
REF290	JVH Planning	Object to Policy ST2, on the basis that the proposed allocation for the larger villages is already met as is the proposed allocation number for the smaller villages. The Policy goes onto say that once the allocation requirements are met only exception sites will be allowed. There is therefore a clear problem with the Plan as drafted, it is unworkable. There is a mismatch between the overall level of requirements and commitments for large and small rural villages and the numbers set out in the Plan as a 20% target.	Policy ST2 have been revised and a new distribution of growth identified. The Policy does provide a monitoring framework for the rural growth distribution and also includes any made Neighbourhood Plans.
REF291	Consultant	Suggested changes: 1. The draft Plan should revisit the arbitrary 20% cap applied to Small and Large Rural Settlements. Additional growth should be directed to more sustainable settlements such as Blyth. This should consider the relationship between employment and housing growth. The Sustainability Appraisal needs to assess this as a reasonable alternative. 2. The policy should remove reference to the weight to be afforded to local community support in determining applications as this could undermine the assessment of an application on its merits. 3. The policy should incorporate an ongoing monitoring of delivery and supply within the Parishes, with a policy basis to support additional supply in the event Neighbourhood Plan allocations are not being delivered.	Policy ST2 have been revised and a new distribution of growth identified. The Policy does provide a monitoring framework for the rural growth distribution and also includes any made Neighbourhood Plans.
REF292	JVH Planning	Object to Policy ST2, on the basis that the proposed allocation for the larger villages is already met as is the proposed allocation number for the smaller villages. The Policy goes onto say that once the allocation requirements are met only exception sites will be allowed. There is therefore a clear problem with the Plan as drafted, it is unworkable. There is a mismatch between the overall level of requirements and commitments for large and small Rural villages and the numbers set out in the Plan as a 20% target.	Policy ST2 have been revised and a new distribution of growth identified. The Policy does provide a monitoring framework for the rural growth distribution and also includes any made Neighbourhood Plans.
REF300	Natural England	Note that additional housing development is proposed at both Carlton-in-Lindrick and Langold both of which are in proximity to the Dyscarr Wood Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The policy maps of these two sites do not show the location of the SSSI. Development allocations in these locations must provide satisfactory evidence to demonstrate that the proposals would not significantly damage or destroy the interest features for which the SSSI has been notified.	The proposed allocations in both Carlton in Lindrick and Langold have all gained either outline or full planning permissions as of March 2020. SSSIs will be added to the Policies Map.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
REF306	IBA Planning	<p>Outline the approach to development across the District and define those 'Small Rural Settlements' which will be permitted to grow by up to 20% over the plan period. The Council has identified fewer 'Small Rural Settlements' than the 'Defined Rural Settlements' identified in the Draft Bassetlaw Plan Part 1: Strategic Plan 2019, reducing the number of rural settlements permitted to grow from 73 to 42. The latest version of the Plan is far more restrictive than the previous which allowed growth in a far greater number of rural settlements to ensure an equitable distribution of growth across all settlements in Bassetlaw and to promote rural vitality. In reaching the reduced number of 'Small Rural Settlements', the Council has based its assessment of whether a settlement is suitable for growth or not on the number of houses in the settlement rather than its population. The Council considers this to be "more appropriate" (p 12 Bassetlaw Spatial Strategy Background Paper (January 2020)) but it is unclear exactly why housing numbers are considered to be a better indication of the size of a settlement and its suitability for growth or why the threshold of '50 or more dwellings' for classification as a 'Small Rural Settlement' has been chosen (p 15 Spatial Strategy Background Paper). The Council suggests that its latest approach has been designed to support the vitality and prosperity of rural settlements, is more proportionate in its distribution of housing and its emphasis on employment-led housing growth, and is more inclusive (P 13 and 14 Bassetlaw Spatial Strategy Background Paper (January 2020)). However, by excluding many settlements previously considered suitable for housing growth from the list of 'Small Rural Settlements' (thereby denying them the opportunity to grow), the proposed strategy is clearly not as inclusive and will result in stagnation in some rural settlements, damage to their vitality and prosperity, and exacerbation of existing affordability issues. Indeed, it is the smaller settlements which are most likely to stagnate without growth and so the Council's approach is even more damaging to these smaller settlements. The Council seeks to justify its new approach on the basis that the ability of rural settlements to accommodate growth in keeping with their character and form varies (paragraph 5.1.27, page 27). Our experience that even very small settlements are capable of accommodating a small amount of additional development without having an adverse impact on their character and form as long as it is of a suitable scale and design. The above is endorsed by paragraph 67-009-20190722 of the NPPG which confirms that a wide range of settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas so blanket policies restricting housing development in some types of settlement will need to be supported by robust evidence of their appropriateness. This supports our position that all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development irrespective of their size and present level of services. Policy ST2 is not wholly consistent with this advice and the Council have not published any evidence demonstrating why many of the smaller settlements in the District cannot make a valid contribution towards supporting services other villages through the provision of limited amounts of housing development. Policy ST2 is not wholly consistent with national planning policy in terms of enhancing and maintaining the vitality of rural communities and allowing villages to grow and thrive. Paragraph 79 of the NPPF states that where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby. Many of the settlements now denied any opportunity to grow are close to other villages with services and so restricting growth in such settlements as proposed not only conflicts with paragraph 79 of the NPPF but also limits opportunities to support important services and facilities in neighbouring settlements. Cannot support the Council's approach to rural housing growth which prevents any housing growth in many smaller rural settlements in the District previously considered suitable for limited growth and request that the Council reconsider its approach to rural housing provision and revert back to that in the 2019 Draft Bassetlaw Plan Part 1: Strategic Plan (see the 'Defined Rural Settlements' list in the 2019 version of the plan) and better aligned with national planning policy. If the Council are concerned about allowing housing growth in some of the smaller rural settlements on the basis that they are more sensitive to such growth, could split the expanded 'Small Rural Settlements' category into two groups, with larger settlements permitted to grow by 20% under the current guidance that no single proposal exceeds 10 dwellings (Section D(3)), and smaller settlements allowed to grow by 20% but under a separate criteria that no single proposal can exceed 2 dwellings, for example. This would enable a more equitable distribution of growth across the settlements in the District and help better support the long-term vitality and</p>	<p>The Local Plans progression has been based on updated evidence and feedback from consultation. The revised settlement hierarchy identifies the most updated approach to growth across the District. Policy ST2 also provides a revised approach to rural settlements and the level of growth settlements are to receive. The approach to baseline data will be clarified.</p>

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

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

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

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
1197255	JHWalter LLP	<p>But it is not necessary for the decision maker to make a judgement on where development should be spatially located. If a settlement was within a parish with an adopted Neighbourhood Plan, any Neighbourhood Plan boundary would be automatically part of the statutory development plan under Section 38 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Removal of Part D (2) will not weaken the decision-maker's control over where development should be located, but will allow the Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan to be read both independently but in conjunction with one another as the Development Plan. This provides flexibility and allows the decision-maker to make a judgement on the planning balance and the spatial strengths and weaknesses of each individual application. The 'doubling up' of the Neighbourhood Plan boundary within Part D (2) restricts the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan to having to solely abide by the locations set within each individual Neighbourhood Plan boundary and severely limits Bassetlaw of the ability to be proactive in the determination of where development should be located. It is stressed that whether the growth allocations, which are required to collectively meet a minimum 1090 dwellings, can be tested against each individual Neighbourhood Plan, if Neighbourhood Plans cannot deliver on allocations or settlements do not have Neighbourhood Plans adopted. It is concerning that the growth allocations would be unduly restricted by the provisions of Part D and in particular Part D (2). There appears to be no further provision for development outside of the boundaries if failure to deliver within was to occur. We also consider that Part D (1) of the policy is also unnecessarily restrictive to have a definitive growth cap of 20% within each parish. The Central Lincolnshire Local Plan has a similar growth allocation for 'Small' and 'Medium' villages but these growth allocations are set with baseline growth levels, rather than a restrictive and inflexible growth cap which is suggested within Policy ST2 Part D (1). Another flaw within Policy ST2, Part D (2) is that there are emerging Neighbourhood Plans which support development outside of but immediately adjacent the development boundary in exceptional circumstances. However, Policy ST2 is not transparent or flexible enough in its current form to deal with scenarios such as this. Policy ST2, Part D requires 'all the criteria below are satisfactorily met', however in this scenario the emerging Neighbourhood Plan would support development adjacent the settlement boundary but the exceptional circumstance would then conflict with Part D (2) as it is not within the settlement boundary. This is another example of why we stress that Part D (2) is neither sound nor necessary for the decision-maker to make a decision about the location of development as the decisionmaker will consider the entire development plan as a whole anyway. Overall, the allocation of development to these villages is a positive spatial strategy providing growth to these settlements. However, Part D and in particular Part D (2) has the potential to be needlessly restrictive of development and creates an inflexible position to make decisions on where development in these villages should be located. The location is entirely predicated on where the Neighbourhood Plan boundaries are, providing that Neighbourhood Plans have been adopted in the first place, despite the purpose of the criteria to be used where the Neighbourhood Plans do not 'otherwise promote' development. To reiterate, Part D (2) is not sound and the removal of this criteria would not have a bearing on the planning judgement of the decision-maker. What the removal will do is allow for the LPA to consider the locational strengths and weaknesses of proposals in accordance with the Development Plan as a whole.</p>	<p>Policy ST2 has been revised following comment from the previous consultation. The Policy ultimately supports the communities to deliver their expected growth in the most sustainable way possible. In addition, it also enables additional growth where there is a clear or identified need and where there is community support. The community support element is now linked more closely with the Neighbourhood Plan process as this is easier to manage/ control and there is a legislative process to go through.</p>
REF316	Fisher German	<p>The distribution of growth amongst the Large Rural Settlements at Policy ST2 is broadly supported, with 20% growth on the existing number of dwellings in the Parish to each of the settlements outlined (Tuxford, Blyth, Carlton in Lindrick and Costhorpe, Langold, and Misterton). Concerns are however raised in respect of the Cottam former power station site (Policy ST5). The Cottam allocation is intended to make a significant contribution (25%) to achieving and meeting the Large Rural Settlements housing requirement within the Plan period. To ensure a sound Plan it is imperative, therefore, to ensure that the Council's delivery assumptions for the site are realistic. The assumptions currently made in respect of the delivery of the site are considered ambitious and may result in the Council not meeting its housing need over the Plan period. Allowing new development to come forward in villages is considered to be in line with paragraph 78 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (NPPF), which states that in order to promote sustainable development in rural areas, "housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies</p>	<p>Housing delivery rates have been reviewed and amended where necessary based on evidence of delivery within the District and for Cottam. This has been informed by Lichfield's Start to Finish 2nd Edition (February 2020).</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
		<p>should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby". New housing in Tuxford (identified as a Large Rural Settlement) will help to enhance and maintain the vitality of the existing community and the services in nearby settlements. For Tuxford, the Draft Plan 2020 assigns a minimum housing requirement of 250 dwellings. We note that the policy states that this requirement is a minimum. This is supported.</p>	
REF319	Resident	<p>Concerns with the significant CIL reduction, the 20% cap and the methodology use in the rural growth monitoring have already been covered in Sutton Parish Council's response. My concern relates to the removal of any sense of housing allocation figure for Neighbourhood Plan areas. The previous release of the draft had a 10% housing allocation across the board with the addition of a 20% cap also across the board. Caps are not mentioned in the NPPF and the creation of them just adds another component that is totally unnecessary. The Housing allocation figure is the cap why add something more. The Housing allocation figure should also be specific to the Neighbourhood Plan community based on several factors not a blanket figure across the District. This release of the Plan totally does away with Housing Allocations and just has a blanket cap across the District Council. Instead Neighbourhood Plan teams with little expertise are expected to determine their own Housing Allocation. Isn't the District Council absolving their responsibilities as the Strategic Planning Authority?</p> <p>Paragraph 101- Neighbourhood Plans- PPG I would like to see the Cap Scrapped and replaced with specific Housing Allocations for each Neighbourhood Plan Community. Make life simple. Other relevant paragraphs concerning Housing Allocations in PPG are 102, 103,104 and 105.</p>	<p>The Community Infrastructure Levy will still apply to rural Bassetlaw in order to support community benefit and investment in local infrastructure. In terms of the overall level of growth for communities, this has been revised and updated following the consultation and is included within the revised version of the Local Plan. In addition, communities who have a made Neighbourhood Plan - such as Sutton, can continue to monitor its effectiveness and review the plan when necessary.</p>
1197268	Resident	<p>1764 dwellings across the Large Rural Settlements and Carlton in Lindrick Parish is currently supplying approximately 34% of this total. A disproportionate number. Carlton in lindrick Parish has already supplied 20% figure. Carlton in Lindrick numbers are already proportionately counting towards District's housing so there should be no more house built in the Parish. We were told a 10 year plan for the Parish.</p>	<p>Carlton - as a settlement - is providing 20% growth as per policy ST2. The land at Peaks Hill Farm, although in Carlton Parish, is contributing towards Worksop's numbers due to its close/ direct proximity to the north of Worksop. There is a green gap between the proposed site and the village of Carlton.</p>
REF327	Scrooby Parish	<p>Cannot reconcile this statement of "small scale, sensitively located" developments with Policy ST2 (Rural Bassetlaw) and its drive to an arbitrary 20% increase. 20% is NOT small scale, neither is the clamour by developers to produce that 20% in ONE single development, in one build. A 20% increase to Scrooby, equating to 29 dwellings, will yield 100 more residents and increase the Parish by 35%, and 58 more vehicles and the 29 dwellings will increase the housing stock of Scrooby by 40%. In Scrooby's terms that is nowhere near "small scale". Where did this arbitrary figure come from and why is it not tested against each Parish's ability to cope with it or even desire it.</p>	<p>Scrooby is considered a small rural settlement and BDC acknowledge that trying to accommodate 20% within the village has been difficult through the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan. Therefore the revised Local Plan has reduced the level of growth for small rural settlement from 20% to 5%.</p>
REF331	Worksop College (C/O Teakwood Partners)	<p>This letter comprises Worksop College's land ownership at Worksop College and Ranby House. In order to be sound, amendments are sought to the draft policies map, which does not correlate to the actual uses of the land within their ownership. The provision of additional development at SRS is supported. However, the inclusion of a cap on the number of homes that can be delivered in SRS is not considered sound, particularly where a development can be proven to be otherwise sustainable. Nor should it preclude development coming forward where exceptional circumstances are demonstrated, and this should be accounted for within Part E of Policy ST2. Clear support for the emphasis in the BLP on healthy lifestyles, new community facilities and promoting sport and physical activity, although a joined-up approach is necessary to secure some of these applications, and most notably those associated with a new athlete's track.</p>	<p>The spatial strategy and housing distribution for the District has been reviewed and changed in the most recent Local Plan. See updated Policy ST1 and ST2.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassettlaw			
REF333	Resident	<p>OBJECTS to the baseline date used in the 2020 draft LP to calculate housing numbers. Reverting to summer 2018 for the purpose of calculating %age housing increase, ignores delivered, sustainable development. OBJECTS to the 20% cap on development in rural villages in Everton's "class" in favour of a minimum 30% cap; with numbers taken away from the three major settlements and the Large Rural Villages where required. And no Garden Village. OBJECTS to the subtraction of the housing pipeline from individual settlement targets. Taken together, the above demonstrates that the LPA is prejudicing sustainable development in rural villages – in favour of a new, large, unsustainable, Garden Village? Indeed, the 1090 target given to "smaller villages" to 2037, represents less than 1 unit per annum in most identified settlements. This is not sustainable development. If the LPA is not willing to restructure the proposed settlement hierarchy in favour of the Core Strategy Rural Service Centre classification (replete with 30% minimum cap); Everton should be re-classified as a Large Rural Village and have its own expansion policy. In the context of 5.2.5, Everton delivers far more services than that required – with the exception of the Doctors Surgery that can be found in the neighbouring village (and reached by bus/electric car) The additional dwellings and larger convenience store/additional services fronting the A631, would be delivered as part of a western strategic extension that would also provide a by-pass circumventing the dangerous junction at Mattersey Rd and filtering vehicles off the A631 towards Worksop. Everton delivers more than the service provision required by 5.2.5, despite lower housing numbers, demonstrates that it has been comprehensively, artificially, constrained. OBJECTS to the 1090 target to 2037 for "small villages". Indeed, the definition of "Small Rural Settlement" at 5.2.6 is woefully inadequate as a means to describe Everton. Some development on a strategic western extension has already been approved on 3 x land parcels with topography lower than the Windmill and extensive landscaping delivery for all three schemes (which puts paid to "urban grain" arguments). This latter requirement will enhance biodiversity via Idle Valley lowland species, on grade 3 poor quality/sand farmland. OBJECTS to the restriction against the development of grade 3a agricultural land. Post-Brexit, such land will not be viable for cropping with yields typically at only 3T/acre.</p>	<p>The revised Bassettlaw Local Plan provides a settlement hierarchy which reflects a settlements size and role in the area and will deliver either 20% as a Large Rural Settlement or 5% as a Small Rural Settlement unless otherwise promoted through a Neighbourhood Plan. Everton does have some local services, but it is not considered to be a scale in comparison to other larger settlements in the District such as Misterton, Tuxford or Carlton in Lindrick. Therefore it is considered a Small Rural Settlement and will fall within the 5% growth requirement as per revised Policy ST2.</p>
REF334	Sutton Parish Council	<p>Rural Growth Monitoring Sutton has two sites that are not being counted in the rural growth monitoring because outline planning was granted prior to April 2018. (One of these however is incorrectly being recorded as planning was only granted in January 2019 at a judicial review 17/00300/OUT.) This cannot be unique to Sutton and the same situation must be occurring across the District. These limbo homes are not being counted anywhere, they didn't represent dwellings at August 2018 and in our case around 40 dwellings are involved. Suggest that as at April 2018 those sites with planning permissions that had a realistic prospect of being delivered should also be included in the total net commitment columns for Parishes.</p>	<p>Rural Monitoring Framework has been updated to reflect changes to policy and feedback from the community.</p>
REF335	Resident	<p>Resident of Ranby village and Babworth parish, which seems to be the "fall guy" in this plan. It is ludicrous to plan for 4000 homes in a garden village and then another 55 homes in the tiny village of Ranby. Despite what the plan says, Ranby village has only about 75 dwellings. Another 55 is not 20% anyway. Strongly object to the 20% provision in Ranby village, as this is still far too many houses for our very rural, small village. It is not in proportion. It would make an enormous difference. The village houses are separated by green spaces, which determine the character of the village. There are no shops or other services (excepting a pub, school and village hall). There is no infrastructure to support or sustain such development. Public transport is limited to a bus service, which runs very infrequently and not every day. Such development would ruin the appearance, feel and character of our village. There are some buildings and structures of historical importance in our little village, and these would also be badly affected. Please do not apply your 20% rule to Ranby village. The area of Ranby near the prison is more "concentrated" with houses and is nearer to Retford, but you have not allocated them any houses at all? Babworth is also significantly closer to the town centre.</p>	<p>Ranby is classed as small rural settlement and will now only receive 5% growth in line with the revised policy. Babworth is considered too small to receive any "planned" growth. However, through the production of a Neighbourhood Plan, it is down to the community to decide how the 5% growth is distributed. The number of existing dwellings assessed to apply the growth is for the whole parish and not just Ranby village. Therefore the figure of 255 is correct as of 2019.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
REF338	Resident	<p>Supportive of Bassetlaw's economic aspirations for the district. The proposed quantity of development within Ranby Village and the Garden Village is unsound. The Local Plan fails to direct sufficient growth to its main towns and consider the level of housing growth proposed to be directed towards the rural areas is excessive and not based on sound planning principles. A sustainable approach to planning for the rural areas needs to establish an appropriate level of development to meet local needs. Do not support the level of growth apportioned to the villages and rural area which has not been evidenced based and does not reflect the levels of growth which are actually required to support the rural area. The level of development being proposed across both the large and small rural settlements is arbitrary (in particular a proposed 20% growth target for the large and small rural settlements) and will cause harm to the overall sustainability of the district. With regard to Babworth, the Parish is a large rural parish comprising predominantly a farming community. The parish has circa 250 homes within the parish boundary and the largest settlement is Ranby. Policy ST2 of the Local Plan subsequently seeks to allocate 51 dwellings towards Ranby on the basis of that comprising a 20% uplift to the settlement's size. It is entirely unjustified and does not reflect the size or function of the village which currently only has c.78 dwellings.</p>	<p>The Local Plan proposes the majority of growth, in this plan period, in the larger settlements across the District. There is some growth directed to rural Bassetlaw - including the development of a garden village and the regeneration of existing sites. Worksop however is receiving the largest share of development.</p>
REF345	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>If the figure of 1090 for the smaller rural settlements is spread then surely if one area takes a big chunk of those because the community have planned for it and in terms of planning there is good sustainable reasoning behind then surely some kind of bank of properties could be created prior to each 5 year review that can then be reapportioned likewise any windfall developments could be banked too then smaller sites who don't want development should be able to bid for property numbers from the bank to protect their own numbers. Our housing numbers are wrong for Holbeck and Welbeck and Norton and Cuckney. In the parish of Norton and Cuckney there are 176 Properties: Cuckney 106, Norton 70 In the parish of Holbeck and Welbeck there are 119 Properties: Hobecks 96, Welbeck 23</p>	<p>Noted. The number of dwellings for Cuckney and the parish have been checked with our Council Tax department and updated.</p>
REF345	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>Could housing allocations across plan areas be shared out so if one NP area has reached its allocation plus 20% it can offer out its excess to other areas in simplistic terms.</p>	<p>Only amongst settlements within their designated neighbourhood plan areas.</p>
REF351	Resident	<p>It is proposed that each Small Rural Settlement (SRS), into which category Lound falls, has its Housing Requirement doubled from the previous 10% to 20% of its size in 2018. This is too many and that Council's own figures demonstrate that this number is not required. The evidence collected by our Parish Council's Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group over the last 4 years shows that there is a general acceptance of 21 new houses (10%) but that a doubling of this is unsupportable. The number of houses required by your Draft Plan is 1090 in the SRS category, yet the 20% requirement shown in Policy ST2 will provide 2124 houses, a 100% over-provision. If many villages are already using the 20% requirement then there is no need for other SRSs to struggle to supply an unpopular increase in their requirement. In Lound the infrastructure, drainage, power supply, etc, will not support such a large increase. Our village has infrequent public transport that is essentially unusable, and thus new houses will depend on private transport. This is against several of the stated aims of the Draft Local Plan, i.e. to increase sustainability and to mitigate climate change. The Local Plan emphasises the provision of smaller/starter homes, which SRSs like Lound are unlikely to provide. Policy ST2 states that for Large Rural Settlements that 'Unless otherwise promoted through Neighbourhood Plans...' they will provide 20% growth. SRSs do not have this reference to Neighbourhood Plans, and this apparently diminishes the importance of Lound's Neighbourhood Plan. Suggest that the requirement for a 20% increase within SRSs be reduced to 10% with a provision for more development if their Neighbourhood Plan supports this according to local needs. This will still provide your requirement and will produce a fair result.</p>	<p>The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
REF352	North and South Wheatley Parish Council	<p>Considering the specific issues for North and South Wheatley, have some concerns over the proposed development at Cottam. Welcome the use of a brownfield site Cottam is relatively isolated, on the west bank of the River Trent and with poor road links to the surrounding area. The proposal to build 450 houses by 2037 and a further 1150 houses after that would have a major impact on the surrounding villages; in particular the traffic flow through Leverton (on the principal route to both Retford and Gainsborough) and Sturton (on the principal route to Gainsborough). North and South Wheatley may be less affected by traffic but we would expect some increase in flow of traffic heading to other destinations such as Doncaster. The plan mentions the requirement for additional health care provision and school places but there is little detail provided. Considering the likely change in the demographic make-up of the population the need for additional health care provision for older residents would be the more pressing concern. The plan acknowledges that rural bus services are poor and with an older population likely to be less able to drive their own cars then the matter of public transport to and from Cottam will have to be addressed. Finally, North and South Wheatley is one of the Small Rural Settlements nominated for a 20% (maximum) growth between now and 2037. This is a sizeable increase (up to 53 houses) in the size of the village and will doubtless cause concern to some of our residents yet it pales into insignificance when set again the potential development at Cottam and the Bassetlaw Garden Village.</p>	The spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy has been revised following additional evidence and feedback from consultation. See Policy ST1.
REF363	Resident	<p>East Markham the figure of 524 dwellings within the neighbourhood plan area, with a 20% cap of 105 houses. However in the settlement the number of dwellings falls to 481 with a cap of 96. It is my contention that the settlement area should be the figure used. Also changed the date to 1st April 2018 for which planning applications towards this cap are valid. This severely disadvantages my village which has approx. 60 applications approved and being built which will be disqualified from the cap. Given all the building work at present taking place in the village and the fact that no infrastructure improvements to roads and services have taken place east Markham should be exempt from any additional development from the period of this plan. Policy ST2 The statement in Para E5 makes a complete nonsense of the 20% cap by virtue of it being able to be overridden. Wary that this 20% cap is not a national policy but an arbitrary figure plucked out of thin air by B.D.C. and could be overruled by a Planning Inspector.</p>	East Markham is considered a 'small rural settlement' and therefore will only support 5% growth from 1st April 2018. The Rural Monitoring Table has also been updated to reflect the change in classification.
REF365	Resident	<p>In order to generate figures for the 20% cap on projected growth, each of the 73 settlements was assessed as to its current size. This exercise involved drawing boundary lines around each settlement, which were then used in conjunction with the District Council's Unique Property Reference Number (UPRN) database in order to calculate the number of dwellings. The figures were generated and deemed current as of 13th August 2018; the full set of figures is included here as Appendix 6. The boundary lines drawn around each settlement were produced solely for this purpose, and should not be confused with the development boundaries that currently apply to some settlements in the district, as defined in the 2011 Bassetlaw Core Strategy. For reference purposes, the maps produced for counting the number of properties in each of the 73 growth settlements are included here as Appendix 7. The 10% housing requirement figures, applicable to designated neighbourhood plan areas and provided for guidance purposes for not-yet-designated areas, were calculated on the same date using the same database (see Appendix 6).</p>	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF373	Residents	<p>Concerned regarding the potential for 51 new build houses in Ranby Village: Applied for planning permission to build one house on our land which BDC refused back in 2004. Appealed and the refusal was upheld. In 2018 we decided to apply for a change of use to our existing garage and games room which was also refused for the same reasons (there is no need for any further housing in Ranby). These reasons being: - Policy 5/3 of the Bassetlaw Local Plan as modified indicated that residential development within settlement envelopes will be permitted only if in character with the area, provides adequate residential amenity, does not create traffic problems and does not set an undesirable precedent. The eastern part of the village is characterised by open fields with large dwellings set in spacious well planted grounds, giving an open, leafy character to the locality. The proposed development (of one house only) would result in a more cramped form of development at a prominent position at the edge of the village, to the detriment of the character and spacious appearance of the area as a whole. As</p>	Ranby is classed as small rural settlement and will now only receive 5% growth in line with the revised policy. Babworth is considered too small to receive any "planned" growth. However, through the production of a Neighbourhood Plan, it is down to the community to decide how the 5% growth is distributed. The number of existing dwellings assessed to apply the growth is for the whole parish and not just Ranby village. Therefore the figure of 255 is correct as of 2019.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
		such, the proposed development would be wholly contrary to the aims and objectives of the policy of the Local Plan (If this is the case for one house, surely 51 should never be considered).	
REF374	Resident	<p>Express my dissent to the proposed increase in housing numbers to be built in this historic rural village. The village gave their answers to a questionnaire in 2016 and after considerable work and effort it was reluctantly agreed to a future increase of 10% in housing requirement. New proposal of a 20% increase in the size of the village is unsustainable. Such a large increase in population will have serious adverse effects on the character and amenity of the settlement. BDC's own report states that "the housing requirement of 20% must result in a settlement which is capable of accommodating the level of growth proposed." Lound is not capable of such a large increase in population. The infrastructure and services are already failing, the sewerage system is already overloaded, drainage of surface water problematical. Lound has no shop, no school, no doctors surgery, the bus service is so infrequent and expensive (£6 return to Retford) meaning that any resident of Lound could not rely on public transport to go to work in any other area. Therefore travelling by car is essential, thereby increasing car use in the area. As a result of the Lound Neighbourhood Plan we, as a small rural setting, agreed a target for new homes but this huge increase is totally unacceptable and there is clearly no local community support. I also believe that the sale of any new properties would be difficult due to the lack of facilities for young families. Hopefully you will agree that the original plan should be reinstated and that BDC housing requirement (which apparently has been exaggerated) can be made up by extra numbers in, perhaps, the Garden Village which will have to have the necessary school, surgery and shops. I hope this exercise, which must have cost a huge sum for local tax payers, will soon be agreed and concluded satisfactorily.</p>	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
REF375	Resident	The proposed 51 houses at Ranby be included in the Garden Village	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF385	Resident	<p>At the meeting on Thursday 13th February in Tuxford an official of the planning department said that the planned growth of the villages would be about 20% until the towns (I presume Retford and Worksop) slightly higher. Historically towns grow much faster than villages consequently Worksop and Retford should be growing at about 60%-70% and the villages at about 6%-8%. In an area of a growing economy having about the same level of building growth everywhere will result in a shortfall in housing in the towns and an excess of houses in the villages. The price of town dwellings will increase causing people at the bottom of the property ladder being unable to buy property. The prices in the villages will drop causing people to travel much more increasing the carbon footprint and pollution, and congestion. To sum up build in an area of a growing economy against market forces at your peril. However, Bassetlaw is a very deprived area. Worksop has still not recovered from the closure of Manton Colliery and the exodus of the textile industry. Collieries close to Tuxford such as Bevercotes, Ollerton and Thoresby which at the sometime held the European coal extraction record for a years' output. This coupled with the rundown of supporting manufactures such as DOSCO (1 mile outside Tuxford dropping from a workforce of 750 to 250 people) has had a huge impact on the local economy. There are no signs of anything that will create real growth this and other deprived areas should be exempt from the national housing scheme. One day a BBC TV news man went to Washington near Newcastle and stood amongst 200 dwellings saying that a year earlier the builder was just finishing them and yet not a single one had been taken. He went on to say that they were all lying empty and yet in the south of England, people were queuing out for property. To sum up build in deprived area at your peril. Further to build a garden village on farmland where there is no hope of employment beggars belief.</p>	Tuxford is considered a Large Rural Settlement due to its size, level of services and the role it provides to other settlements. Tuxford is a very constrained settlement and it is difficult for the town to grow naturally. However, a number of sites have been put forward to be considered for development and these were consulted on late last year and early in 2020. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment has been updated which provides the justification for the housing and employment targets and the balance between the two.
REF390	Resident	Housing – need for social housing especially bungalows as part of the 39% for Dunham on Trent Our bus service is nearly non-existent, if the sites at Cottam and High Marnham are developed (even if they are not). A regular bus service from Worksop, via, Retford, Tuxford – Lincoln! Via Saxilby. There are many not clearly sign posted and not accessible in the winter months. Pavement joining up all villages will promote access and public health and economic prosperity. Village Fledborough to Ragnall to Dunham on Trent – Darlton and to Tuxford with good pavements people could walk instead of using cars and access public transport. The same for South Leverton to Treswell from Laneham to Rampton. Also joining up Cottam and High Marnham will improve the whole accessibility of the area, while not taking away the rural aspects.	There is a need for more specialist and affordable housing in rural Bassetlaw. Some communities are preparing Neighbourhood Plans for their areas to help manage development and influence the type of development in their locality. Connectivity is also important through bus services and public footpaths. The Local Plan is supporting the enhancement of existing public footpaths and encourages new developments to provide additional ones where appropriate.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassettlaw			
REF400	Resident	Ranby village has been allocated too many houses although we live in the parish of Babworth. The village is not able to cope with the number of houses allocated we need to know where the planned building's will be and what will be built.	Ranby is classed as small rural settlement and will now only receive 5% growth in line with the revised policy. Babworth is considered too small to receive any "planned" growth. However, through the production of a Neighbourhood Plan, it is down to the community to decide how the 5% growth is distributed. The number of existing dwellings assessed to apply the growth is for the whole parish and not just Ranby village. Therefore the figure of 255 is correct as of 2019.
REF401	East Markham Parish Council	While provision of the plan is overdue and welcome, East Markham Parish Council has little faith that it will followed by BDC based on the scale of development within the village in recent years. At the last census, (2011) East Markham had 490 dwellings, this had increased to 524 by August 2018 representing a rise in Housing stock of 5.7%. In contrast, Clarborough and Welham (also defined as a small rural settlement within the plan) has seen an increase in dwellings from 480 in the census to 495 by August 2018. This represents an increase of 3.1% in their housing stock. The increase in dwellings over the last 9 years has produced a lot of pressure on narrow village roads. Recent construction of dwellings on Beckland Hill and High Street have seen serious increases in congestion on the village's roads. Development has increased further in the last 2 years. Since April 2018, East Markham has seen 110 properties been either built or approved. This takes the housing stock of the village over the proposed cap within the lifespan of the plan. The Parish Council views the cap as meaningless. Request that BDC view each planning application in the wider context of development in the village rather than on an individual basis. There are 59 houses either being developed or approved around Mark Lane / Beckland Hill. Little apparent thought appears to have been given to the impact that these separate developments will have on roads and drainage in this area. Repeatedly raised concerns about the safety of the Mark Lane / Beckland Hill Road Junction but these have been ignored. Ask that road safety measures are introduced at that point to safeguard our residents. Request that BDC review access to the village. There are only two entrances left for traffic to the village, whereas there used to be four. This is funnelling traffic onto Askham Road, Farm Lane and Beckland Hill. This increase in traffic represents a danger as is evidenced by three car crashes on this stretch of road during the past 12 months. Requests that the access from the village from the A57 to High Street (Western Entrance) be reinstated to take pressure off traffic around the School on Askham Road, and also for the Priestgate to West Markham road over the A1 to be repaired and reopened. The infrastructure of the village has not kept pace with development is with regard to drains and sewers. In February 2020 the village has suffered from the discharge of raw sewage from drains close to the school. This was attended by Severn Trent but the problem recurred twice again that month. Church Street has also experienced raw sewage flowing across the road in front of the actual Church. There has been repeated flooding of residential properties in both York and Low Street. The Village's neighbourhood plan has a specific policy NP7 relating to this. There is little evidence that BDC have considered this in recent decisions. Recent development already has had an adverse impact on the character and amenity of the village. The proportionate cap of 20% has been in existence for some time but there is little evidence that BDC has taken character and amenity into consideration. The 20% proportionate cap is not Government policy but is BDC policy. In the event of a conflict between BDC 20% cap and the Governments no upper limit EMPC seeks clarification as to what takes priority.	The Council has produced and updated its rural monitoring table. This is directly linked to planning applications and the number of dwellings identified in Policy ST2. The table will be updated and published monthly. In terms of highway issues, this is down to NCC and their advice at the time of commenting on planning applications. The proposed 20% for East Markham has now been reduced to 5%. The base date for the monitoring of any completions is 1st April 2018. The rural monitoring table provides the most up to date picture in relation to planning permissions and the level of growth identified for each community in Policy ST2.
REF407	Resident	How do we find the actual figures that BDC has produced against the Government figures for local housing 'need'. The 20% increase in housing in BDC is unrealistic and damaging. What is the national Government figure please?	The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment has been updated which provides the justification for the housing and employment targets and the balance between the two.
REF416	Residents	The draft local plan has been changed to increase the housing requirement to 20% from 10%. Strongly object to this very unwelcome increase. Our Parish Council steering group found that the majority of residents in Lound thought that no new housing is needed. We reluctantly agreed to 10% but we do not want 42 new properties building in our small rural village. The infrastructure in Lound would struggle to cope with this number of properties, our roads are narrow and congested already. There is ample scope for more building in Retford to fulfil your required 20% increase across the county, where there are sufficient facilities and amenities whilst we	Policy ST2 has now been reviewed in response to comments made during the previous public consultation. Lound is still considered a 'small rural settlement', but the level of growth has been reduced from 20% to 5% over the plan period. The rural monitoring table has also been updated to reflect these changes.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
		have none. To reiterate we strongly object to more housing than 10% being built in Lound. There is no need to crowd our narrow road or swamp our infrastructure more than it can cope with.	
REF417	Resident	Would prefer the allocation of 51 homes for Ranby be allocated to the Garden Village as the infrastructure for the village would not be able to cope with the increase of traffic and also there is no amenities (i.e. shops) in the village.	Ranby is classed as small rural settlement and will now only receive 5% growth in line with the revised policy. However, through the production of a Neighbourhood Plan, it is down to the community to decide how the 5% growth is distributed.
REF423	Resident	There are not 250 houses in Ranby village. The A1 should be resurfaced with silent tarmac. The entire length of the A1 facing Ranby Village should be fitted with a sound barrier as on the motorway between Geneva and Montreaux.	The A1 and its upgrade is the responsibility of Highways England and not Bassetlaw District Council.
REF424	Resident	Please comment on maths base number how delivered 255 as only about 100 in the village itself therefore 20% = 20 not 51 dwelling increase? Also, where has been chosen for the 20 new dwellings?	Ranby is classed as small rural settlement and will now only receive 5% growth in line with the revised policy. Babworth is considered too small to receive any "planned" growth. However, through the production of a Neighbourhood Plan, it is down to the community to decide how the 5% growth is distributed. The number of existing dwellings assessed to apply the growth is for the whole parish and not just Ranby village. Therefore the figure of 255 is correct as of 2019.
REF426	Resident	Bassetlaw are talking about creating jobs that at present there is very few or none.	The Local Plan also includes land for jobs. These are located on proposed allocated employment sites or through existing sites around the District. The plan also supports smaller and rural businesses.
REF455	Resident	Surprised to hear that Lound's Housing Requirement has doubled from 21 to 42 and believe this is just too many. The lower figure seemed acceptable but the local services and infrastructure will struggle with a substantial increase. Public transport is inadequate so an undesirable increase in private vehicle movements will result and as a householder who has twice had raw sewage on his lawn in recent years due to blockages in elderly pipework (a link to the main drain from several dwellings on Town Street passes through my property), the existing foul drainage system will surely struggle. I do not consider it "Nimby-ism" to protect the appeal of small rural villages and size is a key factor. Some people like to live in smaller quiet communities as I do whilst others prefer the convenience and facilities of larger urban settlements. Planning should respect such preferences. I am most unhappy that the considerable time and diligent effort has been spent by our (voluntary) Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group appears to have ended at the very least in considerable frustration and no doubt there are costs incurred by the Council which as a taxpayer also grieves me if the exercise proves to be partially wasted.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
REF456	Resident	Lound Object the plan to double the initial plan for 21 new dwellings is mainly the increase of traffic which is already dreadful with the increase we have seen and induced of heavy lorries, through the village the roads are not able to stand this constant battering and our roads are badly needing repairs and any more traffic is madness.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
REF457	Resident	As a resident of Lound must protest of the high handed decision of BDC. Regardless of what was agreed in 2018, it has now decreed that Lound should accommodate double the amount of housing agreed previously. Why? Records show it is not needed. Furthermore, the infrastructure is not adequate to support a greater influx of housing and people etc. The Council must realis this, if the details have been studied! It may be necessary in the future- but not now! Please reconsider, and have the honesty to admit you were wrong.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
REF458	Resident	You wish to increase the new housing requirement by 100%. The locals have worked hard on a village plan with due consultation with the local inhabitants. This is unnecessary as Lound is a small charming village with few amenities. Cannot think who would buy these extra houses. The bus service is very infrequent, there is no school in Lound nor a village store or post office. I wonder who will be able to afford, even the ones already agreed	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
		upon, without increasing the number of new homes. There has been a significant increase in nearby Sutton (which does have a few more amenities) and none of these have sold so far in the area on Lound Low Road. I consider that this decision has been made in haste, without credible thought for those who would wish to occupy these homes.	"small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
REF459	Resident	Appalled to see that the draft BDC Local Plan 2020 proposes to double the increase in dwellings previously required for Lound. Villagers had reluctantly accepted an increase of 21 houses (10%) but the new proposal is neither desirable nor necessary. Such an increase will place extra pressure on the local infrastructure. The village was expanded over recent years on a result of infills and conversions. Drains regularly do not cope with heavy rainfall as it is. Starter homes are unlikely here. Employment opportunities in the area are very limited. Newcomers will mostly be commuters by car or by car and rail from Retford to other towns/cities. They will also need to drive to and from Retford to access essential services and facilities. This is not eco-friendly and is at odds with government policy. There are many recent current and planned housing developments in Retford and the surrounding area including the large new village destined to replace Gamston Airport. These are more than sufficient to meet the BDC requirements. Lound is a village with character. It would be a pity if this be lost as it is gradually engulfed in urban sprawl as have so many others nationwide. Trust that the 10% increase in housing for Lound need not be exceeded.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
REF460	Resident	The steering group in Lound submitted their draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Parish Council for approval. Understand that the draft Bassetlaw District Council Local Plan now shows a 37% increase in housing requirement in Bassetlaw by 2037. The Lound target for new homes has been double in what is small rural village. This is wrong and completely undermines the basis on which the Lound Neighbourhood Plan was created. The Neighbourhood Plan village survey in 2016 showed most householders wanted little or no new housing development. Part 1 specified a minimum of 21 new homes. Lound's draft Plan was subsequently adjusted to meet this target and would protect the village from unsuitable development. This figure has doubled to 42 new homes, calculated 20% of homes in Lound Parish. This is totally unacceptable and not sustainable and undermines all the hard work done by the village Neighbourhood Plan Committee. Also, it does not consider the resident's views on the type of future village development needed. Bassetlaw's reputation has now been strongly damaged. Understand the village steering group, which includes Parish Councillors, has rigorously protested with Bassetlaw officials regarding their unbalanced method of finding the higher figures. This change in housing numbers wrongly punishes the small rural villages like Lound. Through the Neighbourhood Plan, villagers in Lound have undertaken what was required from Bassetlaw Council and cannot support the additional new increase in housing to How can the Strategic Objectives, enhance the quality, diversity and character of rural villages? The character of Nottinghamshire small villages must be protected and maintained for future generations and should not be spoilt by Bassetlaw's inappropriate planning decisions. Lound, as with many other small villages, does not have the infrastructure to support this additional housing growth demand. The village does not have any shops, has drainage issues, poor public transport and a sewage plant at capacity. Plus, the high cost of current housing and future housing, limits any potential interest from low income families. Revise your policy and accept the housing volume laid out in Lound's Neighbourhood Plan and consider the implications and damage to the unique character of Lound if ignored.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
REF475	Resident	Rural development policies – support The villages in Bassetlaw can accept further growth. Too much may strain road links and resources.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF480	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Recognise the need for housing within the District and the responsibility for rural communities to support some additional building. Question how those villages with local plans will support a 20% growth after the extensive consultation that has already taken place. Note that in one presentation BDC spoke that some villages may support with a higher level of development. Yet to identify these locations.	The majority of made Neighbourhood Plans or Neighbourhood Plans that are currently in production have all either considered, have or are planning to, accommodate the 20% level of growth. Some settlements have not due to issues of land availability, deliverability or planning constraints. This is reflected in the revised policy ST2.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
1177432	Resident	This is an excellent idea. The site is very accessible and takes the pressure off housing demand in surrounding towns where the existing infrastructure may be poor. The new location of the garden village makes sense. Could this be increased in size if necessary?	The size of the site is the full extent of the land available for a garden village.
1180212	Resident	I think this is an excellent development.	Support noted and welcome.
1189264	Resident	The idea of a garden village (small town) so close to Retford and adjacent to one of the main routes into and out of Retford seems to be ill thought out. Where do you think people are going to work, shop, commute to and from? Roads in this area are already congested. Access into Retford along both the A620 and B6420 is already bad at peak times. It pretty clear this development won't provide sufficient jobs to employ the new residents so it will effectively create a whole load of new commuters to the more developed population centers such as Lincoln, Doncaster or Sheffield.	The site will provide 15ha of employment land to provide residents with jobs and a local centre and community facilities to meet every day local needs. Additional work on traffic will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. The traffic assessment will look at the projected modelling of potential vehicular trips to and from the site and what, if any, mitigation is required to address the issues identified.
REF018	Resident	Traffic congestion, the roundabout on the A1 is already very busy and the level crossing on Mansfield Road is a main line. This already causes traffic congestion and a further 750 homes would have a huge impact on this. The cross roads at Babworth again are busy and the road is not equipped for this. The crematorium has already massively contributed to the volume of traffic and I feel the road has become unsafe especially the Babworth junction. The A1 closes frequently or diverts traffic at least once a week if not more often, this again will only add to the volume of traffic. Live on Old London Road and all the congestion already has an impact on this road. This development will only force more traffic down this single track lane which is not fit for purpose for the current amount of traffic. The road can only accommodate one car at a time and can spend more time on the grass verge allowing other vehicles to pass. The road is frequently used by ramblers, bikers and horses and safety would also be a huge concern as the road has several blind spots and speeding is also a problem. Previously reported these concerns to the council & highways, this proposal would only make the situation far worse.	Additional work on traffic will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. The traffic assessment will look at the projected modelling of potential vehicular trips to and from the site and what, if any, mitigation is required to address the issues identified.
REF047	Sport England	Para 5.3.19 and policy ST3 it is important that the evidence is available to inform sports and active recreational needs across the district and within the Garden Village. Sport England supports the plans to develop a Built Sport Facilities Strategy as part of the evidence base. Para 9.4.9., Ensure that Active Design is considered as part of the development process.	A Built Facilities Study is being produced. Once approved, together with the existing Playing Pitch Strategy it will inform future policy development. Active Design will be incorporated into the masterplanning of the site. Reference will be added to Policy ST3 to reflect this.
REF054	Resident	Should also mitigate for noise and maintain public right of way.	Policy ST3 makes provision for connectivity to the public rights of way network. Policy ST3 will be clarified to ensure the existing right of way is maintained. Policy ST3 will be amended to ensure the amenity of existing and future residents is protected.
REF061	Resident	A Garden Village is a good idea, it will focus major development in one area and allow villages to have smaller developments which will better reflect their history and the environment.	Support noted and welcome.
1191848	Barnby Moor Parish Council	If it is built on redundant sites, not farm land.	The Local Plan makes good use of previously developed land and minimises the loss of the highest quality agricultural land. But inevitably there are not enough suitable, available and deliverable brownfield sites in the District to meet identified development needs. The Garden Village would be built on predominantly greenfield - mostly agricultural - land. National policy states that planning policies must give consideration to agricultural land and where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality. The proposal uses Grade 3 agricultural land which is lower quality than Grade 1 and 2.
REF085	Retford Civic Society	Recognise that a new village could add something new and exciting to Bassetlaw. Support the proposed development at Five Lanes End as this site has great accessibility both to the trunk road network and to local towns. It is essential that this development does not start until there is a mechanism in place to ensure that	Further work will be undertaken to determine the type and level of infrastructure required to support the first phase of the Garden Village, and its timing.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
		retail and other community facilities, including public transport services, are in place at an early stage to serve residents. Many community facilities require a certain population to be viable and this applies particularly to the possibility of a new rail station. To ensure a successful development it may be necessary to increase the scale of building permitted in the first phase of this development.	
1193061	Resident	This is a purely aspirational plan. Do not see any real evidence to justify the need for a new town development so close to Retford and Worksop. Employment would be a major issue unless the new residents are to commute to major cities. Would need to attract a major employer to the area supplying senior and less skilled jobs. Are there any plans to do so?	The site will provide 15ha of employment land to provide residents with jobs - the aim is to attract different types of businesses to diversify the economy and provide better skilled and higher paid jobs.
1193338	Resident	The building of a new garden village seems sensible as the location sees it within a short distance of the A1. No problems with this development.	Support noted and welcome.
1193555	Resident	The location of the green village as not be considered. It too near climber park sssi that already got a large impact with visitors already. More information on how this going to be built and mitigation they could be provided.	Additional work on potential visitor impacts will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. The assessment will look at visitor impact from the site and what, if any, mitigation is required to address the issues identified.
1194464	Resident	Need to determine which this proposal is, It is named both a "Garden Village" and a "Garden City". Is the idea to lull the communities senses by using the "Village" name and later transforming this to a "City" ? Good productive farmland is to be used to the detriment of the nations ability to produce sufficient food crops. The proposed Rail Station will not be built either at all or until well into the proposed development if it goes ahead. This is an economic fact of life, along with all of the other services "promised". You do not have any guarantees that I am aware of that will ensure that these developments are included with the housing plan. The nett result will be more overloaded services in this area with additional traffic thrust onto the already inadequate road system and inadequate support services. No matter what 'screening' is used there will be intolerable traffic noise from the adjacent A1 Major Trunk Road which must be in line, at some point in the near future, to be upgraded to a Motorway. Who will wish to live close to this Heavy Traffic Route and the subsequent disturbance ??	The site will be a Garden Village but designed and built to reflect the Government's Garden City principles. National policy states that planning policies must give consideration to agricultural land and where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality. The proposal uses Grade 3 agricultural land which is lower quality than Grade 1 and 2. Once adopted, Policy ST3 will set out the infrastructure that any development at the Garden Village would be expected to provide. Without such provision planning permission would not be granted. Policy ST3 will be amended to ensure the amenity of existing and future residents is protected from noise for example.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF115	Canal and River Trust	<p>Additional consideration should be given to the need for off-site improvements to the existing walking and cycling infrastructure in vicinity of the Garden Village. Due to the existing rural location, existing walking and cycling routes are designed for low levels of usage, which could be adversely impacted by the additional usage brought by the development unless appropriate mitigation is undertaken to improve these routes. Whilst part 4 (a.vi) refers to improvements towards links direct to facilities including Retford and over the A1, it does not account for nearby pedestrian and cycling routes that could be utilised by residents for leisure and recreation. The Garden Village is approximately 1500m to the south of the Chesterfield Canal. There is potential for the canal to provide a local leisure resource for new residents as part of a wider circular walking or cycling route, which could help to meet the future open space and leisure needs of future residents, which could promote physical wellbeing and active travel. The towpath, and other existing public rights of way in proximity to the site, are designed to meet their current levels of relatively low use. The Trust maintain assets to a steady state based on existing usage. Any additional usage brought about by the Garden Village could result in additional liabilities, including the erosion of footpath surfaces, which could discourage long term use of the local pedestrian and cycle network for travel and leisure, contrary to the general aims of paragraph 104 (part d) of the NPPF. Consideration is given towards the need to ensure that nearby walking and cycling routes are sufficiently robust to accommodate the likely demands brought upon them from the new development. This could be met through the addition of an additional requirement within part 4.a) of the policy so that it is made specific that improvements to the wider walking and cycling network are considered. Suggested additional wording is provided below: "Improvements to the existing walking and cycling infrastructure in proximity to the site to accommodate the future demands of residents, including account towards routes used for leisure and recreation". Alternatively, expansion of the explanatory text to include reference to the need for the potential use of the existing walking and cycling infrastructure to be considered.</p>	Off site connectivity by walking and cycling will be part of the policy progression and the masterplan process.

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

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

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

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

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village	<p>Gainsborough or Meadowhall. One of the advantages being used for the location is the proximity to the A1, however this also means that people will use their cars to get to the retail and leisure facilities that is sadly lacking in our area. So I envisage that far from limiting future car use, this location will actually increase the use of cars. Also the 2nd point is about maintaining the character of the area. This won't happen as the site is currently rural Retford - fields, trees, hedgerows, open green space etc and will be replaced by 4000 houses and other developments. This is evident from the change in the last version of the plan that was consulted upon as Section 8 of the old plan Rural Bassetlaw has been completely dropped as the Garden Village proposal completely contradicts the principles the original plan had. Section 8.11 from the plan was: 8.11 Following a comprehensive assessment of all 103 settlements in rural Bassetlaw, 30 settlements have been identified as either too small or too dispersed in nature to support additional housing development without this having a detrimental impact upon their character. A list of these settlements is included in figure 7 at the end of this chapter.</p> <p>The areas around the proposed site (Morton, Upper Morton and Little Morton) were listed as settlements not suitable for small scale development at that time, but now faced with a complete oxymoron in that the proposal would amount to 4000 houses being built on the site. The plan is contradicting previous principles applied and also not demonstrating why this should be progressed.</p> <p>Likewise on Historic England's website there are entries shown in their Non-Listed sites – Pastscape and Heritage Gateway on the proposed sites – Crop Markings in the fields, Morton Hill Farm and buildings (the plan does not detail what will happen to these), & an irregular series of linked enclosures (quite dense) including one circular feature. Will these historical features be retained or destroyed?</p> <p>From a personal perspective my family and I are residents in the area and will be directly affected by the plans. Point 5 in Section 5.3.8 of the local plan states:</p> <p>Strong local vision and engagement: designed and executed with the engagement and involvement of the existing local community, and future residents and businesses. This should include consideration of how the natural and historic environment of the local area is reflected and respected.</p>	
REF169	Highways England	<p>The Bassetlaw Garden Village has been proposed to accommodate a total of 4,000 dwellings, note that given its complex nature the target for this Local Plan period is limited to 750. Any development coming forward on this site should note that as the eastern boundary abuts the A1 trunk road, boundary treatment works and drainage will need to be considered to ensure the structural integrity of the network is not compromised. In addition, 22.1 ha of employment land is to be completed, 108 ha of new employment land is to be found and at least 199.6 ha of strategic employment land is to be allocated to address employment need and/or expansions to local businesses.</p>	<p>The Council will continue to work with Highways England so that masterplanning will ensure that the structural integrity of the A1 is not compromised.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF169	Highways England	<p>The revised Local Plan is a great improvement of the previous plan especially with reference to the development of Gamston airfield and Bevercotes pit. Accept your proposal for a "Garden Villages" is very contentious and note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If a new village does move forward recommend that further research should be carried out to consider the possibility of developing an alternative site at West Burton before the final decision is made as the road system and positioning of the site is mid-way between the two large conurbations of Retford and Gainsborough and there are already services and facilities already in place to aid the homeowners before their own are built. • There is insufficient capacity on roads for the proposed increase in use. • The impact on the road network of any of the proposed sites that have been consulted on shows that all the sites would likely increase traffic flow on rural lanes, which are not suitable for additional traffic. • accept that the proximity of both the A1 and the rail links for the proposed Village site at Applyhead has merit, however the A1 already is highly used and when accidents occur this impacts on all roads around Retford and surrounding villages. • No consideration or evidence is included to show the effects of pollution from the A1 covering the area proposed due to increased traffic. • The loss of a significant portion of Green Belt is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, which specifies it as a justifiable constraint on housing delivery. The Local Plan documents give no detail of the Exceptional Circumstances which could justify release of Green Belt. • The Garden Village site confirms that the impact on the environment, in terms of congestion and pollution, will be considerable because of the reliance on cars as the primary means of transport. • The open fields and hedges serve a very useful purpose in mitigating for the locations poor air quality as well as providing open countryside for the residents of Rural Retford's wellbeing. • The Local Plan proposal identifies loss of biodiversity opportunities with increased urbanisation, especially with the loss of field systems and hedgerows. It also identifies the loss of significant portions of Grade 3 agricultural land which is currently producing food products. • Cumulatively the impact will be detrimental to the whole area. 	<p>For a site to be considered as a Garden Village it must be submitted by the landowner as available for development. West Burton is still operational and the owners have not indicated the site is available for development. Additional work on traffic impacts will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. The traffic assessment will look at the projected modelling of potential vehicular trips to and from the site and what, if any, mitigation is required to address the issues identified. Policy ST3 requires an air quality assessment be submitted to ensure impacts of development on air quality are identified and appropriately mitigated. Bassetlaw does not have a green belt. However, the Garden Village would be built on greenfield - mostly agricultural - land. National policy states that planning policies must give consideration to agricultural land and where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality. The proposal uses Grade 3 agricultural land which is lower quality than Grade 1 and 2. Additional work on ecological impacts will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. The assessment will look at the type and mix of biodiversity on the site and what, if any, mitigation is required to address the issues identified. There will also be a requirement that at least 10% biodiversity net gain is achieved on site and that a significant amount of additional trees are planted to enhance the site's ecological value.</p>
1195486	Gamston with Eaton and West Drayton Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal states that if the Garden Village goes ahead, some of the houses will be built before any additional infrastructure is provided. This will add pressure to local facilities which are already overstretched. The quantum of houses proposed may not bring the required infrastructure benefits. • Consideration / commitment does need to be given as to how the Council can ensure that at what stages the additional infrastructure must be provided also what percentage of land within any "Garden Village" will be allocated to open/ green and leisure spaces. • How do they intend to link a cycle routes between any village and the nearest large conurbation? There is a risk that the Garden Village will be undeliverable for some or all of the factors mentioned already, in which case the promise of infrastructure solutions for the district as a whole to be delivered by the Garden Village will not materialise. There is also the risk that the developers will choose not to deliver the housing in large enough packages because of financial factors such as market conditions. Developments could also be subcontracted to smaller builders, putting any or all of the promises of infrastructure at risk because of viability issues or even market collapse. The greater risk to the district, then, if the Garden Village is not delivered, is that the wholesale scatter gun approach to development across the district will continue adding housing without any infrastructure, only this time it will build on open spaces and the Green Belt. The strategy has very little to do with what the district needs or wants and does not reflect in anyway the results of the engagements with stakeholders to produce a shared vision. 	<p>Further work will be undertaken to determine the infrastructure required to support each phase of the development. The requirements for infrastructure and the timing of provision are agreed through discussion with the infrastructure providers. Clarification will be provided as to how much land will be publicly accessible open space, formal sports pitches and wildlife areas. Additional work on sustainable transport provision, routes and connectivity to the existing network will be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. The Garden Village will only be taken forward in the Local Plan if it can be demonstrated that the site can be deliverable. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment states that all infrastructure associated with the site can be delivered as part of a financially viable scheme.</p>
1195486	Gamston with Eaton and West Drayton Parish Council	<p>Support the proposal for a new garden Village in the District. However, this is another completely 'new' major addition to the housing supply in the 2020 Draft Plan alongside the former Cottam Power Station and again there is little information in the public domain to substantiate delivery of the first 750 dwellings alongside the essential infrastructure necessary to establish a new settlement within the timescales suggested. It is unsafe to therefore rely on as many as 750 dwellings coming forward in the plan period requirement. In this regard it is also essential that ST14 is robust in delivering its share of housing requirement for the main towns and we consider that additional additional sustainable sites should be</p>	<p>The spatial strategy will be re-visited as part of the progression of the Local Plan</p>

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

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF198	Consultant	<p>Severn Trent support the principles behind the Bassetlaw Garden village and raise no objection to the proposed allocation of the site at Upper Morton. Welcome the opportunities to be part of the stakeholder groups for developing a plan for the Garden Village. Severn Trent would note that it is important that all allocations, including the Garden village consider water efficiency, drainage, and sewerage from the outset. One of the fundamental principles is that the village should be dominated by high quality Biodiverse landscape and green infrastructure. Support this approach and highlight the need to incorporate Blue Infrastructure alongside the green infrastructure creating blue-green corridors that will support an enable wildlife to thrive. This blue infrastructure is also key for the sustainable management of water, returning surface water run-off to the natural water cycle as good quality through the use of SuDS, and ensuring that the good quality water can be then reach watercourses or groundwater to support sustainable abstraction for use as potable water. The plan is to retain a connection to the rural setting, through the inclusion of trees, and vegetated areas. Support this but as there is also a need to create blue - green connections through the development. The benefits of creating these corridors include the opportunity for promoting sustainable transport, by incorporating of footpaths and cycle ways alongside key infrastructure such as SuDS and watercourses to convey surface water safely through the development ensuring that water quality and opportunities to enhance local amenity are incorporated as well as the quantity aspect of SuDS design. It is important that the Garden village is designed, with the whole lifetime of the development in mind. It is essential that infrastructure is located and designed to be adaptable and resilient to changes. Additional pressures, including climate change, urban creep and further growth and development can then be managed sustainably whilst retaining the sense of place and high quality development. The utilisation of SuDS should assist with this process, in particular the use of source control SuDS. Consideration of wider benefits including opportunities to create priority Habitats should also be considered especially where this can be undertaken as part of multifunctional space. Longer term ownership and maintenance of key infrastructure is usually, clear cut with a specific utility company / council department being the appropriate authority or the responsibility being that of riparian ownership. In more recent years the provision of services through management companies or multi-functional spaces with shared responsibilities has created some confusion. Recommend that a management and maintenance plan for the Garden Village is developed, and that this is kept as a live document to prevent maintenance of the development compromising the overall design. Support "Maximise the effective use of natural resources including Energy and water," within paragraph 5.3.11 and "Sustainable drainage should be fully integrated within green infrastructure as part of a bespoke wildlife friendly scheme."</p>	<p>Support for the principles of the Garden Village is welcome. The Council will continue to work with Severn Trent so that policy development and masterplanning appropriately addresses the requirements of blue-green infrastructure. Policy ST3 makes provision for an integrated SuDS/green infrastructure scheme. Further work will be undertaken with Severn Trent to ensure the policy wording is fit for purpose both now and in the future. Additional text will be added to Policy ST3 to identify arrangements for stewardship of blue-green infrastructure.</p>

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

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF201	Severn Trent	<p>Strategic Highways: The policy is understandably broad-brush, the County Council supports the need for a Planning and Development Brief in the form of a SPD to be prepared and adopted to provide more specific requirements in due course. Part D, 4- The B6420 provides the only way in from the GV site boundary. There are two adjacent 90-degree bends beyond the site boundary that need straightening out by a realignment. This is potentially a significant constraint and therefore should be included within the policy as a separate named requirement. Part D, 4, (iii). - The B6420/A620 junction is poor and probably will require the installation of traffic signals, subject to TA, and potentially land to widen the approaches. This should be secured as part of the GV development rather than a contribution towards the works. The 4 (vi) ped/cycle links to Retford would require more land too. Part D, 4, (vii). - This requires a new railway station. A supporting rail technical note suggests that the provision of a new railway station will require closure of 3 level crossings in close proximity. It is not clear why and whether this 'must' happen. ST3 ought to include a review of the operation of the level crossings including appropriate mitigation which may include crossing closures and a new road over railway bridge(s) to accommodate all traffic. Part D, 4, (vii) - Contributions are likely to be needed for public transport facilities and potentially initial rail subsidy. Policy ST3 D4 should highlight this requirement.</p>	<p>The Council will continue to work with NCC Highways so that policy development and masterplanning appropriately address the requirements of transport infrastructure. Additional work on transport impacts will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. The transport assessment will look at the projected modelling of potential vehicular trips to and from the site and what, if any, mitigation is required to address the issues identified. A rail feasibility has been undertaken which recommends that the level crossings be closed for safety reasons. This note was agreed with the County Council. However, it is acknowledged that additional work on rail will need to be undertaken including impact on level crossings and potential solutions to address impacts identified.</p>
REF222	Notts CC	<p>Minerals and Waste: Policy ST3 states that the garden village falls within the Mineral Safeguarding Area/Mineral Consultation Area (MSA/MCA) for sand and gravel. Confirm that the land identified by the red line boundary for the garden village does not fall within an MSA/MCA and therefore this wording can be removed. Education: Primary - given the 3,250 dwellings proposed to be added to the Garden Village after 2037, a new 630-place (3 forms of entry) primary school would be required as part of the layout of the Garden Village for which land and contributions would be required in order to accommodate the full size of the settlement. The school would need to be located in the heart of the Garden Villages https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/793682/Education_provision_in_garden_communities.pdf</p> <p>Secondary: NCC anticipate a small surplus of places in this area, so pupils arising from housing developments in the Local Plan could be accommodated at existing schools. The proposed Garden Village would necessitate the addition of a further c500 secondary places, for which contributions would be required. Potential expansions of existing secondary schools would be subject to feasibility. If circumstances at the time of a formal application had changed – i.e. changing population, school rolls and school capacities – and a new secondary school was required in this area, NCC would also need developers to contribute land.</p>	<p>Confirmation that the site lies outside a Minerals Safeguarding Area is noted. Policy ST3 will be changed accordingly. The Council will continue to work with NCC Education so that policy development and masterplanning appropriately address the requirements of education infrastructure to ensure that the most up to date position is reflected in emerging policy. Additional work on education impacts will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. The assessment will look at the projected modelling of population growth, school rolls and capacities to determine what mitigation is required to address the issues identified.</p>
REF222	Notts CC	<p>Here we are again using perfectly good agricultural land to 'pave over' thus increasing the risk of flooding and destroying the ability to produce much needed food for the nation. Does nobody at the Council understand that farmland is not being made anymore ?? The myth of Public Transport, with a Railway Station no less, will take a lot longer to realise than the building of many houses that will introduce more vehicle movements along with the Traffic Hazards and Pollution. Does the Council really think that people will walk or cycle to Worksop/Retford or a Railway Station (if built) ?? The other infrastructure required (Shops, Chemists, Doctors etc) will not happen until a large number of the houses have been built and by then the habits and customs of driving to Supermarkets will have already set in. The proposal is to build houses close to a major highway. This will inevitably lead to Noise Pollution and present a poor picture to the Visitors that we currently bring to this attractive part of Nottinghamshire and Great Britain. Further, there is anecdotal evidence of plans being accepted for houses and then different styles/sizes being built.</p>	<p>The Garden Village would be built on predominantly greenfield - mostly agricultural - land. National policy states that planning policies must give consideration to agricultural land and where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality. The proposal uses Grade 3 agricultural land which is lower quality than Grade 1 and 2. Additional work on transport impacts will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. The transport assessment will look at the projected modelling of potential vehicular trips to and from the site and what, if any, mitigation is required to address the issues identified. A rail feasibility has been undertaken which states that a rail station is feasible. However, it is acknowledged that additional work on rail will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. This will timing and cost of provision. Further work will be undertaken to determine the infrastructure required to support each phase of the development. The requirements for infrastructure and the timing of provision are agreed through discussion with the infrastructure providers. Additional work on sustainable transport</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
			provision, routes and connectivity to the existing network will be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. The design of the development will ensure residents continue to enjoy private amenity without adverse impacts from noise.
1196559	Resident	This is an appropriate area for development with links to nearby work places and transport.	Support noted and welcome.
1196560	Resident	Concerns about the Garden Village are: 1) The disruption created for all of the residents to the Parish during the build. 2) There will be a large increase in demand on all of the transport links in the area. 3) The A1 already struggles in multiple areas with flooding and the large amount of traffic it currently sustains – currently requiring re-routing through Retford which brings the town to an almost standstill. 4) The Garden Village will attract buyers from out of the area who will then commute to the cities and London thereby providing limited benefit to the local residents. 5) The increase in population will impact the transport links to the two immediate towns of Retford and Worksop. Parking in those locations will be difficult and the facilities not provided in the Garden village stretched in those towns. 6) Can the local hospitals deal with the increased demand? 7) It is suggested that there will be a rail station provided. This would impact on the current travellers journey times but worse if they were no station and they sought to commute by train the two rail stations (Retford and Worksop) already struggle to deal with the car parking required. 8) The rail company providing the transport is already substandard and has had to be intervened by the government.	Inevitably construction will lead to some disruption through the build. But the Council will work with developers to ensure this is kept to a minimum. Additional work on transport impacts will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. The transport assessment will look at the projected modelling of potential vehicular trips to and from the site and what, if any, mitigation is required to address the issues identified. Policy ST3 provides for a mix of housing on the Garden Village to meet identified local needs including affordable housing, housing for older people and for families. Further work will be undertaken to determine the infrastructure required to support each phase of the development both on site and elsewhere. Bassetlaw PCT have confirmed that a financial contribution will be required to mitigate adverse impacts expected from a development of this size on Bassetlaw Hospital. A rail feasibility study states that a new railway station in the Garden Village could be achieved without disruption to journey times. This has been agreed with Network Rail and the train operating company.
REF239	Resident	The proposed Garden Village is not appropriate and the housing should be added to Retford and Worksop whose main street shops are in urgent need of more customers.	It is important that the Local Plan promotes a balanced approach to growth across the District. Worksop and Retford are being allocated a fair proportion of planned growth. It is expected that residents of the Garden Village will use facilities in Worksop and Retford for non day to day activities.
1196689	Resident	With the proposed development sites (Garden Village and Ranby, in particular), is the proposed land: - Part of an estate, which is to be sold off? - Part of existing farmland? - Part of existing woodland? If the answer to some or all of the above questions is 'yes'. question the Local Plan's ambitions of conservation and the maintenance of our greenfield sites. Like assurance that the Local Plan has investigated the development of brownfield sites, rather than opting for the 'easy option' of purchasing greenfield sites from a couple of landowners because it is easier and ticks a box.	The Local Plan promotes a balanced approach to growth across the urban and rural areas, making use of previously developed land and minimising the loss of the highest quality agricultural land. The Garden Village would be built on predominantly greenfield - mostly agricultural - land. National policy states that planning policies must give consideration to agricultural land and where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality. The proposal uses Grade 3 agricultural land which is lower quality than Grade 1 and 2. Six of the housing and employment allocations are on brownfield land but inevitably there are not enough suitable, available and deliverable brownfield sites in the District to meet identified development needs. All sites are put forward by the landowners/site promoters. The Council does not purchase greenfield sites from landowners to include in the Local Plan.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF247	Babworth Parish Council	<p>The NPPF (paragraph 52) acknowledges that..... The Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan seeks to allocate the Bassetlaw Garden Village a site of 216ha as an area of long-term sustainable growth. It is suggested that this Garden Village could deliver up to 4,000 dwellings over its lifetime with a target delivery of 750 dwellings over the plan period. The recent Uttlesford Local Plan Stage 1 Inspectors Report highlights the problems which can be associated with a reliance upon such sites without clear and robust delivery evidence. In the case of Uttlesford three Garden Communities were proposed. The Inspector acknowledged that the Garden Communities would be responsible for the delivery of a large amount of the housing requirement. In considering the Garden Communities the Inspector identified they would not deliver the quantum of housing in the plan period that the Council's trajectory was showing. The Inspector was concerned about the lack of evidence to enable a conclusion to be made that the proposed allocations were sound and that they would deliver sufficient levels of housing over the plan period. In relation to Garden Village it is identified by the Local Planning Authority that: "Development will be provided within a high quality, highly biodiverse landscape, dominated by green infrastructure and community woodland ..." Whilst it is concluded that this location has been identified as being more suitable, it is not without its constraints. It appears that the Council has been 'wedded' to the delivery of a Garden Village or Garden Villages without consideration of suitable alternatives. In addition, there is significant scope for a slippage in the timetable. Prior to development commencing, post BLP adoption, a significant amount of work is required to overcome the identified constraints, develop the identified required masterplan and appropriate infrastructure. It is probable that the timescale identified for delivery could slip leading to an under-delivery in the plan period for this site. Any slippage in the delivery of this key site will have a significant impact upon the identified buffer. If appropriate the Bassetlaw Garden Village proposal must be founded upon clear and robust evidence together with a realistic delivery timetable.</p>	Acknowledge that delivery of Garden Villages comes under careful scrutiny. The Council will revisit the delivery timeframes to ensure that they are robust and achievable.
REF249	Pegasus Group	<p>The Garden Village is intended to make a significant contribution to achieving and meeting the housing requirement within the Plan period, equating to just over 8% of the total requirement. To ensure a sound Plan, the Council's delivery assumptions for the site must be realistic. The assumptions currently made in respect of the delivery of the site are considered ambitious and may result in the Council not meeting its housing need over the Plan period. In progressing the Garden Village allocation, it is considered that a robust review of the sites deliverability, including start dates, build out rates and having regard to infrastructure requirements/upgrades, should be undertaken to ensure a sound allocation and Plan.</p>	Further work will be undertaken to determine the type and level of infrastructure required to support the first phase of the Garden Village, and its timing.
REF253	Fisher German	<p>The Draft Plan's proposal for a new Garden Village between Worksop and Retford is particularly innovative and to be welcomed. The Garden Village will provide the basis for a substantial number of new homes and new employment land, with development shaped by a comprehensive set of sustainable development principles. Note the strong emphasis in the Draft Plan on active travel within and beyond the new Garden Village and would be particularly keen to ensure that this element of the proposal continues to feature highly as ideas develop. Importantly, the Garden Village proposal also includes provision for a new public transport facility including a rail station on the Sheffield to Lincoln line. This is to be welcomed and will complement other initiatives in SCR which are looking to improve this route as well as strengthen rail connections to Sheffield City Centre from the east. The Sheffield City Region Integrated Rail Plan (July 2019) provides more detail on how we see these services developing in the future.</p>	Support for the Garden Village, particularly a new railway station on the Sheffield to Lincoln line is noted and welcome.
REF255	Sheffield City Region	<p>Encouraged by the commitment to biodiversity, as well as the reference to public transport links, eg the railway station. What would the implication be to Morton, a hamlet, in terms of traffic? Would Morton be swallowed in a future large development, after 2037?</p>	Additional work on transport impacts will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. The transport assessment will look at the projected modelling of potential vehicular trips to and from the site and what, if any, mitigation is required including for Morton to address the issues identified. The Garden Village is expected to be developed over two plan periods. The site boundary is the extent of the whole development planned for post 2037.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF257	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	In general, in total support of the new plan especially the creation of the "Garden Village".	Support noted and welcome.
REF262	West Stockwith Parish Council	This element has the thoroughness that might be likened to a poorly conceived GCSE planning project drawn up by a 17 year old. Appreciate that the policy is based on available land which might generate little or no objection, available links to major transport networks and housing development pressures forced upon Bassetlaw by Sheffield Authority and elsewhere BUT to use this isolated area with a convenient link to the A1 and the local rail network has to be reconsidered. This raises serious concerns for the future 'Garden Village' community and its' surroundings that this apparently simple tick box house building exercise conducted by Bassetlaw DC can answer. The current 'community consultation' for this strategy has been within this consultation document and a single piece of laminated A4 tied to a sign alongside the B6420 (now destroyed by the weather) as I understand it. I support the 'community consultation' process outlined in this section to alleviate the issues I perceive to be inherent in this strategy. My request is for this to be FULLY ADVERTISED in the communities of Retford, Ranby and surrounding areas with SIGNIFICANT SIGNAGE visible to road users erected on site to highlight this consultation process.	Planning for the Garden Village is at an early stage and further work on transport and infrastructure impacts will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. These assessments will look at the projected modelling of potential vehicular trips to and from the site and the impact new development will have on all types of infrastructure to determine what, if any, mitigation is required to address the issues identified to ensure that sustainable development is promoted. The consultation for the draft Local Plan was conducted over 6 weeks and was fully compliant with all relevant legislation and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. This included through local media, with parish and town councils in Retford, Ranby and surrounding areas with site notices used along the road frontage.
1196906	Resident	Bassetlaw DC is struggling to tackle the issues facing Retford, Worksop and other public centres with significant retail business closures. Creation of another community which may face similar issues MUST demand that these issues be addressed before any such a proposal can be developed further. My concern is of a dormitory ghost town where economic growth directed towards centres such as Doncaster or Sheffield rather than locally.	The Garden Village will be a sustainable new settlement that will provide for living and working in the same location. Additionally the Local Plan provides for about 108ha of employment land for business growth. A key priority of the Local Plan is to reduce the amount of out commuting to Doncaster or Sheffield. Providing improved transport links to new employment sites in Worksop and Retford and elsewhere in the District will help ensure that this is achieved.
1196906	Resident	The destruction of 216ha of arable farmland and likely hedgerow habitat MUST demand a full carbon offsetting calculation to prove the objective of this statement. Low carbon in this statement should be replaced with zero carbon if Bassetlaw is committed to a truly sustainable future for it's communities and population. As stated earlier there is a single inclusion in this policy document of a strategy towards electric vehicle use from 2030 onwards. Electric vehicle infrastructure must be included in this 'Garden Village' strategy to have significant meaning.	A Natural Capital Impact Assessment will be undertaken for the site to identify the current level of natural capital and ecosystem services on site and then to ensure that a gain is achieved through masterplanning the site. This would include carbon storage, carbon sequestration, air purification, noise regulation, water flow, water quality, pollination, accessible nature, horticulture production, and biodiversity. Further work will be undertaken to determine whether zero carbon can be achieved as part of a financially viable scheme. The use of electric vehicles in the Garden Village is supported by the Local Plan and infrastructure will be required to be put in place to enable charging in new development.
1196906	Resident	Support the housing allocation of this strategy in principle particularly where it develops brown field or existing communities. Have reservations of a 'Garden Village' dormitory development which is questionable in terms of it's value to the existing local communities particularly Retford and Worksop and the environmental impact due to carbon loading that such a development, with increased vehicle movement and with improper planning might create.	Support for brownfield development welcome. The Garden Village is intended to be a new settlement and is not associated with meeting the needs of existing communities. It is identified to achieve the wider aspirations of the D2N2 SEP and Bassetlaw's Local Industrial Strategy. Additional housing over the long term will provide greater resilience in housing delivery and contribute to improved infrastructure and local services. This approach will ensure that the Garden Village does not become a dormitory development. Further work on carbon impact and traffic impact will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
1196906	Resident	<p>Policy ST3 is well written and includes all aspirations appropriate to the delivery of a new garden community. As the site will have a significant and long frontage along its western boundary to the A1, the potential noise impacts and the impact of the existing pollution arising from the A1 on this new community should be justified with supporting studies. To enhance the sustainability of the Bassetlaw Garden Village the draft Local Plan is promoting a new station on the Lincoln to Sheffield Rail link and whilst a new station to support the proposed garden village is supported, its delivery may be problematic which may have impact on the sustainability of the Garden Village and the Apleyhead Junction. There is also concern regarding the accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists over the A1 / A57 junctions and to the nearest town (i.e. Worksop).</p>	<p>Policy ST3 requires an air quality assessment to be undertaken to ensure impacts of development are mitigated. It is acknowledged that a similar assessment for noise should also be required - Policy ST3 will be amended accordingly. Further work on traffic impact will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. This will need to ensure that in the early stages of development if a railway station is not operational that the additional vehicle movements can be accommodated on the local and strategic road network. Policy ST3 requires new and improved pedestrian and cycle links to nearby facilities, Retford and across the A1 to the A57. However further work will need to be undertaken through a transport assessment to identify the requirements for each development phase.</p>
REF269	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	<p>In our experience in preparing the Core Strategy, the Council was required to prepare extensive high-level documents; a Concept Framework with supporting studies to demonstrate the availability, suitability and likely economic viability of the proposed urban extension (Bassingthorpe Farm) was essential to demonstrate to the Inspector that both the Council and the landowners were supportive in bringing forward the site and that it was suitable and deliverable. A similar level of detail is likely to be required to support the identification of this new settlements within Bassetlaw, as Paragraph 72 of the NPPF refers.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Local Plan recognises that a masterplan framework will be required to progress this site and to demonstrate that the site is suitable and deliverable.</p>
REF269	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	<p>Policy ST3 should be removed from the Local Plan. Disagree that there is the need for a new Garden Village and advocate that the defined Main Towns of Bassetlaw are capable of accommodating additional growth through urban extensions , which is considered to be a more sustainable option for development. Although we are supportive of the Local Plan's ambition to establish sustainable development for the long-term needs of the District, object to the Garden Village as it will not provide for sustainable development and will undermine the sustainability of exiting Main Towns which serve the needs of the rural areas of the District. Bassetlaw does not suffer from overcrowding and key centres such as Retford are suitable for urban expansion and would benefit from further growth to maintain and enhance their vitality and viability as well as the vitality of surrounding rural settlements. Agree with paragraph 5.3.1 in terms of promoting a step change in economic growth, the delivery of a Garden Village and associated transport hub is not necessary nor suitable to facilitate that step change. Have significant concerns in relation to feasibility and viability of those proposals. The 2019 Landscape Study Bassetlaw already comprises a largely rural borough (98%) with a significant number of villages, particularly to the east. Do not support the creation of a new Garden Village, particularly when the Council is already seeking to locate a large portion of its housing distribution to the rural settlements rather than supporting its Main Towns. To support the new Garden Village, the Local Plan proposes a new railway station, road links and public transport hub to enable access to the wider settlements. However, the Local Plan does not propose that infrastructure to be delivered within the plan period or demonstrate how that infrastructure will be delivered. Notwithstanding whether the above infrastructure is feasible, existing Main Towns already offer these facilities and services and would be better suited to deliver additional growth.</p>	<p>In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy.</p>

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

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF270	Barton Willmore	<p>In supporting the Garden Village, both families see an opportunity to create a legacy for the community that they can be proud of. The families are united by a common belief that any development on their land must embrace the principles set out in the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and, in particular, SDGs 3, 11 and 13. To fulfil those goals, the Garden Village must: (i) be constructed in an environmentally considerate manner; (ii) achieve an ambitious increase in biodiversity in its locality; (iii) support an increase of physical activity levels; and (iv) facilitate low carbon living in the community. involvement in the proposals is underpinned by, and conditional on, fulfilment of these principles and Bassetlaw's commitment to the opportunity to create a truly sustainable and green section of the community. The Local Plan consultation has coincided with the publication of 'Living with Beauty' by the Government's 'Building Better, Building Beautiful Commission' (January 2020). The Commission and the Report highlight the importance of safeguarding beauty, community, history, landscape in our places. The overall aspiration of the Report is supported and in particular, the following comments go to the heart of what is anticipated for the Garden Village: "Many of the things that make settlements beautiful also make them healthy, happy and sustainable. A beautiful place is a place in which people wish to walk, rather than a place that the car helps them to avoid. It is a place in which they enjoy spending time with one another."</p> <p>[P11] The Report identifies three key approaches to improving places, which are in line with the land owners aspirations for Bassetlaw Garden Village: "Ask for Beauty: We do not see beauty as a cost, to be negotiated away once planning permission has been obtained. It is the benchmark that all new developments should meet. It includes everything that promotes a healthy and happy life, everything that makes a collection of buildings into a place, everything that turns anywhere into somewhere, and nowhere into home. So understood beauty should be an essential condition for the grant of planning permission." Refuse Ugliness: People do not only want beauty in their surroundings. They are repelled by ugliness, which is a social cost that everyone is forced to bear. Ugliness means buildings that are unadaptable, unhealthy and unsightly, and which violate the context in which they are placed. Such buildings destroy the sense of place, undermine the spirit of community, and ensure that we are not at home in our world. Promote Stewardship: Our built environment and our natural environment belong together. Both should be protected and enhanced for the long-term benefit of the communities that depend on them..... New developments should be regenerative, enhancing their environment and adding to the health, sustainability and biodiversity of their context. For too long now we have been exploiting and spoiling our country. The time has come to enhance and care for it instead. Our recommendations are designed to ensure that we pass on to future generations an inheritance at least as good as the one we have received." It is very important to the landowners that the Garden Village creates a legacy to be proud of, which delivers growth and health and well-being benefits for its residents and the wider community, but not at the expense of the environment.</p>	Support for the Garden Village is noted and welcome. The Council will continue to work in partnership with both landowners to ensure that the proposal for the Garden Village meets their aspirations for the environment, health, biodiversity and community leaving a positive legacy for future generations.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF271	Savills (GV Rep)	<p>The opportunities presented by new settlements are addressed within paragraph 72 of the NPPF 2019. In general, support the aspirations for Bassetlaw Garden Village as set out in section 5.3 of the Draft Local Plan. In particular, paragraph 5.3.3 which states: "Development will be provided within a high quality, highly biodiverse landscape, dominated by green infrastructure and community woodland, where residents and employees can easily move by sustainable transport to new community facilities, shops and services. A new railway station and public transport hub will provide sustainable access to the wider area." The Garden City Principles set out in 5.3.7 and 5.3.8 are welcomed and supported. These principles are echoed in those within Chapter 4 of 'Living with Beauty' which identifies the following factors in creating beautiful places:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Townscape • Mixed Use • Affordability • Respect for heritage • Respect for nature • Respect for communities aspirations • Stewardship • Democracy <p>The comments in 5.3.10 and 5.3.11 go to the heart of the landowners aspirations for the site. With specific reference to policy ST3, the landowners support the overarching policy objectives in principle at this stage as set out in A-D. In particular, the references to an 'environmentally-led' development in D. It is suggested that that given the focus on creating an innovative, green community, in order to meet the criteria set out in D 5. Landscape, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure, an early assessment of the current green infrastructure and its spatial inter-relationships should be made. This will enable the optimum planning of corridors between existing and new green areas around which building for houses and employment, with, of course, their own new green areas, can take place. The family is fully supportive of green space. However, they are concerned that the half hectare community woodland (less than half a football pitch) proposed for this plan period is inadequate for the footfall of the residents of the 750 houses also suggested for this plan period. The family look forward to a more substantial and realistic allocation through detailed masterplanning. Wherever possible, additional areas of green space, community woodland and useable open space should be sought and integrated into the design of the Garden Village. As the timescale for the delivery of the Garden Village extends into the future, the policy should be sufficiently flexible to allow for changing technologies which could improve the sustainability of the site. The landowners consider that it is very important that the development facilitates an increase of physical activity and sport amongst its residents as a result of the economic, mental and physical health and well-being and environmental benefits that would be generated. The landowners consider that the World Health Organisation's Global Action Plan on Physical Activity together with the Sport England and local authority equivalent policy documents be consulted to guide development in this respect. Consideration should also be given to the creation of an overarching vision for the Garden Village which reflects the aspirations of the landowners and the Council for the site. The inclusion of land at Morton Hill Farm to create Bassetlaw Garden Village is supported in principle by our clients, The Mason Family, who are committed to working with The Girdham Family and the District Council to create a high quality, low carbon, landscape-led settlement for the future of Bassetlaw. There are likely to be many questions over the design, deliverability and developability of the site that need to be answered over 2020. The scheme is at the early stages but the family are committed to the principles and will contribute fully to further discussions about the delivery of this development.</p>	<p>Support for Policy ST3 is welcome. Further work on the existing green infrastructure network and its connectivity with other uses will need to be undertaken to ensure that the masterplan can be truly landscape led. Further work will be undertaken to determine the extent of appropriate tree coverage on the site, to ensure that provision is appropriate to mitigate the impacts of each phase of development. Flexibility will be built into the policy to ensure that as the development progresses the use of changing technologies can be incorporated into the design of development where appropriate. Healthy place-making is a key element of the Garden Village. The approach taken to creating an active place will be clarified in Policy ST3. Through collaborative working with the landowners and key stakeholders a vision and objectives for the Garden Village will be produced to reflect aspirations for the site.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF271	Savills (GV Rep)	<p>Bassetlaw Garden Village in the area of Upper Morton indicates there will be further growth in this area beyond 2037 signalling further expansion which will have an impact on Retford and Villages Primary Care Network (PCN). Whilst service and infrastructure includes health facilities it is not specific what is meant by this. Community pharmacy provision is determined under pharmaceutical Regulations and would need an application to be successful. There will clearly be a need for this, so this expressed requirement will need to link into the Council's PNA. Dental facilities are commissioned by NHS England but it remains a dental business decision where to locate their premises. Similarly for optometry. Require ongoing consultation as this plan progresses so that we can support infrastructure development in line with expected need across the wide range of potential primary and community health and care services. Services and Infrastructure identifies: 'This significant new community will be large enough to sustain its own local shops and facilities. Policy ST3 requires a range of community facilities to help meet the day to day needs of its residents and which will have multiple benefits for the surrounding rural area. Sustainable access, including bus connectivity will ensure the existing and new communities are well-integrated, so all are able to benefit from a new Local Centre, health and education facilities and a community hub with associated sports facilities'.</p>	The Council will continue to work with NHS Bassetlaw CCG to ensure the provision of primary and community health facilities meets the identified needs of the development.
REF272	NHS Bassetlaw CCG	<p>Anglian Water is generally supportive of the principles for the proposed garden village. 'Landscape, biodiversity and Green Infrastructure': Anglian Water is keen to promote 'Water smart communities' as part of the garden village. They use a more holistic and integrated approach to water management with the aim to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance liveability by contributing to green streetspaces and high quality open space • Promote the sustainable use of water resources and infrastructure to enable growth • Build resilience against the impacts of climate change and extreme weather events • Contribute to natural capital and biodiversity through multi functional water features • Deliver water efficient homes to reduce household bills and support affordability. <p>Policy ST45 of the Draft plan states that development should meet the optional higher water efficiency standard and water re-use measures should be included in development proposals wherever possible. There is no reference made to the garden village providing for water efficiency and re-use measures as part of the design principles. It is suggested that Policy ST3 be amended: '5. c) Housing standards to promote climate reliance in accordance with Policy ST45; c) An integrated approach to water management including water efficiency and re-use measures together with and surface water drainage and multifunctional greenspace which provides environmental and community benefits'</p>	Support for the principle of the Garden Village is welcome. The principles of Water Smart Communities will be incorporated in Policy ST3 and the masterplan framework. The Local Plan should be read as a whole. So Policy ST45 applies to all new development including the garden village. However it is recognised that water re-use measures could be better referenced. Policy ST3 will be amended to ensure an integrated approach to water management is required at the garden village.
REF273	Anglian Water	The concept of a garden village is not fully supported by the consultation. It is just a 'sound bite' to soften the terrible proposed over development in the area.	Comments noted.
1197023	Resident	<p>The new Bassetlaw Garden Village is a poorly conceived idea and will be of great detriment not only to the local vicinity but also the wider region. The approach lacks any consideration regarding its feasibility and viability. Disagree with the policy ST3. This policy should be removed in its entirety. It is our position that the main towns in Bassetlaw are capable of supporting the required additional growth. The development of a Garden Village would only serve to detriment these towns, and the district as a whole. The proposal of the plan is to facilitate a new settlement such as the Garden Village with a new railway station, road links and public transport hubs, however, the feasibility, deliverability and cost analysis have not been considered fully. The plan states that public funding for the transport infrastructure is likely to be limited but will be developer funded. It is of our opinion that this is an extremely unrealistic expectation. The timeline for these links to be completed is also imperative, as currently, they may not come to fruition for 20 years. Have a similar view with regards to services for the housing development, all of which would need to be run a considerable distance to reach the site. An appropriately positioned urban extension with these services and transport links already in the local vicinity present a far better alternative. Alternative transport (pedestrian and cycle routes), as well as bus routes, have been considered as part of the Garden Village. However, the proposed location means that very extensive infrastructure work will be required for such routes, with unknown usage given its proposed location. Considering the sustainable position of our client's land this is another unnecessary expense.</p>	In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. Further detailed bespoke work will be undertaken to demonstrate viability. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF275	Resident	<p>A garden village built from scratch is going to be a hugely expensive enterprise. The new train station even with an infrastructure grant is unlikely to happen and the prospect of it being developer funded is pie in the sky. The only people who will benefit from this would be project are the landowners who stand to make a significant earner. A development of this scale would be better centred around the existing hubs of Retford or Worksop. Garden Villages on this scale are a gift to online traders, not sufficiently large enough to be self sustaining and will hence do nothing to arrest the continued decline of our towns that comes as a consequence of online shopping. Additional development around those towns is required to maintain, rejuvenate and grow the high streets and other associated facilities. There is already infrastructure around the two towns of Retford and Worksop, buses, trains and road network. A village of 700 lifting to 4,000 eventually, perhaps, is not of sufficient size to justify its own facilities, doctors, shops etc. Garden Village people will likely shop online and infrequently travel to Retford or Worksop by car. The regeneration of brownfield sites forms a key part of the Local Plan Vision and Objectives. Providing support to the comprehensive redevelopment of brownfield sites, particularly within town centres and at the former power station sites is a key Council Plan objective 14. The proposed site of the New Garden Village is alongside the A1 and will be subject to noise and pollution from that road. Whatever advances there are to be in battery technology and hydrogen fuelled cars it is unlikely that HGV vehicles will be cleaned up so as not to be a concern to Garden Villagers during the life of the project.</p>	<p>In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. Further detailed bespoke work will be undertaken to demonstrate viability. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy.</p>
REF276	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>Policy ST3 should be removed from the Local Plan. Disagree that there is the need for a new Garden Village and advocate that the Main Towns are capable of accommodating additional growth through urban extensions, which is a more sustainable option for development. A new Garden Village, totalling some 4,000 homes, within Babworth Parish will immeasurably change the nature of the parish forever. It will become unrecognisable as the most rural and least densely-populated parish in the area, to the most urban parish with only Retford and Worksop having more Dwellings. Such a far-reaching, enormous, single concentration of development should not be "inflicted" on the Parish by building a "garden village" on 216 ha of the parish. It is more important than ever, that development in rural parishes is sustainable and maintains the character of that parish. Although we are supportive of the Local Plan's ambition to establish sustainable development for the long-term needs of the District, object to the Garden Village as it will not provide for sustainable development and will undermine the sustainability of exiting Main Towns which serve the needs of the rural areas of the District. Agree with paragraph 5.3.1 in terms of promoting a step change in economic growth, the delivery of a Garden Village and associated transport hub is not necessary nor suitable to facilitate that step change. Concern in relation to the amount of evidence there is to understand how the development would come forward and how it would be likely to impact the residents of the parish. There is an overwhelming lack of evidence to support the feasibility and viability of the proposed sustainability features required to deliver the Garden Village which will not be delivered. Without those features, the Local Plan runs the very serious risk of simply allocating a large proportion of isolated homes in the open countryside. To support the new Garden Village, the Local Plan proposes a new railway station, road links and public transport hub to enable access to the wider settlements. However, the Local Plan does not propose that infrastructure to be delivered within the plan period or demonstrate how that infrastructure will be delivered. The delivery of new homes through a Garden Village (with or without new transport links) is likely to generate additional car trips into the Main Towns such as Retford as residents will rely on its existing services and facilities. Paragraph 11.1.8 states that public funding for transport infrastructure is likely to be limited and will be largely developer funded. This is not a realistic expectation. The financial viability of creating a new transport hub and train station alongside the Garden Village has not been adequately considered and more sustainable development option is represented by development at</p>	<p>In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. Further detailed bespoke work will be undertaken to demonstrate viability. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
		<p>the main towns. While the development is taking place, in excess of 20 Years it is will cause massive congestion on the B6420 into Retford which is a very dangerous and congested road at peak times, with a level crossing, sharp corners, flooding areas and difficult junction at Babworth. Traffic noise and pollution will increase on the A1 and for the residents of Ranby Village. The Local Plan sets out that the Whole Plan Viability Assessment 2016 states the infrastructure requirements for the Garden Village can be “reasonably sought through on site provision and developer contributions” provided that the site is exempt from a CIL charge. A lack of comprehensive consideration for the creation of a new Garden Settlement and the cost of associated infrastructure. If the viability of the scheme changes part way through there may be a number of dwellings that are completely isolated and cut off from any other services adding to pollution and disruption. Not clear what the justification is for a substantial allocation of 216ha of greenfield land for the new Garden Village to support 4,000 new homes over its lifetime.</p>	
REF277	Babworth Parish Council	<p>The Garden Village is intended to make a significant contribution to achieving and meeting the housing requirement within the Plan period, equating to just over 8% of the total requirement. To ensure a sound Plan, the Council's delivery assumptions for the site must be realistic. The assumptions currently made in respect of the delivery of the site are considered ambitious and may result in the Council not meeting its housing need over the Plan period. In progressing the Garden Village allocation, it is considered that a robust review of the sites deliverability, including start dates, build out rates and having regard to infrastructure requirements/upgrades, should be undertaken to ensure a sound allocation and Plan.</p>	<p>Further work will be undertaken to determine the type and level of infrastructure required to support the first phase of the Garden Village, and its timing.</p>
REF278	Fisher German	<p>There will be huge disruption to the area whilst such an isolated large-scale development is being built on the greenfield site. The traffic problems will be enormous, whilst being built, and afterwards. There are infrastructure problems in your plan. The A1 traffic will be congested and further increased. Ranby village will again be detrimentally affected by the traffic on the A1 in terms of congestion (being able to join the A1), and also the noise and pollution. The A1 is already extremely noisy and an increase in traffic will only increase noise levels. It may become unbearable for us, and other residents to go outside, open windows, or be in certain rooms. By building on such a huge amount of greenfield acreage, the agricultural land is lost, there is less land to absorb the rainfall we experience (which may lead to flooding in other areas), and the environmental impact on the biodiversity is also detrimental. Read the proposals to “offset” this, with some open spaces and trees, but this is not comparable to the established habitats and biodiversity that will be destroyed. It cannot be replaced. This whole area is being developed at a fast pace in terms of industrial developments, and if this carries on, our district will no longer be very rural. The proposed residential developments within our parish will define our rural parish then as urban.</p>	<p>In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. This will include more information on transport impacts and the mitigation required to address those impacts.</p>
REF279	Resident	<p>Welcome the inclusion of a new railway station at D.4.vii. It will however be important that this is developed as a priority and in advance of occupation of the new homes because it is much easier to motivate residents to use public transport when first moving to a new area than trying to change their travel behaviour from car to public transport when habits have already been established. Firm commitments and funding for the new station and new services will therefore have to be secured early on in the masterplanning process.</p>	<p>Further work will be undertaken in relation to the railway station delivery to inform future policy development.</p>
REF281	Notts Campaign to Protect Rural England	<p>By supporting the concept of this village, the Local Plan must recognise the significant impact it will have both directly and indirectly on small rural villages. It is inevitable and understandable that this village will attract young, working families offering affordable homes. Small rural areas attract developers for larger higher priced housing by their very nature as lack of amenities for families and travelling distance in rural areas are inevitable and go with the character of villages. Therefore a 20% increase in housing of this nature is unlikely to be required. This is not ‘NIMBYism’, it is social fact.</p>	<p>The Local Plan also supports appropriate rural growth. Neighbourhood Planning is an alternative but complementary way for the community to plan their areas and ensure the housing mix is appropriate to place.</p>
1197063	Resident	<p>Support in principle the concept of creating a Garden Village – ‘provided with a high quality, highly biodiverse landscape, dominated by green infrastructure and community woodland, where residents and employees can easily move by sustainable transport to new community facilities, jobs and services...’ although the subsequent policy may not do enough to support this aim. Support the principle of a comprehensive masterplan framework supported by a Consultative Group to guide future development.</p>	<p>The Garden Village was at an early stage in January 2020. As the Local Plan evolves the details will become clearer. The design will be landscape led with emphasis on healthy active places where people use public transport, walking and cycling to move around rather than the car for local journeys. Facilities will be located to enable this. A key theme of the Garden Village</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village	While the location may be acceptable, the proposed scale and spatial configuration of the proposed allocation, particularly in combination with proposed Policy SEM1, threaten to close the gap between Worksop and Retford creating urban sprawl from Worksop to the A1 and onwards to within 2.5km of Retford. Concerned about the proposed scale of the development, 'at least 4000 new homes over its lifetime', for which there is no clear rationale. The scale of development ought to be influenced by the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development while following the green principles espoused; the need to retain Green Gaps and a distinct identity between the Garden Village and the towns of Worksop and Retford; and the housing and economic needs and markets of the district and sub-region. The policy ought to incorporate the explicit requirement of creating a net zero carbon development. The policy ought to incorporate the explicit requirement of delivering a net gain to biodiversity within the development. Part 5(d) commits to provision of 'at least 0.5ha for community woodland in this plan period and land identified for 1.5 thereafter'. This represents less than 1% of the 216ha being promoted for development. We suggest that a much more aspirational figure is required and that this ought to be landscape/masterplan led, linking green infrastructure networks throughout the scheme with larger woodland areas on its margins. Likewise the proposed green infrastructure network comprising 5ha in the plan period and 5ha thereafter ought to be more aspirational (as a minimum the words 'at least' could be included) and that this figure ought to be landscape/urban design led. The proposed site is close to Clumber Park, which is managed by the National Trust, and the Trust supports the aspiration to create/improve cycling and pedestrian links as well as, ideally, a public transport connection.	is delviering the green agenda. Support for energy efficiency, renewable and low carbon technologies is built in. Various other carbo offsetting measures including 30% tree canopy cover will help. 20% biodiversity net gain will be secured, higher than that in the emerging Environment Bill. 40% of the site will be set aside for green infrastructure a significant increase on that proposed originally.
REF282	National Trust	ST3.4 42 5.3.22 Agree with proposals to improve junctions at either end of B6420 Mansfield Road (Apleyhead and Babworth) but consider this road will also need elimination of the railway level crossing and the double bends near Morton to carry the increased traffic generated by the Garden Village and A57 capacity improvements: add to ST49.	Further work will be undertaken through the Transport Assessment for the site to determine the impacts on the level crossings. This would be required to be mitigated accordingly.
REF283	Resident	Makes no sense to be allocating a Garden Village in the rural area to deliver 750 homes in the Plan Period when the existing sustainable small rural villages are already showing a surplus over their projected requirement. New settlements are notoriously difficult to get started, infrastructure heavy and unreliable. They have only succeeded in areas of very high demand and have taken many years to deliver homes. A better strategy would be to increase the level of homes in the smaller settlements so that new permissions can be granted here, making best use of the existing social community and physical infrastructure in those settlements. There is no meaningful table in the Plan for each level of the settlement hierarchy showing the requirement, the commitments and what is left to be found. As the Plan stands it is a highly confusing document that does not convey to Plan users what is to be found where, which is the basic requirement of a Local Plan. Object to ST3 and the Garden Village and propose that the Plan be redrafted to • Omit the two new settlements Cottam and Garden Village • Redistribute the numbers anticipated in the Plan period to the existing settlement hierarchy especially to the smaller rural villages to allow them to grow organically and make the best use of the existing infrastructure and make allocations in the villages to achieve this strategy • Consider an alternative use of the Cottam Power Station Site. Identify new sites that are available in the villages of Rampton and Woodbeck to support a larger allocation to the small rural settlements the following sites are available for development.	In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. Further detailed bespoke work will be undertaken to demonstrate viability. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy. But not all growth can be provided for in the Main Towns and through sustainable development in the rural villages. The Garden Village provides an opportunity to meet the District's housing and employment needs.
REF290	JVH Planning	Significant concerns regarding the deliverability of the Garden Village. The policy identifies that a 'Consultative Group' of stakeholders and landholders is to be formed, with a masterplan and SPD for the overall site to be prepared. Whilst not specified in any of the supporting evidence, it is understood that the site is in multiple private landownerships at this time and that the proposals are in their infancy. Supporting text details the extensive infrastructure requirements necessary to deliver the overall scheme, including a new railway station, new access roads and a new public transport hub (these are detailed further in the Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan, 2020). Query whether these costs have been considered fully as part of the viability work supporting the draft Plan. The Bassetlaw Interim Whole Plan & CIL Viability Assessment	In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. Further detailed bespoke work will be undertaken to demonstrate viability. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy. But not all growth can be provided for in the Main

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village	(August 2018) appears to take a general approach to development across the draft Plan, rather than looking at the very specific and significant costs and cash flow issues for a new settlement. It states that the approach to abnormal construction costs (including utilities diversions) is "based on generic tests" and then assumes a generic cost of mitigation of £2,000 per dwelling that are "based on historic evidence of planning obligation contributions over the last five years (excluding Affordable Housing which is factored in separately) the following cost allowances have been adopted in the study" (page 30). This is substantially short of the real costs of delivering a development of this scale in this location. The Aecom January 2018 publication 'Garden towns and villages cost model' suggests that a new garden village in 5,000 residential units on a 350 hectare greenfield site in the South East of England would have construction costs of £53,568 per unit. The very high cost of strategic infrastructure and the impacts on cash flow (which isn't mentioned in the Council's evidence), needs to be considered in detail to demonstrate deliverability. A new railway station is proposed, but this is only safeguarded and is not expected to come forward until after 2037. No costs are attributed to this as it outside of the Plan period. Query who will be paying for this and how will it be secured – is there any certainty of deliverability? The interim solution appears to be a bus subsidy, which as set out in the IDP, is estimated to cost around £590/dwelling (paragraph 3.2.12). This cost appears broadly reasonable, but further detail is required to understand what money needs to be paid upfront to secure the service, and the implications this would have on cashflow. There is no detail on what this bus service may look like – is it a conventional bus on non-segregated roads? How regular would it be? The attractiveness of this service is critical to encouraging modal shift for the occupants in this relatively isolated new settlement before 2037. This is fundamental to the success of the allocation. This is supported by the Inspector's initial findings into the Uttlesford Local Plan (10th January 2020), where in relation to a proposed garden settlement it was concluded that: "44. Whilst appreciating the difficulties in providing a full RTS service from the outset and recognising the role of incremental improvements, in our view, the lack of a RTS until towards the end of the plan period would mean the modal shifts anticipated would not be realised. Moreover, the use of less sustainable modes of travel could have become engrained in the habits of residents living in the homes built within the early phases of the Garden Communities. According to the latest trajectory in ED51 this would be well in excess of 1000 homes.... 46. This being so, there is a danger that the Garden Communities would be served by little more than a conventional, regularly running bus service for a good number of years. This would use the existing road network, which is at times congested and there are concerns that such a bus service would be no quicker, and potentially slower, than travelling by car. It is also unclear to what degree the buses would run on existing roads as opposed to segregated bus lanes or busways and how the latter would be phased in. 47. Buses running on existing unsegregated carriageways, even based on a 10 or 15 minute service, is unlikely to encourage the residents to use their cars less for local journeys, despite this being better than the services that operate in Uttlesford at present. Consider this would be directly at odds with Garden Community Principle 7 which requires integrated and accessible transport systems, with walking, cycling and public transport designed to be the most attractive forms of local transport." These initial findings are appended to this letter as they are highly relevant for the preparation and soundness of a Local Plan that proposes a new settlement. The ongoing Examination into the North Essex Garden Communities is also relevant, particularly in relation to a deliverable sustainable transport approach. In determining the trajectory for the site, it is considered to be inappropriate to draw direct comparisons between the Garden Village proposal and other large schemes in the District (namely the Harworth Colliery site) which appear to be very different in both scale and site-specific circumstances. The latter site is in single ownership (Harworth Estates) and provides 1,000 dwellings overall (which may increase to 1,300 dwellings) with lesser infrastructure requirements. The Garden Village represents a significantly larger scale scheme with multiple landowners, and it is not clear what formal partnership or agreements are in place. There are also significant infrastructure requirements for the site overall, and there do not appear to be any phasing plans to indicate at what point different items of infrastructure will be required to enable the envisaged	Towns and through sustainable development in the rural villages. The Garden Village provides an opportunity to meet the District's housing and employment needs.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
		development trajectory. There is limited evidence related to deliverability which justifies the trajectory for the Garden Village. This means that this element of the anticipated supply for within the plan period should also be treated with caution. Suggested change: 1. Address the significant concerns in relation to the proposed Garden Village. Further detail is required to demonstrate that it is deliverable and that it can contribute 750 dwellings within the Plan period in a sustainable manner in line with the Garden Community Principles.	
REF291 -	Resident	Makes no sense to be allocating a Garden Village in the rural area to deliver 750 homes in the Plan Period when the existing sustainable small rural villages are already showing a surplus over their projected requirement. New settlements are notoriously difficult to get started, infrastructure heavy and unreliable. They have only succeeded in areas of very high demand and have taken many years to deliver homes. A better strategy would be to increase the level of homes in the smaller settlements so that new permissions can be granted here, making best use of the existing social community and physical infrastructure in those settlements. There is no meaningful table in the Plan for each level of the settlement hierarchy showing the requirement, the commitments and what is left to be found. As the Plan stands it is a highly confusing document that does not convey to Plan users what is to be found where, which is the basic requirement of a Local Plan. It is proposed that the Plan be redrafted to • Omit the two new settlements Cottam and Garden Village • Redistribute the numbers anticipated in the Plan period to the existing settlement hierarchy especially to the smaller rural villages to allow them to grow organically and make the best use of the existing infrastructure and make allocations in the villages to achieve this strategy • Consider an alternative use of the Cottam Power Station Site. Identify new sites that are available in the village of Sutton cum Lound to support a larger allocation to the small rural settlements the following sites are available for development.	In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. Further detailed bespoke work will be undertaken to demonstrate viability. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy. But not all growth can be provided for in the Main Towns and through sustainable development in the rural villages. The Garden Village provides an opportunity to meet the District's housing and employment needs.
REF292	JVH Planning	The role that new settlements can provide is acknowledged in the NPPF (paragraph 72). The delivery of new settlements can be challenging and reliance on this site to deliver 750 dwellings from 2027 onwards may be optimistic. Evidence regarding the deliverability of the site is also unclear and the proposal is therefore not justified nor potentially effective and in breach of the tests of soundness. While the New Settlements Addendum demonstrates the suitability of the site in terms of the SA, it does not demonstrate the deliverability of the site during the plan period with a reliance on evidence from Harworth Colliery (a site adjacent to an existing settlement); evidence on land ownership, developer interest, the involvement of Nottinghamshire County Council from a transport perspective (especially important given the new railway station and park & ride) does not appear to be available at present. To prevent an over reliance on delivery from the site and be consistent with national policy (specifically paragraphs 59 of the NPPF regarding the need to significantly (our emphasis) boost the supply of housing and 73 on developability) additional housing allocations should be made to provide a sufficient buffer and ensure that the housing requirement is met.	In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. Further detailed bespoke work will be undertaken to demonstrate viability. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy. But not all growth can be provided for in the Main Towns and through sustainable development in the rural villages. The Garden Village provides an opportunity to meet the District's housing and employment needs.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
1197091	William Davis	<p>To ensure this vision is realised the Garden Village should be developed to the following nationally identified Garden City principles: "generous, accessible, and good quality green and blue infrastructure that promotes health, wellbeing, and quality of life, and promotes opportunities to deliver environmental and biodiversity net gain and enhancements to natural capital." and 'Development will be provided within a high quality, highly biodiverse landscape, dominated by green infrastructure and community woodland'. Given that BDC have to meet significant housing targets, then a BDC led, sustainable development with ambitious habitat creation targets is a bold vision that we are supportive of in principle. Fully understand the need for sustainable development to support economic growth and jobs. It is essential that wildlife is safeguarded during this process if we do not wish to see an impoverished environment. The aim should be to achieve a win-win situation for wildlife and the economy. Not against all development. Work with developers within the county to ensure opportunities are taken to benefit wildlife and create truly sustainable development. Planning must focus on adaptation to protect, restore and create a robust and resilient natural environment which can stand up to the challenges of climate change. The uncertainties of a changing climate are just as relevant for people as they are for wildlife. Well connected, landscape-scale areas for wildlife are good for our mental and physical well-being and the economy. The added benefits of creating, or restoring, wildlife habitats include flood control, pollution control to food production and long-term solutions to climate change impacts. NWT are strong advocates of the need for access to high-quality wildlife-rich open space for the residents of the Garden Village. Note that the proposal includes the retention, enhancement and integration of important hedgerows, woodland and trees on site, an integrated approach to surface water drainage and multifunctional greenspace and the provision of at least 0.5ha for community woodland in this plan period and land identified for 1.5ha thereafter. In addition, a multifunctional green infrastructure network comprising 5ha in this plan period, and 5ha thereafter, that connects to the existing, to incorporate publicly accessible open space to meet the standards set out in Policy ST41 is also proposed. Welcome the intention to protect existing habitats and create new woodland and multifunctional greenspace. Proposals should provide targeted and significant Green Infrastructure that maximises biodiversity opportunities and protects and enhances existing ecological features such as wildlife corridors that link to the countryside beyond the site. The creation and enhancement of GI through development must contribute to Biodiversity Action Plans to halt and reverse the decline in priority habitats and species. No Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) or water courses are within the proposed location of the Garden Village which consists largely of intensively managed arable fields. There are boundary hedgerows, which will have some wildlife value. Arable field margins are Habitats of 'principal importance' in England and so every effort should be made to retain and enhance them through the new development. The UK BAP lists of priority species and habitats remain, however, important and valuable reference sources. Notably, they have been used to help draw up statutory lists of priority species and habitats in England, (see NI species and NI habitats lists), as required under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 (England). Further information provided about UK BAP priority species and habitats. Local authorities in England and Wales have a key role to play in the conservation of biodiversity and this is now recognised and formalised within Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006, where: "Every public body must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity" The location of the Garden Village is likely to be a less damaging option to wildlife when compared, for example, with development of the former Bevercotes Colliery Local Wildlife Site which had been considered previously. Note that the development will be guided by the preparation of a comprehensive masterplan framework facilitated by a Consultative Group. Facilitated by the Council this key delivery mechanism will ensure stakeholder and community buy-in from the outset. Keen to be involved in a project group in order to help shape the plan for the site. The masterplan should be supported by a full Ecological Impact Assessment (EIA) so that protected species are properly considered in the planning process and to allow the local planning authority to be in possession of all relevant ecological information when developing the masterplan. The EIA will need to be periodically</p>	<p>In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. This includes for green infrastructure both the amount and mix of uses within the network.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village	<p>updated due to the phasing of the scheme. Refer to Practical Guides for Creating Successful New Communities Guide 7: Planning for Green and Prosperous Places, TCPA. Living Draft, January 2018. It is stated that Bassetlaw Garden Village will promote a step-change towards active and public transport through a highly legible, attractive and accessible movement network, including a new railway station and integrated public transport hub and will seek to improve opportunities for cycling and pedestrian links between the Garden Village, the surrounding communities, in particular Retford, and over the A1 to natural and heritage assets such as Clumber Park. Hope that our Idle Valley Nature Reserve will become a key destination through the cycle network.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF293 -	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	<p>Policy ST3 details the Council will support the delivery of a new Garden Village on 216ha of land adjacent to the A1/A57 Apleyhead Junction. The Framework is clear that local plans should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of the area and be sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change⁹. In this regard it is essential therefore that the expected supply from the Garden Village over the plan period is based on realistic assumptions on lead-in times and delivery rates. It is important that clear evidence is provided to demonstrate that any assumptions that are made within the housing trajectory are demonstrably realistic at this stage, accurately reflecting the challenges associated with the delivery of such sites and their current planning status. This evidence should include Statements of Common Ground between interested parties and appropriate sense checking should also be undertaken against local, regional and national evidence (for example, the information on lead in times and delivery rates from sites contained within Reports such as Lichfields 'Start to Finish' Report; and, Savills Spotlight: Planning and Housing Delivery Report, May 2019). The potential for further slippage from such a scheme will necessitate a flexible approach within the Local Plan's policies to ensure that they are responsive to rapid change and that development needs can be met in full over the plan period. Given the strategic scale and specific nature of the proposal it will be vitally important for the Local Plan to provide a clear contingency against its overall requirement to take into account the fact that such proposals will invariably deliver at a slower rate than originally envisaged when a Local Plan is examined. This can be achieved by including policies that take a responsive and flexible approach to sustainable development at the edge of suitable settlements to ensure that a positive response can be taken where monitoring indicates that the expected delivery from the proposed Garden Village has slipped (see comments on Policy ST2 above). Paragraphs 5.1.34 to 5.1.36 of the Plan summarise the process undertaken through the preparation of the Local Plan to date which has led to the identification of land adjacent to Apleyhead Junction as the preferred location for a Garden Village. As the Council are aware, land at Bevercotes Colliery was previously considered alongside Gamston Airfield as the location for the Garden Village for Bassettlaw. Gladman maintain that Bevercotes Colliery is fully capable of being delivered through the plan as a standalone Priority Regeneration Area. The identification of Bevercotes Colliery as a Priority Regeneration Area will provide further assurance that the long-term housing and employment needs will be delivered during and after the plan period. As outlined in section 6, Bevercotes Colliery can be bought forwards in a manner that positively responds to the local landscape and biodiversity, whilst respecting the existing communities and contributing to the local economy.</p>	<p>In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. Further detailed bespoke work will be undertaken to demonstrate viability. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy. But not all growth can be provided for in the Main Towns and through sustainable development in the rural villages. The Garden Village provides an opportunity to meet the District's housing and employment needs.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF299	Gladmans	<p>Natural England recognises the intention of the proposed garden village to follow the nationally identified garden city principles. Welcome the laudable aims to create a sustainable community with green infrastructure at the heart of the project and the creation of wildlife friendly space between Worksop and Retford. Strong reservations with the location of the village in such close proximity to Clumber Park, part of which is nationally designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest. The impact of locating a new settlement of up to 4,000 new homes does not appear to have been satisfactorily considered within the local plan documents. Clumber Park covers an area of 1,531ha with the SSSI covering 526ha. The park comprises one of the largest expanses of semi-natural vegetation in Nottinghamshire. It is made up of relict ancient woodland, historic parkland and extensive grass heath with rich invertebrate, bird and bat communities. The origins of the site can be traced back to the Royal Forest of Sherwood. Additional interest is provided by conifer woodland and open water. The SSSI was re-notified and extended in May 1999. Clumber Park SSSI is located 950 metres from the proposed garden village and our main concerns are that the close proximity of an additional large population will increase visitor pressure and reduce air quality on this site which will potentially damage the fragile habitats and species that the SSSI designation protects. Visitor Pressure - Whilst the plan admirably promotes (5.3.2) the use of new cycling and pedestrian links from the garden village to Clumber Park, this facilitation of visitors to the site will increase the pressures detailed below. The intended hope that residents will use the links which will reduce reliance on car transport to the site cannot be relied upon and an increase in vehicle traffic is probable. The SSSI is notified for a number of sensitive habitats and species and a substantial increase in visitor numbers is likely to result in a detrimental effect on these features;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Increase in compaction to soils and vegetation particularly of the lowland heathland, acid grassland and woodlands. · Increase in disturbance to ground flora vegetation · Increase in disturbance to breeding bird assemblages of the woodlands and open water · Increase in disturbance to ground nesting birds (woodlark and nightjar) considered to be of European importance identified within the boundary of the Sherwood Forest possible potential Special Protection Area (ppSPA). <p>Air Quality - Air quality impacts from car use as well as from the residential and employment /industrial development opportunities will see a change to the current situation, and possibly have a detrimental effect on the sensitive habitats of the SSSI, particularly lowland heathland and acid grassland. Air quality impacts on invertebrates, which Clumber Park is also notified for are not yet fully understood. In addition Apleyhead Junction Site SEM1 is immediately adjacent to Clumber Park. It will have pedestrian and cycle routes linked to the Garden Village to provide employment via sustainable transport. However, due to the proximity and the unpredictable behaviour of the residents who may work here or others commuting in, an increase in traffic to this location will likely result in reductions in air quality and associated impacts on the SSSI notified features. Welcome the provision within the Garden Village of green corridors linked to community woodland which would contribute towards the Sherwood Re-forestation project, however there is no detail about this Project or links to references. At point 5d of the policy wording we note the provision of at least "0.5ha for community woodland in this plan period and land identified for 1.5ha thereafter", whilst this is welcome we are concerned that this may be inadequate given the pressure from users. We would wish to ensure that tree planting creates a biodiverse area of woodland and not a token area of trees.</p>	<p>The potential impact of the Garden Village upon Clumber Park SSSI and the Birklands and Bilhaugh SPA will be assessed through a Recreational impact Assessment. This will be undertaken in partnership with Natural England.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF300 -	Natural England	<p>The NPPF (paragraph 52) acknowledges that; ...the supply of new homes can sometimes be best achieved through planning for larger scale development, such as new settlements or extensions to existing villages and towns that follow the principles of Garden Cities. Working with the support of their communities local planning authorities should consider whether such opportunities provide the best way achieving sustainable development". The Local Plan seeks to allocate the Bassetlaw Garden Village a site of 216ha as an area of long-term sustainable growth. It is suggested that this Garden Village could deliver up to 4,000 dwellings over its lifetime with a target delivery of 750 dwellings over the plan period. The recent Uttlesford Local Plan Stage 1 Inspectors Report highlights the problems which can be associated with a reliance upon such sites without clear and robust delivery evidence. In the case of Uttlesford three Garden Communities were proposed. The Inspector acknowledged that the Garden Communities would be responsible for the delivery of a large amount of the housing requirement. In considering the Garden Communities the Inspector identified they would not deliver the quantum of housing in the plan period that the Council's trajectory was showing. The Inspector was concerned about the lack of evidence to enable a conclusion to be made that the proposed allocations were sound and that they would deliver sufficient levels of housing over the plan period. In relation to the Bassetlaw Garden Village it is identified by the Local Planning Authority that: "Development will be provided within a high quality, highly biodiverse landscape, dominated by green infrastructure and community woodland ..." It is acknowledged that several alternatives were reviewed. Whilst it is concluded that this location has been identified as being more suitable, it is not without its constraints. Furthermore, it appears that the Council has been 'wedded' to the delivery of a Garden Village or Garden Villages without consideration of suitable alternatives, including additional sites within the Main Towns, including Retford. 3.7 In addition, notwithstanding our concerns regarding the assessment of alternatives to a Garden Village, there is significant scope for a slippage in the timetable. Prior to development commencing, post BLP adoption, a significant amount of work is required to overcome the identified constraints, develop the identified required masterplan and appropriate infrastructure. It is, therefore, probable that the timescale identified for delivery could slip leading to an under-delivery in the plan period for this site. Any slippage in the delivery of this key site will have a significant impact upon the identified buffer (see section 4 below). If appropriate the Bassetlaw Garden Village proposal must be founded upon clear and robust evidence together with a realistic delivery timetable. It is on these grounds that our client has significant concerns with the Garden Village.</p>	<p>In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. Further detailed bespoke work will be undertaken to demonstrate viability. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy. But not all growth can be provided for in the Main Towns and through sustainable development in the rural villages. The Garden Village provides an opportunity to meet the District's housing and employment needs.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF304	Pegasus	<p>In supporting the Garden Village, both families see an opportunity to create a legacy for the community that they can be proud of. The families are united by a common belief that any development on their land must embrace the principles set out in the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and, in particular, SDGs 3, 11 and 13. To fulfil those goals, the Garden Village must: (i) be constructed in an environmentally considerate manner; (ii) achieve an ambitious increase in biodiversity in its locality; (iii) support an increase of physical activity levels; and (iv) facilitate low carbon living in the community.</p> <p>involvement in the proposals is underpinned by, and conditional on, fulfilment of these principles and Bassetlaw's commitment to the opportunity to create a truly sustainable and green section of the community. The Local Plan consultation has coincided with the publication of 'Living with Beauty' by the Government's 'Building Better, Building Beautiful Commission' (January 2020). The Commission and the Report highlight the importance of safeguarding beauty, community, history, landscape in our places. The overall aspiration of the Report is supported and in particular, the following comments go to the heart of what is anticipated for the Garden Village: "Many of the things that make settlements beautiful also make them healthy, happy and sustainable. A beautiful place is a place in which people wish to walk, rather than a place that the car helps them to avoid. It is a place in which they enjoy spending time with one another."</p> <p>[P11] The Report identifies three key approaches to improving places, which are in line with the land owners aspirations for Bassetlaw Garden Village: "Ask for Beauty: We do not see beauty as a cost, to be negotiated away once planning permission has been obtained. It is the benchmark that all new developments should meet. It includes everything that promotes a healthy and happy life, everything that makes a collection of buildings into a place, everything that turns anywhere into somewhere, and nowhere into home. So understood beauty should be an essential condition for the grant of planning permission." Refuse Ugliness: People do not only want beauty in their surroundings. They are repelled by ugliness, which is a social cost that everyone is forced to bear. Ugliness means buildings that are unadaptable, unhealthy and unsightly, and which violate the context in which they are placed. Such buildings destroy the sense of place, undermine the spirit of community, and ensure that we are not at home in our world. Promote Stewardship: Our built environment and our natural environment belong together. Both should be protected and enhanced for the long-term benefit of the communities that depend on them..... New developments should be regenerative, enhancing their environment and adding to the health, sustainability and biodiversity of their context. For too long now we have been exploiting and spoiling our country. The time has come to enhance and care for it instead. Our recommendations are designed to ensure that we pass on to future generations an inheritance at least as good as the one we have received." It is very important to the landowners that the Garden Village creates a legacy to be proud of, which delivers growth and health and well-being benefits for its residents and the wider community, but not at the expense of the environment.</p>	<p>Support for the Garden Village is noted and welcome. The Council will continue to work in partnership with both landowners to ensure that the proposal for the Garden Village meets their aspirations for the environment, health, biodiversity and community leaving a positive legacy for future generations.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF307	Savills	<p>The opportunities presented by new settlements are addressed within paragraph 72 of the NPPF 2019. In general, support the aspirations for Bassetlaw Garden Village as set out in section 5.3 of the Draft Local Plan. In particular, paragraph 5.3.3 which states: "Development will be provided within a high quality, highly biodiverse landscape, dominated by green infrastructure and community woodland, where residents and employees can easily move by sustainable transport to new community facilities, shops and services. A new railway station and public transport hub will provide sustainable access to the wider area." The Garden City Principles set out in 5.3.7 and 5.3.8 are welcomed and supported. These principles are echoed in those within Chapter 4 of 'Living with Beauty' which identifies the following factors in creating beautiful places:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Townscape • Mixed Use • Affordability • Respect for heritage • Respect for nature • Respect for communities aspirations • Stewardship • Democracy <p>The comments in 5.3.10 and 5.3.11 go to the heart of the landowners aspirations for the site. With specific reference to policy ST3, the landowners support the overarching policy objectives in principle at this stage as set out in A-D. In particular, the references to an 'environmentally-led' development in D. It is suggested that that given the focus on creating an innovative, green community, in order to meet the criteria set out in D 5. Landscape, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure, an early assessment of the current green infrastructure and its spatial inter-relationships should be made. This will enable the optimum planning of corridors between existing and new green areas around which building for houses and employment, with, of course, their own new green areas, can take place. The family is fully supportive of green space. However, they are concerned that the half hectare community woodland (less than half a football pitch) proposed for this plan period is inadequate for the footfall of the residents of the 750 houses also suggested for this plan period. The family look forward to a more substantial and realistic allocation through detailed masterplanning. Wherever possible, additional areas of green space, community woodland and useable open space should be sought and integrated into the design of the Garden Village. As the timescale for the delivery of the Garden Village extends into the future, the policy should be sufficiently flexible to allow for changing technologies which could improve the sustainability of the site. The landowners consider that it is very important that the development facilitates an increase of physical activity and sport amongst its residents as a result of the economic, mental and physical health and well-being and environmental benefits that would be generated. The landowners consider that the World Health Organisation's Global Action Plan on Physical Activity together with the Sport England and local authority equivalent policy documents be consulted to guide development in this respect. Consideration should also be given to the creation of an overarching vision for the Garden Village which reflects the aspirations of the landowners and the Council for the site. The inclusion of land at Morton Hill Farm to create Bassetlaw Garden Village is supported in principle by our clients, The Mason Family, who are committed to working with The Girdham Family and the District Council to create a high quality, low carbon, landscape-led settlement for the future of Bassetlaw. There are likely to be many questions over the design, deliverability and developability of the site that need to be answered over 2020. The scheme is at the early stages but the family are committed to the principles and will contribute fully to further discussions about the delivery of this development.</p>	<p>Support for Policy ST3 is welcome. Further work on the existing green infrastructure network and its connectivity with other uses will need to be undertaken to ensure that the masterplan can be truly landscape led. Further work will be undertaken to determine the extent of appropriate tree coverage on the site, to ensure that provision is appropriate to mitigate the impacts of each phase of development. Flexibility will be built into the policy to ensure that as the development progresses the use of changing technologies can be incorporated into the design of development where appropriate. Healthy place-making is a key element of the Garden Village. The approach taken to creating an active place will be clarified in Policy ST3. Through collaborative working with the landowners and key stakeholders a vision and objectives for the Garden Village will be produced to reflect aspirations for the site.</p>
REF307	Savills	<p>Support the development of site at Upper Morton. Neighbourhood Plans have successfully indicated where suitable small scale and in fill housing development can take place across Bassetlaw. In addition, the Green Garden Village proposed at Upper Morton will provide enough housing for the needs of Bassetlaw Residents. The greenest solution for housing is looking at existing buildings and seeing what can be converted to housing use and brought up to a green eco standard. I also believe housing should be closer to places of work, which Cottam site proposed housing certainly isn't. Yes, there is scope for housing and regeneration within Worksop and the proposed Garden Village at Upper Morton will enable residents of Worksop and places near Retford to live in a green environment and access the community and also places of employment.</p>	<p>Support noted and welcome.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
1197234	Resident	The Proposed railway station will encourage additional parking by the commuters from out of town who have traditionally travelled to Retford or Worksop to catch their trains. How many of the affordable homes proposed will be allocated Housing association / council house dwellings? How many of the sheltered accommodation units for older people proposed will be allocated to Bassett Law Housing association / council house dwellings? What does the appropriate contributions towards primary and secondary schools entail, will these schools be definitely be built. The build up of traffic to the schools in Retford will bottleneck at the junction of the B6420 and the A620 road junction. Will the appropriate contributions towards health care facilities guarantee that there will be sufficient medical facilities on the Garden Village site? Can Bassettlaw / Worksop hospital cope with the additional volume of patients? The build up of traffic at the A620 & B6420 junction due to the local school start and end times is horrendous. What does the proposed contribution improvement plans entail to ensure that the traffic there flows smoothly going forward?	At least 20% of homes will be affordable. 10% will be for rent. 20% of the homes will be for older people. In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. Further detailed bespoke work will be undertaken to demonstrate viability.
1197243	Resident	Do not support the concept of a Garden Village. Again, services including healthcare, social care and education should be in place before building. Bassettlaw Hospital will be inadequate to cover the needs of the proposed developments	In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan.
1197261	Resident	The development of the Garden Village states that it will introduce 4000 new properties, this is a huge number of houses, and will mean a huge number of residents. If the Garden Village is introduced, this is more countryside and green space which will be lost. The plan also talks about the introduction of a railway station. I assume this will be on the existing Leeds-Lincoln line? I use this line every day to commute between Retford and Sheffield. My journey already takes 45 minutes. The introduction of another station on this line will significantly add to my journey time.	The rail feasibility study shows that an additional station can be accommodated in service delivery on the Lincoln-Sheffield line.
1197263	Resident	Object to the proposed Garden Village. The council has included us (our home and plot of land) in the proposed Garden Village without obtaining our permission to do so. This came to light late yesterday evening at the very last minute consultation held at Ranby Village Hall. Have not offered our land to the Council for the proposed Garden Village. This is privately owned land that is, I repeat, NOT for the council's disposal. We will be located in the middle of the proposed Garden Village. Our water supply comes through the farm where this proposal is. How is the council going to guarantee our water supply? You cannot deprive a family of their basic drinking water and kill us by dehydration. This will have a direct impact on our amenities and the council needs to think carefully before proceeding with this plan. How is the council going to protect our privacy? Currently live in the country, and are not overlooked. Our amenities will again be affected by surrounding us with 4000 houses. The traffic created by 4000 houses will create excessive noise pollution for us. What steps are the council going to take to protect us from this? The neighbourhood's character will be altered, currently being countryside and view from the B6420 will be altered. This will have an impact on the neighbourhood's amenities once again.	The site is in the ownership of two landowners and excludes the land referred to. Existing services that cross the site will be maintained and secured through a legal agreement. Careful design will ensure that amenity is maintained. A Transport Assessment will identify impacts from the development on the road network and identify measures to address those impacts.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF320	A&D Architecture	<p>I am a child living where you are planning to put 4000 houses I do not like this for multiple reasons. My first point that by building more houses here you are destroying the green fields. I do hope you are aware about global warming. But by doing this (building 4000 houses) you are just simply increasing a few problems. 1. you are shorting earth's life, 2. less lives will be able to live - this one I am not too sure on but I am pretty certain that this could happen if you kill out living things. Now I know you are probably thinking that people in the future could do this too and I won't be there to stop this so why am I trying to stop you now. I am doing this for certain reasons: 1. to help the future 2. YOU ARE DESTROYING THE BEAUTIFUL EARTH AND CREATION. The earth isn't here for us to build on and kill nature. No! we came in the process of it's making so if you ask me, we are simply destroying what made us. I don't know about you but that sounds crazy. You are doing it, not me. You are an adult you should know better than me a child. But because you are destroying the countryside with putting 4000 houses here I will have to live in this destroyed world. Please think about where you put houses and stop picking on countryside just because it is easy for you and you don't need to think too hard. My next point sort of carries on from the last. It is about wildlife. Wildlife the creatures, the animals, the cute, the ugly, the young, the old it comes in all sorts of shapes and sizes. Many people don't like animals or creatures (can't blame the ones scared of them I can't say much to that. I am scared of spiders myself. I don't kill them if it is not necessary I release them back into the wildlife. Back to the point).But we can't and shouldn't really kill them, they were here first, we evolved from them. We can ignore them but if you go building 4000 houses around here, you are not going to knock the farmer out of his home, you are going to knock tonnes of wildlife out of homes - they come in all different shapes and sizes from huge birds of prey and foxes to the tiny mice and rats. We have also had grass snake which are protected in our garden who rely on the mice population in the fields to survive and so do the buzzard. We have swallows which are protected and heron and stoat all sorts. Now here's a different view of the problem let's put it this way. Think of baby bunnies being born. 7 years time you have decided to build those amount of number of houses in the countryside. You get to the bit where those little bunnies were born now living. Now imagine that you had lived in one house for most of your life you will have started to have grown to loving this house then without no warning a load of builders come and you have to leave the house you now love - gone and destroyed. You narrowly missing death too, nowhere to live and bring your babies up. You get the image let's move on. Now another reason I don't like this is I love playing in the fields and the byway when it has been raining. This is another point if you build 4000 houses here you will have to make sure that we are not flooded – how will you guarantee to keep me and my family safe from being flooded by building 4000 houses here? My dog also won't be pleased for she loves walking down the byway and getting mucky so do I. You are destroying green fields and happy lives homes (not the homes you are making, the animals homes). Also by doing this you are kinda going against the world of your own. A lot of us are trying to stop polluting the world but by doing all this building in the clean countryside you are polluting the world and no doubt about this. If you build the houses the people living in them will possibly litter and we don't want litter in the country, we are trying to prevent it. Let's move on.</p> <p>I will have to live the rest of my life in this destructed world that you are making in my countryside. Then my children will have to live in it too. It is not pleasant unless you are used to it but I am now a country child. Living in the country is better than living in a town. Never have I got ill since I came to live here, I have been here since I turned 3. I love this place and plead that you stop building on this beautiful open green countryside where I am growing up in. When I got told I was horrified, it is terrible if you knew what it was like you would definitely feel the same way.</p>	The Local Plan uses brownfield land where possible but unfortunately there is not enough to meet housing growth. The environment will be protected and enhanced through development. This will be through ecological assessments for the site.
REF326	Resident	<p>vehemently do NOT support this policy as it will create many problems of traffic on the B6420 and other issues in a rural area. The Consultation Period should be extended. We lived at Barn Cottage for 24 years and this Policy is totally unwelcome.</p>	<p>A Transport Assessment will identify impacts from the development on the road network and identify measures to address those impacts.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF330	Resident	<p>Despite the requirement to scrub 2 x proposed Garden Villages following the previous consultation, the LPA clings on to the vanity-project-ideal, with an entirely new location. Representing wasted work/local authority resource, considering that the LAA has already identified sufficient land for all housing needs in the district. The retention of the Garden Village ideal is all the more confusing when according to 5.1.8 of the subject consultation:yet the "Functional Cluster Model" is dead. The 2020 Draft Bassettlaw LP has returned to a settlement hierarchy model. Whom will the Apleyhead Garden Village be serving? Ranby?? Another example of how the total reliance on N2D2, has led to this intervention/location.</p> <p>Settlements for whom N2D2 is not relevant (as identified by GL Hearn), are being sacrificed. All previous comments made in connection with the Garden Village proposal apply. That the LPA is upping housing targets intended as regeneration assistance, to prop up a Garden Village, is entirely counter intuitive and fails to deliver Sustainable Development. This submission OBJECTS to Garden Village delivery and to POLICY ST49 (2,3,4). Alongside acknowledgement that electric cars will be instrumental in delivering sustainable transport solutions both during but especially after, the lifetime of the proposed LP, monies allocated to public transport for the Garden Village, should be used to enhance services in existing villages.</p>	The housing targets in the Local Plan are necessary to be consistent with national policy. Unfortunately there is not enough land available to meet housing needs. The Garden Village helps meet those targets. The Local plan and Neighbourhood Planning support appropriate growth in rural villages proportionate to its place.
1197282	Resident	<p>Do not agree with building on the colossal 533 acres of green fields for a "garden village". I think to call it that is a misnomer. It would not be a village, and by the nature of where it was built, it would not be a "garden". It will destroy more precious greenfields and countryside, not to mention all the flora and fauna that will be lost. The roads into and around Retford will be clogged up with traffic, as all those residents have to commute everywhere. It will be the same situation with congestion while it is being built, and the A1 will be affected terribly. Don't believe the "train station" plan will come off, and there are 2 stations within close proximity already. I also think that building a separate new town, like to garden village will actually destroy Retford and Worksop, as people will not necessarily visit those town centres. Houses should be built closer to the towns, to support them. The garden village is not sustainable.</p>	<p>In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy. But not all growth can be provided for in the Main Towns and through sustainable development in the rural villages. The Garden Village provides an opportunity to meet the District's housing and employment needs.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF333 -	Resident	<p>The location of this proposal is absolutely unacceptable as it is going to destroy 216 hectares of Greenfield site still being actively farmed. As a result of this proposal farmers will lose their livelihood and home. The local green landscape will be completely destroyed and replaced with housing and industrial estate. This will affect the local's amenities to enjoy the pleasure of countryside living. It is unbelievable that green agricultural land that is currently being actively farmed is going to be converted into a housing estate and industrial estate depriving the future generation of nature and natural wildlife. Preserving a few trees as per Bassetlaw Council's plan is in no way comparison to the wildlife that live here. There are plenty of brownfield sites in Bassetlaw that can be utilised for this purpose. There are protected species like swallows and grass snake that live here and depend on other species such as rabbit and field mice to survive! When we challenged the council at a local consultation meeting on why Greenfield was being used rather than Brownfield, the reply was that it is easier and quicker to put houses up in Greenfield as compared to Brownfield which requires cleaning up. We find this reason completely unacceptable. You are appointed as planner so plan properly and don't find an easy way out, for goodness sake. Currently there is no mains sewage or gas supply in the proposed area. Therefore, more destruction of nature will be required in order to set this up. Choose to live in the country, to be in harmony with nature, for the future generation to understand the balance of this. The council are robbing us of this right and choice we made and are forcing us to live amongst 4000 other homes (and as we understand it industrial area) in a polluted environment with no care for nature or the future generation by bringing destruction to Greenfield and the wildlife that live here. This is not the life future generation want and it is time for planners to understand this. Remember we have not inherited the Earth from our ancestors but have borrowed it from our children. Let us please not destroy the earth we live in for our future generation. As planners we put our hopes and future in your hands. Please don't let us down by destroying the world we live in. Don't destroy the countryside. There are other alternatives to building on non-agricultural land, as planners please engage your brains and don't just look for easy route out. Think about the future, think about your children's future and the future of many generations to come. They will NOT thank you for destroying their countryside and putting up thousands of houses. Don't leave the Earth in a destroyed state for the younger generation. Don't deprive them of greenfield and nature and the right to grow up and enjoy the countryside. Don't be one of the planners that the future generation will be disappointed in!</p>	<p>The Local Plan allocates brownfield sites for development but there is not enough brownfield sites available to meet housing needs. Some greenfield land is required. This includes the Garden Village. Impacts on the environment will be identified and mitigated through technical assessments such as ecological assessments to identify impacts on wildlife.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF335 -	Resident	<p>The location of this proposal is absolutely unacceptable as it is going to destroy 216 hectares of Greenfield site still being actively farmed. As a result of this proposal farmers will lose their livelihood and home. The local green landscape will be completely destroyed and replaced with housing and industrial estate. This will affect the local's amenities to enjoy the pleasure of countryside living. It is unbelievable that green agricultural land that is currently being actively farmed is going to be converted into a housing estate and industrial estate depriving the future generation of nature and natural wildlife. Preserving a few trees as per Bassetlaw Council's plan is in no way comparison to the wildlife that live here. There are plenty of brownfield sites in Bassetlaw that can be utilised for this purpose. There are protected species like swallows and grass snake that live here and depend on other species such as rabbit and field mice to survive! When we challenged the council at a local consultation meeting on why Greenfield was being used rather than Brownfield, the reply was that it is easier and quicker to put houses up in Greenfield as compared to Brownfield which requires cleaning up. We find this reason completely unacceptable. You are appointed as planner so plan properly and don't find an easy way out, for goodness sake. Currently there is no mains sewage or gas supply in the proposed area. Therefore, more destruction of nature will be required in order to set this up. We chose to live in the country, to be in harmony with nature, for the future generation to understand the balance of this. The council are robbing us of this right and choice we made and are forcing us to live amongst 4000 other homes (and as we understand it industrial area) in a polluted environment with no care for nature or the future generation by bringing destruction to Greenfield and the wildlife that live here. This is not the life future generation want and it is time for planners to understand this. Remember we have not inherited the Earth from our ancestors but have borrowed it from our children. Let us please not destroy the earth we live in for our future generation. As planners we put our hopes and future in your hands. Please don't let us down by destroying the world we live in. Don't destroy the countryside. There are other alternatives to building on non-agricultural land, as planners please engage your brains and don't just look for easy route out. Think about the future, think about your children's future and the future of many generations to come. They will NOT thank you for destroying their countryside and putting up thousands of houses. Don't leave the Earth in a destroyed state for the younger generation. Don't deprive them of greenfield and nature and the right to grow up and enjoy the countryside. Don't be one of the planners that the future generation will be disappointed in!</p>	<p>The Local Plan allocates brownfield sites for development but there is not enough brownfield sites available to meet housing needs. Some greenfield land is required. This includes the Garden Village. Impacts on the environment will be identified and mitigated through technical assessments such as ecological assessments to identify impacts on wildlife.</p>
REF336	Resident	<p>Strongly oppose Policy ST3 setting out the Council's vision for the new Bassetlaw Garden Village and consider the approach to be unsound, unfeasible and unviable. I think that the Garden Village will harm the vitality and viability of Retford town centre and will cause harm to the community of Babworth. The Council's priority should be to enhance existing settlements such as Retford where development can benefit from existing transport networks and support the local economy and wider rural hinterlands rather than attempting to create a new village and transport hub which I do not think is viable. In reality, the Garden Village will simply add traffic to Retford's town centre. The allocation of dwellings within Ranby village should be vastly reduced and the Garden Village idea scrapped.</p>	<p>In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy. But not all growth can be provided for in the Main Towns and through sustainable development in the rural villages. The Garden Village provides an opportunity to meet the District's housing and employment needs.</p>
REF337	Resident	<p>The infrastructure of the Five Lane Ends junction will see slow traffic for a number of years sitting outside their village on the A1 this is noisy and creates pollution some kind of acoustic barrier would go some way to alleviate this on the North Bound A1 by Elkesley approval and development of this prior to the works on 5 lane ends would go some way to get residents on side.</p>	<p>A Transport Assessment will ensure traffic impacts from the development are assessed and mitigation identified.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF338 -	Resident	<p>The objective of a Garden Village is broadly supported, particularly where it can (alongside other strategic objectives) deliver a step change in the regeneration and growth prospects of Bassetlaw. It is important that the Garden Village policies do not inadvertently link the delivery of the new settlement to the adjacent Apleyhead Junction allocation (Policy 9; SEM1). Although the wording of Policy ST3 does not link the two sites, later draft Plan references to Policy SEM1(see paragraph 6.4.2 of the plan) do infer a degree of interdependency in terms of economic and housing growth. Policy ST3 should not inadvertently place any infrastructure or delivery requirements on the Apleyhead Junction site or create any other interdependency between it and the garden village. Any such requirements could adversely impact on the ability to deliver significant employment development in the short to medium term.</p>	<p>The two sites are separate. But infrastructure work identifies that both will generate impacts on local infrastructure so it is important the impacts are understood cumulatively.</p>
REF345	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>NEW TOWN PROPOSAL It is 8miles between the centre of Retford and the centre of Worksop. Babworth crossing is 1 mile from Retford.The proposal is to build a residential new Town from Babworth Crossing to 5 lane ends 'Apley Head Junction' The SEM1 proposal is to extend the industrial commercial area at Manton in a continuous area out to Apley Head Junction on the West of the A1, the west side of the A1access junction from the proposed residential New Town. The proposal would create a residential New Town urban extension. to the East of Apley Head junction with the industrial commercial area attached but running West to Worksop, to create a continuous residential and industrial commercial area stretching from Worksop Manor, Rhodesia and Shireoaks to Babworth crossing. A continuous built up area of over 8 miles. All this on the edge of Clumber Park and the dukeries. The existing area designated is an attractive wooded agricultural area , more agricultural East of Apley Head junction,but the whole area thinly populated by the odd farm and cottage. Tourism and leisure which tend to be focused on Clumber Park and the Dukeries is likely to be discouraged by the Apley Head proposals. This will be damaging for Bassetlaw as leisure and tourism growth is desirable, and is likely to be achievable. Tourism and leisure has the ability to replace the industrial and commercial jobs where A1 and automation are going to reduce the traditional jobs in that sector that Bassetlaw has attempted to attract. There is a logic in extending the industrial commercial area from Manton, as there are no residents to consider between there and the Apley Head Junction. There is an abundance of industrial and commercial land in Bassetlaw in any case. A lower population below retirement age is envisaged. So there is likely to be lower demand for industrial commercial jobs. More jobs in the tourism and leisure sectors will mean Bassetlaw will not be short of employment opportunities. There is a surplus of proposed employment sites in the Bassetlaw Draft Plan. A lower working age population with growth in the retired non working older population. A large proportion of the employment land is likely not to be required for Bassetlaw jobs , but may provide employment for commuter's traveling into Bassetlaw. There is mention of a railway station, however officers at Nottinghamshire County Council have not been approached. Transport for the North has not been approached, I am a board member there. The support of these public bodies would be needed to take this forward, but British rail would need to agree as they are the body who would have to find the investment needed. I am not aware that they are even aware that a station is to be included in the Bassetlaw draft plan. Even the size envisaged for the projected New Town housing development is unlikely to justify a railway Station at Apley Head, as the road connections are likely to satisfy transport requirements. The demand, in even the large size envisaged will not be sufficient to justify the investement with the demanding infrastructure and improvement programmes in the North, from this government and future governments, in the coming decades. There will be much better investment opportunities and more demanding projects, benefitting larger numbers of people between the existing Towns and cities of the North and upgrading existing stations. It is usually considered acceptable to walk for 20minutes or more to a train station for commuting purposes and regular use. Accepting this would make a lot more land along the Western side of Worksop available and usefull, around the Western Side of Worksop, and Rhodesia , and there is already a Western by pass relief road in existance there providing adequate vehicular capacity and access. Access to Nottingham and the Derbyshire small towns can be obtained by rail from Worksop and the Shireoaks station. Development and improvement of the existing rail station at Shireoaks has the greatest probability of success, simply because it already exists. If there was a</p>	<p>The evidence shows that a high number of jobs is expected over the plan period and this needs to be balanced with the number of dwellings delivered. This is a requirement of national policy. A governance structure is in place with in principle support of key stakeholders.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
		<p>will to locate more people in the future to the West of Worksop , the Apley Head New Town would be unlikely to be needed in the timescale envisaged and linked to the draft plan. The West of Worksop has the advantages of easy access to health facilities at Bassetlaw hospital and easy access to Doncaster and Sheffield hospitals. The station provides easy access to Sheffield and the cities of the North by rail for communities and business travellers. The Apley Head New Town is proposed in any case as overspill for Sheffield City Region. There was an understanding that Bassetlaw would take the influx. If this Sheffield based influx were to be removed from the building demand it would be seen that there would be no requirement for the Apley Head New Town. The projected building requirements are projected to provide a wide margin of additional homes, above the projected population generated requirements. An element of environmental luxury is proposed for the Apley Head Newtown, and this is usual with Bassetlaw planners to provide such envious conditions for people moving into Bassetlaw and yet leave the local residents in Bassetlaw permanently deprived. This can be seen in the way planning permissions are being granted in East Markham for instance where the 20% increase in planning permissions has been granted, the cap exceeded, in developments out of character with that previous garden village, on Beckland hill and Mark Lane for instance. This is an urban extension in practice. The proposal will fragment country areas</p>	
REF347	NJL Consulting	Map of National Grid assets at the Garden Village provided.	Noted.
REF361 -	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council and Notts CC	For forty years I have lived on the 's' bend on the B6420 and it has always been an extremely dangerous bend with a great many cars ending up in my garden/ditch every year. Another issue is with regards to my nursery entrance which is situated 250 metres from the railway crossing. A suggestion has been made that there may be a flyover over the railway crossing and my concern would be how this would impact my business.	A Transport Assessment will ensure traffic impacts from the development are assessed and mitigation identified.
REF368 -	National Grid	Support for the efforts of Bassetlaw DC to produce a Local Plan and SA. Believe that the Garden Village (ST3) are excellent ideas.	Support noted and welcome.
REF372	Morton Nurseries	In recent years, upwards of a dozen significant schemes have been granted planning permission on sites in and around Retford. The inevitable result has been to put pressure on the infrastructure to the point that services and facilities such as schools, medical services, traffic, parking, drainage etc....have been stretched to the limit. Further development on a large scale in Retford would aggravate the situation referenced to above, therefore we support the proposal to develop Morton.	Support noted and welcome.
REF377 -	Resident	While receiving the need for homes – particularly affordable homes and social housing, concerned about the scale of the Garden Village proposal. A potential increase of around 4000 homes without supporting infrastructure will have a huge impact within the immediate locality. What is a green and pleasant rural environment will have gone forever. I am not sure that it is a good idea. Quality of life is a crude expression but it means a great deal. The countryside is a strategic reality in that ideal.	The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy. But not all growth can be provided for in the Main Towns and through sustainable development in the rural villages. The Garden Village provides an opportunity to meet the District's housing and employment needs.
REF383	Resident	Yet more housing built near to very busy motorway causing health risks from traffic fumes. The new development opposite Westmoor added to the village will actually join the outskirts of Worksop together making a large town. The junction of Mansfield Road and the A620 at Babworth is too small for the increasing traffic and needs a roundabout. Housing density too high.	A Transport Assessment will ensure traffic impacts from the development are assessed and mitigation identified.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF402	Resident	<p>Against this proposal. Too big. Simply way too big. Too many houses in a rural area in one place The disruption will cast an incredibly long period. The traffic is lowering the quality of life already before and to 4000 extra homes and industrial area is included! Talk of a new train station is folly. It can only detract from Worksop and Retfords existing stations over a short way either side. Why not put money into those two stations. Also many would drive to Retford station for more choice of destination from there. Also no one would take a train to Retford itself because of the distance into town so the very concept would fail. More car journeys into Retford would be taken. The road network and particularly junctions (already highly congested) would set a huge unsustainable increase in traffic. Why not put money into smaller more acceptable developments and more environment. Why not develop the centre of Retford Town to help the struggling high street. There are many ageing sites where homes can be built – even above the areas etc...Get people back into towns, not outside. The A1 is an immensely busy road when it gets blocked and congested which it regularly does. The traffic pull of around this junction (5 lane ends) and Blyth, and Elkesley and block all the surrounding roads with this site of proposed development there would be a dreadful standstill and road blocks and ques. It would inherently change the fabric of the surrounding countryside. With Blyth and Babworth and Morton industrial areas and including Retford and Worksop industrial developments not at capacity, is another large industrial area really needed or desired. Years of disturbance with development etc... would seem never ending for a wide community.</p>	<p>The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy. But not all growth can be provided for in the Main Towns and through sustainable development in the rural villages. The Garden Village provides an opportunity to meet the District's housing and employment needs. Brownfield sites are identified in the Plan but there are not enough available to meet needs. Some greenfield sites are required.</p>
REF403	Resident	<p>Oppose the building of the garden village. As the owner of Babworth rescue kennels the village will be on our doorstep. Anyone living near will be subject to our dogs barking constantly day and night. This will lead to complaints to the Council who will no doubt put a noise abatement order on us or close us down. Been here for 18 years and moved to this location so the dogs would not be a problem to any near neighbours so putting an entire village next door is beyond comprehension. The loss of farming land that has been farmed for generations. Loss of habitat for the birds and wild animals. Mansfield Road is already a very heavy traffic road with a village of this size the increase in traffic would be unbearable. The entire road has no footpaths for pedestrians to walk so this in itself is a danger to anyone living in the village. Since moving here we have already seen our property decrease in value due to now being surrounded by solar farms and our view from every window is panels and now you want to put an entire village on our doorstep.</p>	<p>Appropriate measures such as use of green infrastructure, and the location of dwellings will be built into the design to ensure that the existing business is not affected.</p>
REF406	Resident	<p>Loss of arable land therefore drainage and food production. Roads wholly unsuitable not maintained or wide enough Threat to BARK dog rescue from new residents complaints Drainage/sewer waste from where to where? Public Transport – railway? But what about buses? How will you staff a public health centre and at what stage. Retford GPs are at limit. What facilities are planned for adolescents? What proportion of the housing are meant for first time buyers and +55s What services will be available e.g. gas, water. What are quality employment surely not more sandwich factories? Why will electric cars minimise flood risk?</p>	<p>In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy. But not all growth can be provided for in the Main Towns and through sustainable development in the rural villages. The Garden Village provides an opportunity to meet the District's housing and employment needs. Brownfield sites are identified in the Plan but there are not enough available to meet needs. Some greenfield sites are required.</p>
REF408	Resident	<p>1. All residents will be complaining about dogs barking and noise from the rescue. 2. We moved here so dogs wouldn't bother people with noise. 3. Fireworks come November/New Year will scare already scared animals.4. Road is not suitable for an increase of traffic 5. Kids will try to upset dogs from the other side of the tracks when bored. 6. You've already wrecked the area with thousands of solar panels. 7. Destroying good farm land 8. We have been here 18 years and employ 4 staff on full time wages caring for abused animals. You have wrecked our view from our house don't allow this on good farm land like you did the solar farms for a back pocket donation which never reached anyone who was affected by your decision to allow these solar farms.</p>	<p>Appropriate measures such as use of green infrastructure, and the location of dwellings will be built into the design to ensure that the existing business is not affected.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF409	Resident	Cannot see it being beneficial to Retford area as there are no industries left "no jobs" not enough medical positions to support such an expanse of housing. Traffic will be a problem roads at present are not sufficient for the amount of vehicles. All the industries that were in the Retford area have gone and housing estates built on there.	In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy. But not all growth can be provided for in the Main Towns and through sustainable development in the rural villages. The Garden Village provides an opportunity to meet the District's housing and employment needs. The Local Plan is providing for 11.11ha of employment land in Retford to local jobs needs.
REF418	Resident	A great idea but why so near the A1, properties were compulsory purchased approximately 23 years ago as the A1 was to be widened. The A1 must be widened at some point so plans should reflect this.	Further discussions with Highways England will determine the extent of any land required.
REF425	Resident	Do not support. The requirement for housing is understood, this however appears very poorly considered with no understanding of the costs involved in this proposal. It comes across as easy solutions to the problem on paper. To be so close to Retford (and to some degree Worksop) but too far to easily access them seems a problem waiting to happen. The proposed train station will cost millions and is restricted in times. It is also an inconvenient line. This will result in people choosing to drive which will strain roads/traffic/parking. Shops etc will bring people away from the town centre. This area of land is also very good for growing crops despite its current classification. Better locations are available.	In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period.
REF480 -	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	4) The site at Morton seems to have a credible transport plan and will be able to sustain a community (train station, and close to major road network which limits the impact although doesn't negate it). Have concerns that there appears to be no firm commitment to when these crucial infrastructure projects would take place (accept BDC has ltd scope)	In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. In terms of infrastructure provision that will be dealt with through the master plan and subsequent planning applications and negotiations.
REF484 -	North Notts and Lincs Community Rail Partnership	It is assumed that the transport hub will be on the site of the former Chequerhouse station, which should become the site for a garden village station.	It will be within the vicinity of the previous station. The transport hub will be located at an appropriate position on the railway line following consultation with Network Rail.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST04 - Worksop	Central Area		
1189777	Resident	Delighted with, and fully support A6. Full support B and would want to be consulted and contribute to the preparation of the Worksop Central Area Development Plan Document.	Support noted and welcome.
1192494	Resident	Policy ST4 is welcomed. Would be interested to see the Worksop Central Area Development Plan when produced. The plan, once approved should drive activity and regular updates provided to confirm progress against plan. No new retail development should be permitted outside zone 3 unless it is specifically designed to serve the identified needs of the very local communities.	Support noted and welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST04 -Worksop	Central Area		
REF115	Canal and River Trust	<p>Chesterfield Canal flows through the centre of Worksop, and provides good access for residents and visitors to the wider Green Infrastructure network through the use of our towpaths. The canal environment also offers opportunities to encourage tourism, through the focus on heritage assets associated with the canal corridor and from the use of leisure resources connected with the use of the canal. For example, the canal is used by leisure craft. Such use contributes to the local leisure and visitor economy of the area. It can also assist in animating waterside spaces, and providing a more attractive setting for existing and proposed development. To ensure that the Plan is effective in maximising the benefits of the canal, it is essential that policy is provided to provide guidance and certainty to developers and decision makers over how waterfront spaces should be incorporated into new development. Policy ST4 (part A) should be expanded to include to include relevant points as to how development could maximise benefits alongside the waterway. Measures include ensuring development integrates with the waterway; ensuring development is designed to improve access to, along and from the waterway; improvements to wayfinding to the canal form the wider town centre and ensuring development optimises natural surveillance of the waterway. Do not believe that policy ST4 is suitably precise to fully cover the matters needed to ensure effective waterside development, which are very important to ensuring that future development along the Chesterfield Canal, and other waterspaces, maximises the potential regeneration benefits that could be brought by waterfront development. Reference is given towards the development of a Central Worksop Development Plan Document (DPD). A DPD could provide greater certainty for developers and decision makers in supporting the regeneration of the Town Centre. This provides a unique opportunity to help guide the redevelopment of key sites in proximity to the canal, which could help to ensure that the potential benefits of the canal to the town are maximised. Welcome the opportunity to comment upon the DPD as and when it is developed. Paragraph 5.4.9 makes referent to ourselves as "the Rivers and Canal Trust". For clarity, we advise that this should be amended to read "The Canal and River Trust".</p>	<p>Policy ST4 provides the strategic framework to facilitate the regeneration of the Central Area. The policy is clear that the detail will be set out in a separate DPD, which is the more appropriate document to address the detail identified. However, to ensure Policy ST4 provides an appropriate framework for the DPD reference will be made in Policy ST4 to access to the Canal and wayfinding throughout the area.</p>
REF140	Resident	<p>The thing I think needs improving in this plan, is bringing our town centres back to life. But the only way this will happen is if you provide ample free parking in town centres. Its now £1 per hour to park while you shop in Retford how do you expect shops to survive when Amazon is cheaper and will deliver free to my door next day, 7 days a week. Do not suggest using public transport to get into town there are 3 buses a week all on Thursday in our area.</p>	<p>This is not a planning matter.</p>
REF201	Severn Trent	<p>Severn Trent is supportive of the general principles of the policy would note that for bullet point 4 – 6: Identify the need to consider high quality design, but does not provide any clarify about what is defined as high quality. It is recommended that key design considerations such as Water Efficiency, Drainage Hierarchy, SuDS and Blue Green infrastructure area specifically mentioned to improve clarity and ensure delivery of the plan's objectives (see comments to Policy ST3). Worksop is situated within a groundwater Source Protection Zone, including some areas of the settlement being defined as Zones 1, 2 and 3. For any development in an area covered by Zone 3 recommend that the comments provided in the Protection of Groundwater sources are followed, where a site is identified as falling in a SPZ 1 or 2, recommend that further consultation with STW is undertaken to understand the development proposed and how best to protect the Groundwater Source.</p>	<p>Paragraph 1.2.4 states that several policies may be relevant to any proposed development - therefore the document should be read as a whole rather than considering policies in isolation. Policy ST45: Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation refers to water efficiency standards and Policy ST32 Design Quality covers design considerations for blue/green infrastructure. However, for clarity and to provide a comprehensive framework for the DPD Policy ST4 will be amended to include a criteria relating to climate change mitigation/adaptation and another requiring that all new development should make provision for appropriate infrastructure. The DPD will ensure that the guidance for Groundwater Source Protection Zones are reflected appropriately.</p>
REF222	Notts CC	<p>Policy ST4, A, Part 7 should include reference to public transport and public transport facilities.</p>	<p>Improved access and connectivity of public transport in the Central Area is essential to the development of a framework for the area. Policy ST4 will be changed accordingly.</p>
REF247	Babworth Parish Council	<p>It seems that the Local Plan has not fully investigated the sorely needed development of our local towns (Retford and Worksop) with a view to driving business and finance to our High Streets and to support local businesses. Whilst the Local Plan talks about promoting healthy living and reducing carbon emissions, struggle to comprehend cycling into Retford or Worksop on the A620. With the increased proposed</p>	<p>The Bassetlaw Transport Study Part 2 considers the transport impacts of the development proposed by the Local Plan on the existing transport infrastructure, and identifies mitigation where appropriate. Policy ST50 recognises the importance of protecting existing cycling routes/facilities</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST04 -Worksop	Central Area	dwellings in the Garden Village and Ranby alone, there is absolutely no consideration of the increased number of cars which will pack the surrounding roads and cause significant risk to anyone who wishes to embark on a 'cleaner' lifestyle. Ask whether the development of our beautiful market towns has had serious consideration, thought and planning.	and connection to and extension of these where appropriate. Policy ST4 requires that cycle connectivity through the area to be improved.
1197262	Resident	Worksop needs regeneration - in it's present state nobody would want to live here anyway - every entrance into town has rundown, empty properties and the town looks so shabby and tired, an absolute disgrace.Much within a few yards of BDC's own building, and owned by BDC	Support noted and welcome.
REF350	Indigo Planning	Policy ST4 goes onto state that the Council will support development proposals in the WCA where they meet a number of criteria including amongst others where they "introduce a range of complementary and compatible land uses, such as high quality residential, recreational, commercial, leisure, cultural, retail and temporary uses to support the diversification and regeneration of the Area". Whilst support the regeneration of the WCA including the town centre, concerned that Policy ST4 appears to support retail uses across the whole of the WCA including in areas outside the town centre. For example, in Delivery Zone 1, Delivery Zone 2, Delivery Zone 4 and Delivery Zone 5 which are either all located or partly located outside the town centre boundary. Consider that the currently worded Policy ST4 is contrary to NPPF paragraphs 86 and 87 which require retail uses to be located in town centres unless it can be demonstrated that there are no suitable or available sites either within or on the edge of the town centre. There is a strong risk that allowing retail proposals (especially larger scale ones) outside Worksop town centre will undermine the Council's strategy to regenerate and enhance the town centre. Request that Policy ST4 is amended in accordance with the NPPF as follows: "3. introduce a range of complementary and compatible land uses, such as high quality residential, recreational, commercial, leisure, cultural, retail and temporary uses to support the diversification and regeneration of the Area subject to the sequential and impact assessment as set out in Policy ST13 if proposing a main town centre use outside of the designated town centre."	Paragraph 1.2.4 states that several policies may be relevant to any proposed development - therefore the document should be read as a whole rather than considering policies in isolation. On that basis Policy ST13 provides the policy framework for the assessment of retail applications in the District. In addition the DPD would provide further detail about the mix of land uses in each zone. However, for clarity Policy ST4 3 will be amended slightly to ensure retail development is appropriate to its location.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST04 - Worksop	Central Area		
REF293	The Wildlife Trust	<p>Section 5.4.1 states: 'The regeneration of brownfield sites forms a key part of the Local Plan Vision and Objectives. Providing support to the comprehensive redevelopment of brownfield sites, particularly within town centres and at the former power station sites is a key Council Plan objective¹⁴.' Note in the Appendix that the following definition is provided for Brownfield Land. It appears to have been taken from the NPPF. "Land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including land within the structures curtilage. This excludes land occupied by agricultural or forestry buildings; land developed for minerals extraction or waste disposal; land in built up areas, such as residential gardens, parks, recreation grounds and allotments; and land that was previously developed but where the remains of the permanent structure or fixed surface structure have blended into the landscape." Support proposals for re-use of previously developed land outside development boundaries where it will result in the restoration or natural regeneration of the site e.g. sustainable wetlands. Feel there should be a presumption against development of brown field land for other types of development, where it has already developed significant nature conservation interest. Often previously developed land that has been left for some years will have developed significant biodiversity value. Open mosaic habitats on previously developed land (formally called post- industrial sites) Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 Section 41: Habitats of Principal Importance in England. In all likelihood responders to the Draft Plan will indicate a strong preference for the redevelopment of brownfield sites rather than greenfield. This is understandable, because impacts on previously undeveloped land will always appear greater. Brownfield habitats however, (particularly early successional sites), can be important biodiversity resources. There is increasing development pressure on brownfield sites and to ensure sustainability every effort should be made to retain and/or recreate this habitat within a site. Acknowledge that the re-use of previously developed land for new development makes a major contribution to sustainable development by reducing the amount of undeveloped land that needs to be used. Where such sites have significant biodiversity interest of recognised local importance, local planning authorities, together with developers, should aim to retain this interest or incorporate it into any development of the site. There needs to be a criterion based policy to assess the suitability of previously developed land as appropriate and sustainable. Assess the biodiversity of the site through a desktop study of wildlife sites (Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation/Local Wildlife Sites) and protected species, followed by a rigorous ecological assessment of the site.</p>	<p>Paragraph 1.2.4 states that several policies may be relevant to any proposed development – therefore the document should be read as a whole rather than considering policies in isolation. On that basis Policy ST1: Spatial Strategy addresses the issue of re-use of previously developed land across the District. Policy ST1 and paragraph 5.1.4 of the supporting text will be amended to better align with the principle of the NPPF that requires land to be allocated with the least environmental or amenity value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework and other relevant legislation.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
1175882	Resident	<p>Raise concern over the ability of the rural infrastructure to handle a "large rural development" - This description is also used to describe Tuxford and Blyth. Treswell and Leverton would struggle to accommodate the traffic without a new route to Retford, which would be the nearest town. Suggest some though required around roads. New garden village next to A1 makes complete sense, but Cottam will need some planning - The trunk road avoids the villages which is fine for wagon traffic off the A1 but people living there once all complete will be travelling to Retford and the roads aren't geared up to this in my opinion.</p>	<p>The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site can be suitably mitigated. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
			plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise. The site will be supported by a detailed masterplan and its preparation will be subject to public consultation and input.
1176658	Resident	Badly polluted site , polluted soil , asbestos & waste, also close to Live gas Power station, & a large Gas supply pipe,Electrical switch gear,not really the place to bring up children.also its an area of low or no development being outside any village	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site can be suitably mitigated. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise. The site will be supported by a detailed masterplan and its preparation will be subject to public consultation and input.
1177309	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Support the redevelopment of the Cottam Power Station site but am concerned that the infrastructure requirements don't go far enough. Most of the villages in the east of the district are accessed through other villages. This means traffic volumes are increasing year on year, without appropriate investment. To make this part of the district "developable", there needs to be major upgrades to Laneham Road and/or the creation of a new road that serves Treswell, Rampton, Cottam, the Levertons, Woodbeck and Laneham. Infrastructure planning also needs to consider the likely redevelopment of West Burton during the plan period. Coupled with Cottam /High Marnham redevelopment, this is likely to lead to more north-south traffic in the eastern part of the district, and we need to prepare for this. It will ultimately help to rebalance the district away from the Worksop / Retford /Harworth & Bircotes monopoly on resources which is to be encouraged – but it must be done in the right way and with a strong commitment to enhancing access beyond the current road network which already has limitations.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site including from traffic can be suitably mitigated. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise. The site will be supported by a detailed masterplan and its preparation will be subject to public consultation and input.
1183729	Resident	The development of this site, initially 450 dwellings and thereafter 1150, will completely destroy this rural aspect of the River Trent. Object to this development based on the following: Light pollution and noise from this new village which would be set in the countryside. How do you envisage Torksey Street within this plan - currently used by dog walkers, horse riders and walkers. Building on flood zones - don't Councils ever learn! Adjacent to LNR - the impact from dogs walking on this valuable site has not been assessed. 450 dwellings equates to minimum of 100 dogs (based on UK figures). Add to this cat population and the effect on the bird population. Where are these people going to work? Lincoln, Doncaster, Newark. Villages like Rampton and Tresswell would be used as shortcuts to main roads. Farm traffic is a local part of this road system, not ideal from a traffic perspective. I moved here with cattle in the meadow behind my home and limited light, noise, traffic etc. If I wanted to live in sight of a housing estate I would have moved near Retford. Councils should develop redundant areas of towns for homes, close to where people can work.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site can be suitably mitigated. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise. The site will be supported by a detailed masterplan and its preparation will be subject to public consultation and input.
1184447	Resident	in regard to cottam power station,i think it ill conceived ill thought out and will create a total nightmare for the surrounding villages. The roads now are not fit for purpose,i shudder to think what it will be like if it comes to pass. How are you going to police it by the way you can't do that now. whoever dreamed this up is certainly not living in this area	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways can be suitably mitigated. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise. The site will be supported by a

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
			detailed masterplan and its preparation will be subject to public consultation and input.
REF009	Resident	Really hope this will happen it will make such a difference to our villages especially Cottam it's such a scruffy village now, be so lovely to have lovely houses and not cottam chimneys.	Support noted and welcome.
REF013	Resident	5:4:13 “-providing the services and facilities which - are lacking in this part of the District for many years. This is a massive insult to the local communities, the Council have deliberately refused development in the local area saying “it is unsustainable”. The local area has become stagnating dormitory villages, why the sudden change? Disappointed with the way this proposed development has been dropped on the local area. No objection to building new houses but why does it have to be so concentrated in one place. This development is about as far away from Retford as you can possibly get. Over the years landowners and local residents have made countless requests for sympathetic infill and generic growth in the area. Only a few have passed with the majority being turned down. It may be hindsight but had all or most of those requests been approved there may not have been this rush to meet government housing quotas now. A few years ago applied for a planning pre-application on the field adjacent to our house, it cost us in the region of £500.00 to be told “the development was unsustainable”. I asked the planning officer “did he visit our site?” He wouldn’t answer the question, it led me to believe he never visited our site and we paid £500.00 for the privilege, how can a desk driven decision be acceptable? In another case a planning application was made by the resident living next door to Sundown Adventureland. The resident appealed the planning refusal, at appeal he was refused saying “there were no footpaths from his house to Rampton village, and as a result he would need a car to go to the local shop. How galling is that when there are thousands of car journeys made to Sundown Adventureland every year, is one car more or less going to make so much of a difference? 3b) makes reference to a convenience store of up to 500 ² m, (Aldi store in Retford is in the region of 1,500 ² m). Traditionally convenience stores usually charge RRP which can be 25% or more above “high street” prices. There is no real incentive for residents to shop local. “The Plan” doesn’t mention any more shops in the later phase(s)? How will residents get their weekly/monthly “big shop”? If only one resident does their “big shop” by car it makes a mockery of the decision metered out to the resident next to Sundown. In light of this that decision should be overturned. If this involves additional cost to the applicant it should be waived as a gesture of good will.	National planning policy sets the approach to housing delivery and this continues to change so that each area contributes to the Government’s national housebuilding targets. The Local Plan must respond positively to national policy. The proposed shop was intended to be used for local everyday needs and not to cater for a large shopping trip.
REF013	Resident	As a member of the Treswell with Cottam community concerned about the ramifications for our Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP). The Government says “Neighbourhood planning gives communities direct power to develop a shared vision for their neighbourhood and shape the development and growth of their local area. They are able to choose where they want new homes, shops and offices to be built, have their say on what those new buildings should look like and what infrastructure should be provided, and grant planning permission for the new buildings they want to see go ahead. Neighbourhood planning provides a powerful set of tools for local people to plan for the types of development to meet their community’s needs and where the ambition of the neighbourhood is aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider local area”. Our NDP encompasses Treswell Village, Cottam Village, the immediate area in-between and the former Cottam Power Station Site. The former Cottam Power Station Site has been of concern since its closure. Now it appears there is no shared vision. Have usurped our NDP for us to determine our neighbourhood and the shape and development of growth in our local area. No mention of the River Trent being used for tourism and/or leisure in a possible “Burton Waters type development”? 5:4:17 “Use of green infrastructure will ensure the continued separation of the site from the villages of Rampton and Cottam ensuring their individual character distinctiveness and identities are protected” When looking at the area outlined in red it is clear that the western boundary of the development abuts All Saints Church Rampton, Torksey Road. What is the proposed area and composition of this green infrastructure, what is the timescale for it to become mature? Also applies to the north/north western aspects facing	All of the neighbourhood plans in Bassetlaw need to be in general alignment with the planning strategies that sit above them, those being the Core Strategy / Bassetlaw Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework. Whilst the Cottam Power Station site is a significant feature in Treswell and Cottam Parish it is appropriate that its future is being managed in the first instance through the Bassetlaw Local Plan. The site is ‘strategic’ - it has significance beyond the local area and the size of the site is significant, exceeding other potential development sites in Bassetlaw. The site straddles two parishes, and abuts others, many of which are also producing neighbourhood plans. This means that the Local Plan is the most effective vehicle to manage the potential future uses of this site, it having the potential to address these various complexities in a comprehensive manner. Neighbourhood plans provide an invaluable means to address the fine details of the local area, they are unable to influence issues beyond their boundaries. This does not mean that neighbourhood plans will not have a role to play. The made Treswell with Cottam Neighbourhood Plan 2019, did not address Cottam Power Station directly in its policies, as the site was still active as a power station at the time. The current work to review the Neighbourhood Plan provides a useful opportunity to update

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

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
REF099	Resident	<p>Object to the Cottam development on the following basis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is in a rural location and should remain as such. Light and noise pollution relating to 1500 homes; • Additional cars c2000 min; • Small, narrow local roads cannot cope • Local roads extra traffic combined with farm vehicles • Unknown what developer would do with Torksey Street • Current footpath adjacent to Power Station used by horse riders, cyclists, motorcyclists – this needs addressing; • L.N.R. impact from dog walking. Could be minimum of 1000 dogs! And cats. • Buildings on floodzones – madness • Currently can't walk to flood bank as area has been flooded for months • Where are these people going to work? Doncaster, Newark, Worksop. Impact on local roads. 	<p>The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk can be suitably mitigated and that residents can easily move around by sustainable and public transport. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.</p>
1194464	Resident	<p>1) Regeneration of the Cottam Site must not be allowed to be 'piecemeal' which will not ensure that the required services and support will be built and provided as the site develops. 2) The roads towards the east will be inundated with additional and unacceptable traffic loads thrust onto the already overloaded road network. This will occur if development is given the go ahead as construction traffic will use the shortest route and you do not have the facilities to deal with transgressors. 3) This low lying area will probably be susceptible to flooding and the additional 'hard paving' by additional roadways and buildings with hard paved areas surrounding them will only exacerbate that flooding..</p>	<p>The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk can be suitably mitigated and that residents can easily move around by sustainable and public transport. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise. The site will be supported by a detailed masterplan and its preparation will be subject to public consultation and input. This will ensure development is not piecemeal.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
REF115	Canal and River Trust	<p>Welcome consideration given to this site, which should help to provide certainty to future developers and decision makers with regards to how this large brownfield site will be brought back into use following its use as a power station. Due to the former use of the site and its proximity to the River Trent and Local Wildlife Sites, it is important that any redevelopment of the site seeks to fully remediate the site and prevent any contamination towards the nearby watercourse. Welcome reference towards the need for remediation and protection of the watercourse to ensure compliance with NPPF paragraph 170. Recommend that consideration is given towards the incorporation of waterborne freight to deliver construction materials and aggregates to site. The redevelopment of the site would require the importation of a significant amount of construction material and aggregates to site. The River Trent forms a direct route to the Humber Ports (and marine sourced aggregate) which could be provided to the location without the need for HGV traffic. The use of the waterway for the transportation of waterborne freight, especially bulk materials and 0 of sustainable transport which can help in reducing greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion on the local highway network. The Trent is identified by the Trust as a Freight waterway, capable of handling waterborne freight. Efforts to mitigate against the adverse impacts of traffic are promoted by NPPF paragraph 102 and in the case of larger loads, is the governments water preferred policy for the movement of abnormal loads. Correspondence from the Department for Transport to PINS highlights the policy position for the movement of abnormal indivisible loads by water, and the advisory role of Highways England. https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/wpp_letter.pdf NPPF Paragraph 148 highlights that the planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future. Waterborne freight can help accord with this aim, as carbon emissions by water are demonstrably lower when compared to other forms of transit, such as road transport. Commercial Boat Operators Association (CBOA), using a case study of the transport of steel by water, highlights that carbon emissions of transport by water can be 45% lower than that of comparative transport by road. http://www.cboa.org.uk/downloads/environmental_impact_report.pdf Request that the policy wording and/or explanatory text is expanded to ensure that future consideration is given to the use of the River Trent to transport construction materials to the site (and to export any waste materials from the site). This could be undertaken through the expansion of part 4 (Transport and Movement) of the policy with the following suggested text: "b) Consideration should be given towards opportunities to utilise the River Trent for the transportation of construction and waste materials to and from the site during redevelopment.</p>	Consideration of the use of the River Trent for transportation, for freight and construction materials will be added to the supporting text.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
REF117	Rampton and Woodbeck Parish Council	<p>Like to know more about the proposed housing and whether it will fit within Rampton & Woodbeck Neighborhood Plan, and what infrastructure is planned to support such a large development. The parish boundary between Rampton and Cottam, half of the power station itself is within Rampton Parish and with the bottom three and a half cooling towers with our parish, therefore any homes built on our side of the boundary line, regardless of the name of the new settlement or where the access is from, is within our parish and the precept, any cil money, s106 money from will be to Rampton & Woodbeck parish council for those homes and not to Treswell Parish Council, only those homes built north of the boundary line will be to Treswell with Cottam Parish, how many of the initial 450 homes and how many of the total 1650 homes will be within our parish and how many will be within Treswell With Cottam parish? Why has there been no detail around the sort of houses that would be built, detached, bungalows, semi's, social and numbers of those proposed. Why is there no clear definition to where the houses will be, are they only on the former cottam site itself rather than the surrounding farmland owned by edf. Would the train line be used and a station opened so people can travel by rail from there. How many drs spaces will be created in local surgeries or will a new drs be built. Will a community centre be built. Will there be shops and a village green? Would the local communities of Treswell/Rampton etc be allowed to say the design and layout of the community as it is split into both parishes? Why is this allowed in addition to the housing allocated in the Treswell and Rampton neighbourhood plans. What flood protection is there will there be? How will access to the Seymour drain be garrenteed for the local drainage board. Wont the houses be surrounded by pylons, a grid connection and the Uniper Gas Power Station in the middle of the development, or is the Gas station closing in the next 15 year too? Are you aware of badgers and gt chrested newts in the pond areas around the former site and will they be protected. Why does it say 1200 more homes thereafter with no defined timescale for the build. How much S106 money will it generate for Treswell and Rampton Parishes. How much CIL money will it generate for Treswell & Rampton Parishes and is it expected that the parish councils provide playparks, a community centre and other parish facilities or will Bassetlaw provide these?</p>	<p>The regeneration of the Cottam Power Station site is recognised as an important but longer-term proposal for the District. Details about what will be delivered on the site are not yet fully developed, and the role of the Bassetlaw Local Plan is to provide a broad framework to guide this going forward. Key to this will be a masterplan for the site, to be produced by the developers and agreed by the Council, which will provide greater detail about what is proposed, and supported by relevant evidence. This is a sizeable, strategic site that will likely have impacts beyond the immediate local area. As such, the evidence to support any proposals will draw upon a similar geography but also to acknowledge the immediate context of the site, including the surrounding parishes and their settlements, and how any proposals seek to respond to this. The contents of the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan, alongside the neighbourhood plans of other neighbouring parishes, should provide invaluable points of reference to this effect, alongside broader evidence base studies.</p>
REF117	Rampton and Woodbeck Parish Council	<p>Have you consulted with both Anglian Water and with Severn Trent as a place bigger than Tuxford is now, will need its own sewage works and may need a small water works or an upgrade with a booster station from the nearby works. Where will all the people work? as no extra jobs are being created. The plan is so vague and lacking in detail, several people find it hard to know what to object to and what to support. Will the design, and style of homes be consistent with the types of homes that are wanted and dictated within our Neighbourhood Plan. Will any of the homes be built on farmland currently owned by EDF or will it all be just on the existing power station site. What is the lifespan of the Uniper Gas Power Station at Cottam? Are the homes to be built around this or is the gas station going to Before it entered decommissioning, the Cottam Power Station Manager stated that the future of the site was to include the largest batter storage device in the UK to deal with peaks and troughs on the national grid, is this still taking place and having homes built around it? Do you have any plans to force the Highways Authority to adopt Torksey Ferry Road out of Rampton and pave the road as a southern access to the site? Is there any contamination on the site from the former coal, slag and any asbestos or chemicals that need thoroughly cleaning away before it can be built on? • Elderly people in the village who helped build the power station in the 1960's state that all sorts of rubbish, including the diggers and building equipment and vehicles were buried underneath the base of the power station, because in those days Health & Safety was not a thing it is today and they just chuck all this waste and things there, this would need dealing with before homes built on top. • Lack of details plans re infrastructure, Dunham and Leverton Schools are full to capacity, Rampton has some spare capacity, but not the facilities to take in a large influx of pupils and there is a lack of child minding and preschools/nurseries in the area. Plus the Drs at Leverton would struggle and it is hard to recruit medical personnel to rural areas anyway. • The roads situation is far from ideal heading north towards the Gainsborough/Doncaster area. • There was surprise by several councillors at this proposal from bassettaw because, given that EDF talked about solar farming, and the use of the area for energy generation, and</p>	<p>The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It wil also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise. The site will be supported by a detailed masterplan and its preparation will be subject to public consultation and input. That will show the proposed layout and where different types of development will go and the detailed infrastructure requirements. The Uniper plant is expected to remain on site. Appropriate mitigation will be required to ensure there are no adverse impacts on future residents or the ongoing operation of the business.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
		storage via new battery technology, in the past 2 years at the EDF open forum meetings • What about the Impact of traffic on all surrounding villages? • What is the impact on wild fowl, swans and geese and bird life on Trentside areas, This was one of the reasons permission was refused for wind farms some years ago. What guarantees will there be to protect the Gt Chrested Newts at Cottam, the badgers and bats Lack of any specific detail re buses, a sore point given the withdrawal of frequent bus services to Treswell and Rampton villages.	
1194590	Resident	In my view the former Cottam site is not safe for housing due to ground contamination , it should be developed as a green energy site using small oscillating wind Turbines in line with Bassetlaws green credentials also all large loads from the demolition should be transported by barges utilising the loading dock already constructed this is a green and cost effective mode of transport widely used all over europe ,this should be a condition of law for the demolition company.	Comments noted.
1194599	Resident	Regrowth for rural area is to high and not what was agreed and approved by the NDP steering group. As a resident I do not wish to see anymore new builds in our rural community. Bassetlaw have met their quota on new builds already. I move to this area to get away from the hussle and bussle of town life not to be crammed back into another. Insufficient draining and flooding. Increased traffic. Lack of infrastructure doctors, schools, public transport, dentist, shops. Rural environment will be lost. Insufficient drainage and flooding already. The adverse impact on protected trees, plants and wildlife needs. Protected species already on the site. Subsidence already occurring in Cottam and surrounding. Noise & traffic pollution and increased crime rates. Would like to see something greener and environmentally friendly. The connection to the national grid is already in place so we are 50% there.	The Local Plan must ensure there is enough land to meet the Districts housing needs for the next 17 years or so. The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.
1194662	Resident	Do not support the redevelopment of the Cottam power station site for residential use,the site is remote from suitable transport links and would impose vastly increased traffic volumes on the rural road network of east Bassetlaw. The rail link is not viable to re connect to lincoln as the old bridge is an ancient monument and preserved in some way and has been converted to pedestrian use as part of the footpath network.The plan goes against the wider concept that east bassetlaw mainly comprises of SMALL villages and hamlets, the scale of the development proposed is parachuting a small town into an area un-fit to accept it. Bassetlaw's housing requirements have already been met by the other allocations proposed under this plan.I propose a more suitable idea for regenerating the Power station site would be to allocate for a Green Energy site with its grid connection and already has permission for a battery storage project.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk can be suitably mitigated and that residents can easily move around by sustainable and public transport. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
1195107	Resident	<p>Do not support the plan housing on the site of Cottam power station. The would cause disruption to all the surrounding villages, in particular Cottam. The roads are not of a sufficient standard including a lot of single track roads. Cottam already has to endure HGVs which are travelling to Coates and are not only damaging roads and verges, but are damaging houses due to the vibration caused by these vehicles. The village would potentially add another 2000 vehicles to the routes through all the villages. Develop the existing areas of nature and conservation which already has protected wildlife in existance there; and build a renewable energy site which would have immediate access to the national grid. Bassetlaw has already met its 20% target for housing without building on the Cottam power station site</p>	<p>The Local Plan must ensure there is enough land to meet the Districts housing needs for the next 17 years or so. The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.</p>
1195111	Resident	<p>The use of the land for housing development is inappropriate in the current and predicted climate of ecological and sociological needs of the area . The infrastructure development required to enable free movement of existing and intended residents during the development and as a functioning new and permanent village will be considerable and in complete opposition to a carbon zero future. Surely development of current amenities could take preference and therefore being of benefit to the wider communities of Bassetlaw The location of the site is removed from existing urbanisation and would impact on rural living. The usual issues of increased demand on water, sewerage, energy and the current concerns of flood risk in an area of a tidal river are also real considerations. However we could take a positive view on this location for low risk leisure and green energy power generation, e.g. Solar power or hydro/water turbine power production. Clean energy production to benefit Bassetlaw residents and meeting carbon zero living. Cottam is in a location supporting wildlife, a natural tidal river and the greater ecological systems which should be maintained for future generations. I and many other local residents have chosen to live in rural Bassetlaw. Let's maintain this choice of living and remind ourselves that Bassetlaw is to be congratulated on meeting current housing requirements and future projected needs without this development through the Green Village Scheme. To summarise I object to non-essential residential development of the former Cottam Power Station site.</p>	<p>The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.</p>
1195155	Resident	<p>Live directly opposite the power station. The plan to build yet more houses there will be incredibly detrimental to wildlife, grass verges and the amount of pollution. It is a rural area and does not have viable infrastructure such as gps, schools, and hardly any public transport. Have a large amount of industrial traffic passing through and this will add to the noise and disruption that residents have to face on a daily basis. Moved here after being diagnosed with cancer. I wanted to live in peace and quiet. The thought of a massive housing estate and everything that goes with that, just fills me with dread.</p>	<p>The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.</p>
REF140	Resident	<p>Subject to flood assessment. First it would give motivation to clear the site or it will stay a blot on the landscape for years as EDF would have no motivation to clear it. The site already has both road and rail connections to it. Although you do not mention a railway station the addition of one at this site would have the same benefits as the Bassetlaw Garden Village linking it to Retford and the East Coast mainline.</p>	<p>A requirement of development is that the site submits a Flood Risk Assessment to be agreed with the Environment Agency. Options to investigate the re-opening of the railway line for passenger rail should be</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
			explored by the site promoters to determine whether it is a feasible alternative to the car.
1195216	Resident	The railway line into Cottam should be upgraded for passenger traffic to link the new settlement	Options to investigate the re-opening of the railway line for passenger rail should be explored by the site promoters to determine whether it is a feasible alternative to the car.
1195859	Resident	Cottam redevelopment plan. Insufficient draining and flooding. Increased traffic. Lack of infrastructure doctors, schools, public transport, dentist, shops. Insufficient draining and flooding. The adverse impact on protected trees, plants and wildlife needs. Pollution. Protected species already on the site. Bassetlaw Council does not need any further new builds.	The Local Plan must ensure there is enough land to meet the Districts housing needs for the next 17 years or so. The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc.
1195911	Asbury Planning Limited	Support the allocation of the former Cottam Power Station site for a mixed-use regeneration led new settlement. This is a 'new' addition to the housing supply in the 2020 Draft Plan and there is little information in the public domain to substantiate delivery which is pretty much all that is presented in this Draft Plan. There appear to be many areas of uncertainty with regard to site reclamation, flood risk ,nature conservation and heritage constraints that it is unsafe to rely on the circa 450 dwellings coming forward in the plan period in this secondary location and counting toward the housing requirement. In this regard it is essential that ST2 is robust in delivering the the housing requirement for Rural Bassetlaw from its large and small rural settlements without relying upon 450 dwellings from Cottam. Not convinced that the delivery policy for the smaller rural settlements will secure delivery of these homes.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.
1196000	Resident	In principle, a good idea, and it makes perfect sense to use the existing land productively. Would like to see more detail about the changes to the roads that would be required. It's clear that, for this to work in line with the environmental objectives, there would need to be better transport links and the provision of services (healthcare, shops, etc). It would also make sense to provide support to public transport to ensure that the impact of car use is minimised.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.

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

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
REF201	Severn Trent	Note that the local Plan identifies a number of areas as prime locations for redevelopment, whilst we are in general supportive of the re-development of brownfield sites, and understand that there are often additional considerations including contamination that may need to be addressed before development can be carried out. Recommend that that Planning policy looks to ensure that development is carried out in way that will result in wider benefits, including but not limited to separation of surface water connections to foul sewers where possible, and the attenuation of surface water flows as close as reasonably practically to greenfield, this especially where connecting to the sewers. Severn Trent support the inclusion of "the green and blue infrastructure and its amenity value will ensure the area becomes a more attractive place to live," within paragraph 5.4.6. Care will need to be taken to protect water sources and ensure that redevelopment of sites does not mobilise pollutants due to the underlying aquifer.	Development of brownfield sites will be carried out sensitively to ensure there are wider benefits including through the appropriate provision of water infrastructure and water management. In line with other policies in this Plan care will be taken to ensure future development does not adversely affect the underlying aquifer.
REF201	Severn Trent	Whilst Severn Trent is supportive of the general principles and the inclusion of bullet point 5.d) "An integrated approach to surface water drainage and multifunctional green spaces;" the plan does not provide any mention of the drainage hierarchy. The site is situated adjacent to the River Trent therefore the need to connect surface water to the foul sewers should not be required, this is a key element of ensuring that the development is sustainable and resilient to the future impacts from things like climate change etc. It may also be useful to specifically mention the need to incorporate true SuDS principles that look all 4 pillar of SuDS, Quality, Amenity and Biodiversity as well as Quantity. Recommended wording for the considerations are covered under our response to the Bassetlaw Garden Village.	The drainage hierarchy applies to all new development so is better covered by a strategic policies for water management and flood risk and drainage.
REF207	Gerald Eve on behalf of EDF	Enclose a Vision Document (VD) which aims to corroborate the Site's constraints and opportunities whilst indicating how the legacy of the power station could be delivered through strategic and comprehensive redevelopment. The thrust and overall objective of the policy working towards the delivery of a new large rural settlement is fully supported by EDF. The strategy is considered to be appropriate not only as a long-term sustainable future for the Site but also one that would directly support and enhance the existing communities of Cottam, Treswell, Rampton and beyond. The approach taken is considered to be consistent with the aims of plan making as set out within Chapter 11 of the NPPF, which focusses on making effective use of land. The re-use of this large-scale brownfield site would result in delivery of a substantial number of new homes and environmental improvements that would otherwise be a missed opportunity, instead placing pressure on greenfield sites across other parts of the district. The draft policy in this respect is considered to be prepared on a sound basis. The approach to bringing forward development in accordance with a framework masterplan to be prepared by a developer is welcomed (ST5 B-C). This is considered to be a standard approach to bringing forward large-scale regeneration proposals, ensuring all stakeholders have an opportunity to be consulted on the masterplan's evolution. Later parts of the policy indicate specific stakeholders such as the Environment Agency and Highways Authority that would need to be involved throughout the planning process, and it is expected that this would include the early stages of masterplanning the Site. Draft Policy ST5 B specifically refers to the importance of phasing arrangements being agreed, and EDF notes that this is likely to be critical to the Site's successful regeneration. It is predicted that a phasing strategy would focus on those parts of the Site that would 'unlock' the wider development site, bringing housebuilders forward on plots of circa 100-150 units to start with, increasing to plots of 200-250 units as development and market interest gather momentum. For a site of this scale it would be normal to expect at least two housebuilders on site at any one time. Good Quality Design and Local Character, sets out criteria to be adhered to within the design and masterplanning process, as well as relating to detailed matters that may come forward during the reserved matters application process. The following points are noteworthy in respect of the corresponding criteria: a) EDF has already taken steps to Screen the demolition process in line with the Environmental Impact Assessment regulations (2017), for which BDC confirmed within its Screening Opinion that an Environmental Statement would not be required. b) Major development of this scale will always be subject to Flood Risk Assessment, but the Site's context is particularly sensitive in this riverside location. The existing Site has flood defences in place that have not	Support for the redevelopment of the site is noted. The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
		<p>previously been breached and it is expected that an adequate developable area can be achieved without placing additional risk on new homes or other locations up or down stream. c) The Site's rural location requires a sensitive landscape-led approach and this is welcomed by EDF.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
REF207	Gerald Eve on behalf of EDF	<p>The VD provides an early indication of how the Site could sensitively fit within the landscape, given the comparative visual impact will be significantly reduced following demolition. d) EDF supports the need for sustainable and innovative design, particularly given the Site's unique context. The approach is wholly consistent with the objectives of NPPF e) Whilst it is EDF's strategy to find a developer to purchase the Site to bring forward regeneration proposals, it fully supports the principle of incorporating localised green energy production, including enhanced transport connections such as exploring rail connection opportunities. f) EDF would expect a future developer of the Site to engage with Nottinghamshire County Council as minerals authority to ensure that no conflicts existed between regenerating the Site and realising any extraction opportunities. Moreover, the challenges of extracting minerals in this flood-sensitive location are likely to be significant.</p> <p>STS 2: Development Mix The scale of development both in terms of housing and employment land is considered to be realistic. Where demand exists as development starts to come forward, and subject to overcoming the relevant constraints, opportunities may exist beyond the plan period to consider increasing the scale slightly or adjusting the ratio of uses, for example, if employment land take-up is low. Further, it may be possible to include a new primary school on-site subject to the Local Education Authority's requirements and the details of such issues as land-take and funding.</p> <p>a) The split between the number of homes to be delivered within the plan period and those beyond is considered to be realistic. This is based on the broad timescales for decommissioning, demolition, remediation and bringing forward the requisite planning applications prior to commencing infrastructure works and only then commencing construction of homes. b) The approach to promoting a mix of housing types is consistent with national policy and could result in a widely beneficial mix of housing to benefit the existing communities, both in terms of bringing affordable homes to the market for those wishing to purchase their first homes through to specialist and care accommodation catering for older people or the infirm. c) The principles of Policy ST45 are broadly supported and EDF advocates a climate resilient to regenerating the Site. d) EDF welcomes an open range of housing densities appropriate to the rural setting. The lack of prescription in this criterion is considered essential so as not to minimise opportunities for delivering a full variety of densities. For example, this could include higher density apartment and care home living through to lower density detached and bungalow accommodation. e) The scale and split of employment land both within and beyond the plan period is considered to be reasonable and would likely be mutually beneficial to establishing market demand for the Site.</p>	<p>Support for the redevelopment of the site is noted. The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.</p>
REF207	Gerald Eve on behalf of EDF	<p>Social and Community Facilities EDF comments: a) subject to engagement with the Local Education Authority in terms of assessing demand for school places, an opportunity may exist for a primary school to be provided on site. Regardless, the need for financial contributions to support provision of school places in the surrounding community (assuming a new school on site is not required) is a standard requirement for major residential proposal and is therefore fully supported. b) The Local Centre will provide an important focal point for the community. It is suggested that the policy makes clear the exclusion of any requirement for the sequential test or retail impact assessment to be required during the planning application process, as the quantum and mix of Local Centre uses will most likely be market-driven. The restriction on convenience floorspace of up to 500 sq m should be clarified as gross sales floorspace in order to allow sufficient flexibility in delivery (i.e. for food and/or non-food retailers). c) EDF supports the need for appropriate financial contributions to be made towards health care facilities d) Similarly, the principle of a community hub and sports pitches is fully supported. Other leisure opportunities such as walking and cycling networks are also likely to play an important place-making role in regenerating the Site. Transport and Movement, is noted as an important aspect of the policy to ensure the delivery and also the long-term sustainability of the Site. EDF recognises that the Site is remote from major settlements, with the nearest main town of Retford located approximately 9 miles to the west. The integration of a mix of public transport opportunities, cycle routes and exploration of opportunities to utilise rail and river connections could set the new settlement apart from other rural locations. The need for a detailed and comprehensive transport assessment is</p>	<p>Support for the redevelopment of the site is noted. The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area supported. It is recognised that the existing road network will need some improvements and EDF supports the need for further investigation into the capacity of key junctions and an assessment of potential traffic flows to consider the specific works needed to support the Site's delivery. Ensuring adequate parking and servicing provision, are considered to be standard criteria for a development site of this scale. Landscape Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure, highlights the key environmental objectives for the Site. Again, EDF considers that these broad objectives are consistent with both the scale of the Site and the corresponding objectives of the NPPF, including Chapters 15 and 16. a) EDF supports the need for an archaeological assessment for the site as well as a wider built heritage assessment that would consider the impacts of regenerating the Site on nearby heritage assets such as the numerous listed buildings within a short distance of the Site boundaries. However, given the existing heavy industrial nature of the Site, it is considered likely that a residential-led regeneration scheme would be sensitive to the b) The Cottam Wetlands Local Wildlife Site is noted as a key environmental asset and should be protected accordingly. EDF support the retention, protection and enhancement of the wetlands through the masterplanning and development process. c) EDF prides itself on ensuring that its impact on the local environment results in no risks to human health or biodiversity. Taking the Site forward, EDF's expectations are to find a responsible developer who would utilise access to the river as an asset to the Site's regeneration, maintaining the highest standards of protection of the river throughout the development process and also via the long-term management of the settlement through a management company. d) A multi-functional drainage strategy and utilisation of sustainable drainage principles is expected as a standard approach for a site of this scale and is therefore supported. Details of drainage would be developed in consultation with the Lead Local Flood Authority and the Environment Agency. e) EDF fully supports the need to focus on green infrastructure in the masterplanning of this new rural settlement. Details of the management of these networks would be determined during the planning application process and could involve a mix of private and public management depending on the status of certain routes and facilities. The use of a Planning Performance Agreement to aid the planning application process is welcomed and broadly agreeable subject to detailed matters regarding cost and resource allocation – this would be discussed at the planning application stage. For completeness, it is noteworthy that the policy reference 'ST5 F' should be amended to 'ST5 D'. Minor suggestions are noted above and are consolidated below for ease of reference: 1. Clarifying that the Local Centre would not be subject to sequential test or retail impact assessment 2. Clarifying the convenience retail provision of 500 sq m as gross sales floorspace 3.	
1196375	Resident	Do not support the housing development in the Cottam Power Station site There is insufficient draining on site and risk of flooding. The villages cannot cope with the increased traffic. There is a total lack of infrastructure doctors, schools, public transport, dentist, shops. There will be an adverse impact on protected trees, plants and wildlife needs protected species already on the site. IT WAS STATED AT THE RECENT MEETING BY A COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVE THAT THIS DEVELOPMENT IS NOT REQUIRED TO MEET HOUSING NEEDS IN THE PLAN A RENEWABLE ENERGY SITE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED ABOVE HOUSING	The Local Plan must ensure there is enough land to meet the Districts housing needs for the next 17 years or so. The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. There are currently no plans for energy generation on the site.
REF218	Central Lincolnshire	Note and support the policy for the former Cottam Power Station, reserve the right to comment further once the full details of the proposal and any potential impacts are understood.	Thank you for your comments

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
REF222	Notts CC	<p>Part C, 4, a) The Transport Assessment would need to identify the need for and propose improvements on strategic routes from the site and explore the opportunities to transport goods and people by river and rail.</p> <p>Part C, 4, a) (i) The site already has two large accesses onto Outgang Lane. It is not clear why only one is included within the application area. The main site would benefit from two accesses, the second potentially closer to Cottam village such that the main development area is not served from one large cul-de-sac.</p> <p>Presumably a further access would be required to serve the land to the north of Outgang Lane. Part C, 4, a) (ii) Outgang Lane/Cottam Road is of a reasonably high standard. However, pedestrian and cycle routes are likely to require improvement between the site, the village, and Rampton through the site. These should be secured as part of the development rather than by way of a contribution. Part C, 4, a) (v) Should include a contribution towards public transport</p>	Comments made will be reflected in the future policy framework and inform infrastructure planning.
REF222	Notts CC	<p>Minerals and Waste As outlined in the Waste Core Strategy (2013) Cottam was one of three power stations in Nottinghamshire and as part of the energy operation, two types of ash are produced: Pulverised Fuel Ash (PFA) and Furnace Bottom Ash (FBA). Whilst most, if not all, PFA is sold and re-used as secondary aggregate in the construction industry, the production of PFA often outstrips market demand for the material and so the remaining PFA material which is not re-used or recycled is disposed as either part of land raising schemes or to reclaim and fill derelict voids. Policy WCS6: Power Station Ash in the Waste Core Strategy outlines how the County Council favours the recycling or re-use of material but where this cannot occur, priority will be given to proposals that use ash to fill or reclaim mineral workings or derelict voids, with land-raising of ash for disposal only acceptable when no other reasonable options exist. At Cottam, permission was granted to dispose any remaining PFA into two lagoons; the North Lagoon and South Lagoon. Disposal in the north lagoon ceased in 2016, as per condition 5 attached to planning permission 1/12/12/00001, and disposal in the South Lagoon is permitted until 2023 under permission 1/38/12/00001. As the power station has now ceased operation, the ash disposal site is to be restored to the satisfaction of Nottinghamshire County Council and will then enter a 5-year aftercare period. As disposal has ceased in the North Lagoon, this area entered into aftercare in 2016. During the aftercare period, the site will be monitored and assessed by Nottinghamshire County Council to ensure the full and proper restoration of the site to the requirement of the planning permission and so will remain of interest to the County Council from a waste perspective. In terms of this allocation and any potential future application, it will need to consider the restoration plans and aftercare process that have been agreed for the site by the County Council as the Waste Planning Authority. It should also be considered that where PFA has been deposited, these areas are unlikely to be suitable or stable for development and that there is potential that these disposal sites may be re-worked in the future to recover PFA. Such consideration could be included within Policy ST5 and its supporting text. The former Cottam Power Station also lies within the MSA/MCA for sand gravel, which the draft plan recognises in paragraph 5.4.19 and outlines that the County Council will be consulted to ensure it does not lead to the sterilisation of mineral. As Policy SP7 outlines, where a need for non-mineral development can be demonstrated, prior extraction will be sought where practical. This prevents not only the sterilisation of mineral but also can reduce the waste produced from the construction of the site.</p>	Comments made will be reflected in the future policy framework.
REF222	Notts CC	<p>This regeneration area falls within the Rampton Primary Planning Area, incorporating Woodbeck and Treswell with Cottam. NCC anticipate that contributions would be required to create 3 additional classrooms within the span of the local plan. Rampton Primary is on a restricted site and would be difficult to expand, so feasibility would be required. The development at Cottam Power Station is anticipated to add a further 1,150 houses after 2037, which would necessitate a new primary school and potentially land on which to build it.</p>	Comments made will be reflected in the future policy framework and inform infrastructure planning.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
1196559	Resident	<p>The Head of the environment Agency is now stating that "homes should not be built on flood plains", and that "there is a clue in the name". Well, that is certainly not Rocket Science, and whilst the Policy states that there are Flood Defences the addition of the huge development proposed with again "concrete over" huge areas of land that currently is able to absorb rainfall. It is presumed that Drains would discharge to the River Trent, thus increasing the risk of overtopping of the River Banks. Again, a proper plan for Traffic to and from this proposed development is woefully missing. How are the new occupants and workers/materials suppliers intended to access the 'out-of-the-way' location ?? It always seems to be the 'Chicken and The Egg' scenario. Roads will follow, we are told and are expected to believe ! If the proposal is allowed traffic needs to be kept away from the villages between this site and Retford, bearing in mind that there are only three ways to go from Cottam. The River is in the way to the East.</p>	<p>The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.</p>
1196560	Resident	<p>There is a disconnect between the aims and the proposed development at Cottam which will have a massive impact on local communities and cause environmental damage. The plans for this in relating to Cottam development are unrealistic and will cause harm to local communities. The regeneration proposed at Cottam power station will have a negative impact on the existing communities and the infrastructure is not available to sustain such a development.</p>	<p>The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.</p>

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

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

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
		from Cottam power station site as illustrative of our concerns. Travelling to Lincoln, Tuxford, A1 South – Dunham, East Drayton Travelling to Retford, Gainsborough, M180 – Treswell, South Leverton, North Leverton, Sturton le Steeple. Consider the above communities as one cluster as BDC did in their previous draft plan.	this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.
REF263	Resident	If half the traffic from the proposed housing development (450 now, with a further 1150 houses later) travels either south or east (and I would expect more than half because your planning Officer told us that Cottam residents gravitate towards Lincoln), the number of additional cars at the Ragnall Crossroads will be at least approx 450 cars: each house will have two cars because of the lack of public transport. This is set to rise to an additional 1150 in later years making a total of 1600 more cars using this poorly sighted crossroads. Traffic going south to the crossroads would pass our small village school which already struggles with speeding traffic and passing high heavy goods vehicles. Traffic wanting to travel in an easterly direction would use the small Dunham Bridge which would mean travelling through the village of Dunham with its dangerous bend, already the site of numerous accidents due to traffic speed. Last month (January), an attending ambulance was hit by a car travelling too fast and unable to stop, one of many accidents in Dunham. Traffic travelling in a westerly direction would go through Darlton, one of two communities on the entire length of the A57 where the road actually divides the villages (Dunham being the other one), necessitating residents crossing the busy road on a regular basis, including school children catching the school bus and children crossing the A57 to access the play areas. This whole eastern side development of Bassetlaw impacts on our four parishes because of the increased traffic. As we live in a rural area we already have a high spring/summer/autumn high heavy goods traffic related to agriculture.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.
1196914	Resident	cottam power station site would be better used for industrial use with traffic out via A57 dunham crossroads With West Burton also shortly stopping coal generating electricity, this would be a better site for housing as it is nearer better roads to major areas of employment.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.
REF269	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	It is also acknowledged that the draft Local Plan promotes the reclamation and regeneration of the former Cottam Power Station for the delivery of a new Large Rural Settlement (Policy ST5). The Council does note that this site currently is in a remote location and there is no access across the Trent to Lincolnshire from here.	Thank you for your comments
REF278	Fisher German	Note that to ensure that this is a sound allocation, a robust review of the sites deliverability should be undertaken, including start dates, build out rates which has regard to infrastructure requirements/upgrades.	Housing delivery rates have been reviewed and amended where necessary based on evidence of delivery within the District and for similar projects in other areas of the country.

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

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

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

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
REF300 -	Natural England	Welcome the policy aims of a landscape-led approach to design and the delivery of green and low carbon energy for this proposal. Welcome section 5 of the policy wording which offers protection to the Cottam Wetlands LWS and other ecological interest plus the provision of a multifunctional green infrastructure network. Suggest that reference should also be made to the wider River Trent improvement projects (Trent Vision and Wild Trent) which are currently being developed.	Reference to the improvement project has been made in the supporting text.
1197187	KSR Accountants	Renewable Energy Park alongside Wildlife area would be far more beneficial to the environment and the community	There are currently no proposals for energy generation for this site.
1197238	Resident	There is a variance between the policy, and the impact of certain developments especially that at Cottam. The overall strategy is fine, but the council does not seem to have considered the impact of the proposed development at Leafield and at Cottam with the broad thrust of its other environmental policies. Proposing to build a mega village on and very near a flood plain, in an area with poor or no public transport, and poor road access. This will lead to pollution over and above that already experienced by residents in Cottam, Treswell and nearby villages.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.

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

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

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

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
REF361	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council and Notts CC	<p>Been justified by planners and the Cottam Station owners who have a financial interest in obtaining residential planning permission. It is obvious that a residential development is not appropriate and a village centre is a planners fantasy not a practical suggestion. The boundary of the brownfield site has been extended beyond the existing brownfield land but a large area of agricultural land west of Cottam and another larger area directly East of Rampton village, leading East, and adjoining to the existing power station site. The agricultural land here is of high quality and should remain as is. It may be sensible on the existing brown land to allow light industry and commercial land for local businesses and to supply local residents with jobs. The site is totally unsuitable for housing and the incoming population that would come with it. It is as far from a main road as can be in Bassetlaw. Putting a population in the middle of nowhere, rather than a community that has grown naturally is likely to lead to dependency and possible deprivation.</p> <p>Cottam is a hamlet lying to the North of this site. A single track road runs through Cottam, and the villages of Leverton can be accessed through Cottam village, but this is undesirable for the safety of those residents. The route West would go through the village of Treswell, alternatively traffic transferring North would go through the T junction at Treswell, often congested and not a good turn to continue North through the villages of South then North Leverton. Before negotiating the built up village of Sturton and to the Bole roundabout on an A road. A 7 1/2 mile journey to the main road at Bole corner. The route South can be accessed 2 miles from the Power station site at a T junction before entering the village of Treswell. The road was altered and improved to take heavy traffic during building and maintenance of the station. Any industrial and commercial traffic would need to be restricted to this access route which intersects the A57 Markham Moor to Lincoln main road. The distance is 6 ¾ miles to the A57 junction at Dunham Crossroads. Dunham on Trent primary school lies on this road just 200 yards from the A57 junction. Residential traffic from any development on the station site cannot be. Along this designated route lies the Woodbeck Rampton crossroads. This is a death trap because many people have died over the years. The communities have asked for improvements, but NCC not willing to spend any money. A roundabout may be the solution. The dangerous crossroads is another reason why Cottam and an increase in residential traffic should be avoided. The route North travels through North Leverton. There is a dangerous crossroads in the centre of the village. There is much concern with the crossroads as the increases in housing imposed are already envisaged to increase the congestion and the danger there. There is a campaign by the community to improve the crossroads, but officers are advising solutions will not alleviate the dangers, and money cannot be spent without improving safety. Less traffic would be welcome.</p>	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.
REF361	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council and Notts CC	<p>No residential at Cottam would be safer. It would be unsustainable, environmentally unfriendly, and dangerous for the residents of the roads leading from the station and in the villages through which the unrestricted residential traffic would have to pass. Most of the routes connecting Cottam are country roads grown and tarmacked. They do not lend themselves to improvement even if the finance was possible. It is ludicrous to suggest a wasteful expense of creating a village centre for surrounding villages-in what is the edge of nowhere with a river which floods to the East. Many of the residents own their own cars along the Trentside already. The bus service already travels along the Dunham North Leverton route without entering many of the villages. Passengers must contact the bus company in an on demand request service. Not many passengers use it but it is valued by those who do, and is an economical way of continuing to provide public transport. It will be salutary to learn that the Council's suggested transport hub will be a bus stop sign with a shelter on a dead end. Bassetlaw do not provide the bus services and the planners have clearly not researched this. The existing garden villages along the Trent side have to be self reliant. There is deprivation of facilities along the Trentside, as the Council splash the cash in the West and North, the villages throughout Bassetlaw have long been neglected. Cottam is as far from major medical facilities as can be in Bassetlaw. There is a small surgery in North Leverton but it would be at least 35 minutes to Bassetlaw hospital. Medical Facilities in Lincolnshire would take even longer. There is adequate brown field land at Cottam, and it does not make sense to use valuable agricultural land where there is little demand for</p>	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise. There are no proposals for development at West Burton in this Local Plan.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
		<p>housing and industrial demand, because of the poor transport and road links. West Burton Power site be substituted for Cottam. Closing shortly It is only one mile North to an A class road at Bole corner, and this short distance does not intrude in any villages. Access is safe and efficient with good roads to Gainsborough, Retford, Doncaster , Sheffield and the North.</p>	
REF362	Treswell and Cottam Parish Council	<p>The Treswell with Cottam Parish Council, and the NDP Steering Group, are disappointed that EDF have said no form of renewable energy is viable for the site. Perhaps without the possibility of the housing development, there may be a viable way to introduce a form of renewable energy production on this site; a solution, as you will see from the responses, is overwhelmingly favoured by this community. This community does not consider that the development of a Cottam Garden Community represents best use, although they do understand that it represents highest value for both the current site owners and the District Council. This community fear that many questions remain unanswered, and that the housing development proposed is unnecessary, unsustainable, and unaffordable, and that the proposed Cottam Garden Community should not be included within the Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020 for a number of reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Our medical facilities for doctors and schools are at capacity. Ensuring that these facilities are in place for first phase occupation is critical. Bassetlaw state that these facilities are not available for first phase developments, and for communities less than 500 units. 2. Conservation of existing wildlife facilities currently occupying the whole of Cottam Power Station site is critical 3. Confirmation as to who is responsible for the maintenance of flood defence system around the development site, and wider reach to protect existing communities and residents, is required 4. A full, and thorough, traffic study to be carried out on the country roads to identify, and to develop further, one-way systems through neighbouring villages to safeguard existing residents and road users and support new, improved highway infrastructure is vital 5. New road infrastructure will be essential to join up the new Garden Community to the A57 running alongside the River Trent to alleviate heavy road use on the country roads/lanes around the site. This new infrastructure would need to be complete before any work starts on the site development 6. Re-consideration to be given to assist Cottam parishioners who wish to develop their sites, who have been refused due to potential flooding issues to be included in a future Draft Local Plan-inconsistencies 7. Improved routes for walking/biking to join up new Garden Community to nearby local communities should be part of the planned, infrastructure provided by the developer to encourage/secure, social integration, community cohesion and retain/increase revenue with existing shops/pubs etc 8. Development on other decommissioned coal fired power stations may have been successful but these have been developed adjacent to existing facilities such as major roads, employment, schools, doctors etc. To be successful, and sustainable, these facilities need to be installed, on site, prior to the occupation of a housing development 9. The District Council have a responsibility to ensure the health and wellbeing of all residents. The fear is, that this unsustainable, unnecessary development, may become forgotten and a blight, rather than something to be championed. Careful thought and consideration need to be given to the regeneration of the site, and preferably, NOT the option that gives the best return. 	<p>The Local Plan must ensure there is enough land to meet the Districts housing needs for the next 17 years or so. The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, infrastructure and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise. There are currently no plans for energy production on this site.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
REF362 -	Treswell and Cottam Parish Council	<p>Below are alternative suggestions made by residents who attended a consultation meeting at Treswell Village Hall on 20th February.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Return the site to agricultural land for the benefit of all communities and wider environment 2. The development of a Renewable Energy Park alongside the non-negotiable Wildlife Area 3. An area providing the opportunity for a combination of different types of Leisure Activity 4. Development of Cottam Garden Community 450-1600 dwellings and associated commercial, industrial and amenities (Surgery, Pr. School, Shop, Church, Public House) 5. A combination of the non-negotiable Wildlife Area, renewable energy installation, leisure and housing development 6. Prefer that the land to become agricultural or extended wildlife area with riverside walks or a renewable energy park. 7. Should take this opportunity to retrieve what was lost to build this power station initially. 8. Create an opportunity to promote the health and wellbeing of the countryside and nation; the natural wildlife area should be extended to provide a forest, with walks. Cycle tracks should extend over the recently built bridge to Torksey and then beyond along the Fosse to Saxilby and Lincoln and beyond. 9. Cottam Power Station site is surrounded by farm land, should be returned to agricultural and returned to the community as first planned. 10. When this land was compulsorily purchased to build the Power Station, the original plan was to return the land to the community when it was no longer required for energy production. The land floods and so is unsuitable for homes. 11. To allow wildlife to re-inhabit the area for future generations. 12. Development of 450-1600 homes would increase vehicle movements on our minor roads and increase noise and pollution. 13. Returning the land to agricultural would benefit everyone. Land for agricultural purposes needs to be conserved for future generations and not for ourselves. 14. Returning to agriculture and extending the adjoining wildlife area would provide a natural defence from flooding. 15. It should go back to how it used to be- agriculture and woodland. We do not need any dwellings. Let the planners have them on their doorstep- see how they like it! 16. Strongly opposed about houses being built in Cottam. Who wants houses? - You have them... Cottam don't want any. 17. A farming community and we need to support local farming and local industry 18. Keep the land to be used for agriculture. Good for the environment and community. 19. Good to return to agriculture; but land is historically heavily contaminated 20. Prefer that the land is returned to agriculture but a renewable energy park would benefit and protect the wildlife - as an acceptable alternative. 21. This site was stolen from the local farmers, and the community, by compulsory purchase order to produce electricity for the nation- time to restore it to agriculture- give it back. 22. Would prefer the planting of hardwood trees and return the land back to original owners. 23. People who live in the country side need to support countryside, ways and activities. 24. Importing of families from less rural locations often creates challenges for both them and existing village dwellers. 25. Town and countryside often don't mix. 26. Return the land to agriculture- leave it for the sheep! 27. Returning the brownfield site to agricultural land will be better for the environment and the local community. 28. After 50 years and more, the land being used as it has, has made lots of money for the generating companies. 29. It would be an act of great generosity for the site to be returned to agriculture as this area is rural and full of wildlife that needs our continued support to survive and thrive. 30. There is insufficient agricultural land here, in question to be economical for that purpose 	<p>The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, infrastructure and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise. There are currently no plans for energy production on this sit or to return the site to agricultural use.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
REF362	Treswell and Cottam Parish Council	<p>The development of a Renewable Energy Park alongside the non-negotiable Wildlife Area Reason:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Site has been producing energy for the nation for many years, still connected to national grid. This would also provide some employment opportunities for families in the community. 2. Renewable Energy Park, Solar or low height turbines, would give benefit to local community and environment, whilst maintaining and developing the non-negotiable wildlife area. Although the renewable energy park may not be viable for EDF, it may be for other developers/energy producers. 3. It has all the infrastructure for electrical generation and if we are changing from fossil fuels for road vehicles then there will be a much greater demand for electricity. Solar Panels and wind turbines are the obvious choice, but I believe that there should be energy storage systems for periods when there is no wind and no sunshine. This will also create jobs for local people. 4. The development of a Renewable Energy Park is more in keeping with the original site usage, keeping local road usage to existing levels. 5. With a history of generating electricity, I believe this should be a solar farm supplying green energy to the local community. 6. This toxic site is not suitable for domestic use. Wind turbines, Solar Power, or a gas station preferred. Demolition rubble should be taken by barge and used for coastal defence. 7. Renewable Energy Park preferred. No noise from Solar Panels, minimal noise from wind driven generators. Minimal traffic increase. 8. The infrastructure is in place to divert Renewable Energy into the grid. The existing gas station is remaining and will be ideal for that purpose. This would also help to look after the large variety of wildlife in the area instead of destroying it by building on the land. 9. A renewable Energy Park would assist in reducing the carbon footprint for the area. It would also not result in any increase in traffic through the surrounding villages in particular, Cottam, which already has to endure HGVs travelling through to Coates damaging property due to vibration and damage to roads/verges would be kept to a minimum. 10. Generating energy from a renewable source reduces air pollution- good for the environment. Diversifying energy supply reduces our dependence on imported fuels. The manufacture and installation of renewable energy equipment and installation would create jobs for the local community. 11. In the present crisis of climate change, I feel this is the best way forward. 12. Preserving the rural landscape is important, and renewable energy is essential for the future- this is an ideal opportunity to develop it locally. 13. The infrastructure is already in place, residents in the area are well used to a large Power Station so it would be a natural progression moving forward to creating a clean energy producing site. 14. Grid already for joining to Solar Panels and Wind Turbines. 15. The site is ideal for Renewable Energy Park. We need to protect wildlife areas. 16. I would prefer that the land is returned to agriculture but a renewable energy park would benefit and protect the wildlife. 17. Green energy production-Infrastructure already in place- grid. Clean, no additional traffic/population good for carbon footprint. 18. After 50 years of being a part of the landscape to provide energy it is the natural progression to carry on with a renewable energy source within the area. 19. Low maintenance REF preferred; less traffic, already on the national grid. Greener future protects and saves the wildlife and does not impact on current infrastructure as the building of many unnecessary homes. 20. Site is already on the national grid. Low maintenance, low traffic, protects established wildlife. 21. We need to provide for and protect our wildlife. A Renewable Energy Park and Wildlife Area could work very well together. 22. We currently need more Green Energy and this site is perfect for this; there would be no increase in traffic on our narrow, single, track roads. 23. A Renewable Energy Park is preferable; to reduce carbon footprint, and contribute to reaching green carbon targets and address climate change, natural link at Cottam to National Grid. 24. Hundreds of turbines not acceptable. 25. No to Renewable Energy Park- yes to extending the Wildlife area to whole brown field site. 26. Giving some of the site to Renewable Energy Generation is the only alternative and it would create job opportunities. 27. Preserving the rural landscape is important, and renewable energy is essential for the future- this is an ideal opportunity and location in which to develop it locally. 28. Definitely no Renewable Energy installation needed; already got the Gas Station- don't want any more. 29. With more information we would probably prefer an extended wildlife area with riverside walks or a renewable energy park. 30. Retention and continued support of wildlife, currently occupying this site, is critical for this location. 3. An area providing the 	<p>There are currently no proposals for energy generation for this site or to return the site to agricultural use. The Local Wildlife Site and habitats and species on site will be appropriately protected through any future proposals.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
		<p>opportunity for a combination of different types of Leisure Activity Reason:1. There is enough leisure/camping in this area. We need to promote nature, walking and cycling.2. It would be nice to have leisure amenities for the benefit of local villages3. Infrastructure- road for access unsuitable for additional visiting traffic- no.4. Create an opportunity to promote the health and wellbeing of the countryside and nation; the natural wildlife area should be extended to eventually provide a forest, with walks. Cycle tracks should extend over the recently built bridge to Torksey and then beyond along the Fosse to Saxilby and Lincoln and beyond- it goes as far as Woodhall Spa and beyond.5. No camping - Perhaps include the Forestry Commission, National Trust or other association in the development of this brownfield site.6. This site has a prime riverside location and is suitable for a number of healthy leisure activities; water sports, moorings, marina, riverside walks, joining up to national cycle tracks- but no camping please.7. Site turned into a Learning Centre for future generations eg MAGNA – it is a shame that the Control Centre is to be on display elsewhere – future development and Sundown represents joined up thinking.1. DEFINITELY NOT This area is rural and does not have the capacity/facilities for this. Additional traffic associated with such a development would be detrimental to all existing residents, traffic management and necessary road repair/infrastructure. Remain rural; rural living is why we chose to move out of town.2. Our concern is that up to 1600 homes would relate to infrastructure challenges; roads, flooding, and where would all these residents work? There is little opportunity for employment.3. Concerns over this proposal. There is few opportunities for employment- where would the occupiers work? The local infrastructure would be unable to cope with large scale demands. A significantly smaller development may be more appropriate for this rural area and only if it was in combination with a wildlife protected area (Support?).4. A maximum of 450 dwellings with all the appropriate amenities- school, medical services, community hall, church, public house, store- as described in the Draft Local Plan, would be acceptable (Support?).5. We are really opposed to more houses. They are not needed or suitable for land that floods. An extra 2 cars per household would add pressure to the already busy roads. Carbon footprint, climate change?6. We feel that housing in this area is needed and if that brings more amenities to the area then it would be an advantage. Also, it would bring the housing to an existing brownfield area and take proposed housing pressure off the villages in this area. (Support?)7. Too much development would ruin the rural nature of this area. To create a balanced addition to Cottam and to other nuclear villages any development should be no bigger than 50 dwellings. (Support?)8. Existing communities could not cope with all the additional traffic; medical services etc are already stretched to limit.9. There is no infrastructure for the housing that is not needed (Retford housing stock is adequate?)10. Lack of infrastructure does not support building of 1600 houses and related construction, nor is this necessary- housing stock for Retford is at least adequate.11. The area floods and is not suitable for housing and there is insufficient infrastructure to support.12. Site not suitable for housing. Flood plain and contaminated ground, asbestos, oil etc. Already enough daily traffic through the village due to Rampton staff. Roads in a terrible state and enough housing in Retford already.13. Housing would produce too much traffic, would need new roads in and out of new community and a regular public transport service reintroduced.14. 1600 homes vastly increase carbon footprint; 2 vehicles per home, inadequate local transport- where is this new community to work? Few opportunities for employment locally.15. This would lead to traffic disruption, location - distant from supporting services and road infrastructure totally inadequate- totally the wrong place for housing development. Where are occupants going to work?16. I would support a selection of retirement bungalows and council dwellings that would help Cottam and the surrounding villages in many ways to develop a supportive community.17. The building of homes for me is preferable but I would need to know that the amenities- school, medical facilities, shops etc were to be planned to serve the early inhabitants of such a development.18. I would support some development in Cottam- but not in front of Floss Lane. The village needs more recognition to bring the community and its people together.19. Lack of infrastructure does not support the building of 1600 houses and related construction- nor is it necessary in Retford according to the numbers in the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan.20. Infrastructure not suitable for</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
		<p>this.21. Community medical facilities and schools are at capacity- additional facilities would not be made available to early occupants of this development22. Extensive, possibly unaffordable improvements to road infrastructure required to safely join up to local communities- before any development begins- to keep the communities and current highway users safe.23. BDC have a responsibility to ensure health and wellbeing of all residents and if this goes ahead, I fear that this development's unsustainability will render the proposed Cottam Garden Community a blight, rather than something to be championed.5. A combination of the non-negotiable Wildlife Area, renewable energy installation, leisure and housing development 1. This combination is preferable. But- we have ample Leisure facilities for our community. We wish to remain rural and not be a part of a large town.2. Remain rural; rural living is why we chose to move out of town. No leisure facilities eg camping – just walking, cycling tracks etc. Get the nation active.3. This option would fit into the existing local environment and benefit the local community rather than having a huge impact on it. It would make the area more attractive to families who wished to relocate into the existing Trent Villages.4. This is possibly the best solution for all in the surrounding area, but the number of homes should be kept to a minimum and should complement the character of the existing dwellings in Cottam and the surrounding villages5. Infrastructure inadequate to serve such development6. Definitely no Renewable Energy installation needed; already got the Gas Station - don't want any more.7. Additional, improved walking/cycle routes to join up nearby communities- community cohesion8. Developer to provide new playpark facilities and easy access foot/cycler paths from nearby communities.2. The development of a Renewable Energy Park alongside the non-negotiable Wildlife Area Reason:1. Site has been producing energy for the nation for many years, still connected to national grid. This would also provide some employment opportunities for families in the community.2. Renewable Energy Park, Solar or low height turbines, would give benefit to local community and environment, whilst maintaining and developing the non-negotiable wildlife area. Although the renewable energy park may not be viable for EDF, it may be for other developers/energy producers.3. It has all the infrastructure for electrical generation and if we are changing from fossil fuels for road vehicles then there will be a much greater demand for electricity. Solar Panels and wind turbines are the obvious choice, but I believe that there should be energy storage systems for periods when there is no wind and no sunshine. This will also create jobs for local people.4. The development of a Renewable Energy Park is more in keeping with the original site usage, keeping local road usage to existing levels.5. With a history of generating electricity, I believe this should be a solar farm supplying green energy to the local community.6. This toxic site is not suitable for domestic use. Wind turbines, Solar Power, or a gas station preferred. Demolition rubble should be taken by barge and used for coastal defence.7. Renewable Energy Park preferred. No noise from Solar Panels, minimal noise from wind driven generators. Minimal traffic increase.8. The infrastructure is in place to divert Renewable Energy into the grid. The existing gas station is remaining and will be ideal for that purpose. This would also help to look after the large variety of wildlife in the area instead of destroying it by building on the land.9. A renewable Energy Park would assist in reducing the carbon footprint for the area. It would also not result in any increase in traffic through the surrounding villages in particular, Cottam, which already has to endure HGVs travelling through to Coates damaging property due to vibration and damage to roads/verges would be kept to a minimum.10. Generating energy from a renewable source reduces air pollution- good for the environment. Diversifying energy supply reduces our dependence on imported fuels. The manufacture and installation of renewable energy equipment and installation would create jobs for the local community.11. In the present crisis of climate change, I feel this is the best way forward.12. Preserving the rural landscape is important, and renewable energy is essential for the future- this is an ideal opportunity to develop it locally.13. The infrastructure is already in place, residents in the area are well used to a large Power Station so it would be a natural progression moving forward to creating a clean energy producing site.14. Grid already for joining to Solar Panels and Wind Turbines. 15. The site is ideal for Renewable Energy Park. We need to protect wildlife areas. 16. I would prefer that the land is returned to agriculture but a renewable energy park</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
		<p>would benefit and protect the wildlife.17. Green energy production-Infrastructure already in place- grid. Clean, no additional traffic/population good for carbon footprint. 18. After 50 years of being a part of the landscape to provide energy it is the natural progression to carry on with a renewable energy source within the area.19. Low maintenance REF preferred; less traffic, already on the national grid. Greener future protects and saves the wildlife and does not impact on current infrastructure as the building of many unnecessary homes.20. Site is already on the national grid. Low maintenance, low traffic, protects established wildlife.21. We need to provide for and protect our wildlife. A Renewable Energy Park and Wildlife Area could work very well together.22. We currently need more Green Energy and this site is perfect for this; there would be no increase in traffic on our narrow, single, track roads.23. A Renewable Energy Park is preferable; to reduce carbon footprint, and contribute to reaching green carbon targets and address climate change, natural link at Cottam to National Grid.24. Hundreds of turbines not acceptable25. No to Renewable Energy Park- yes to extending the Wildlife area to whole brown field site26. Giving some of the site to Renewable Energy Generation is the only alternative and it would create job opportunities.27. Preserving the rural landscape is important, and renewable energy is essential for the future- this is an ideal opportunity and location in which to develop it locally.28. Definitely no Renewable Energy installation needed; already got the Gas Station- don't want any more.29. With more information we would probably prefer an extended wildlife area with riverside walks or a renewable energy park.30. Retention and continued support of wildlife, currently occupying this site, is critical for this location3. An area providing the opportunity for a combination of different types of Leisure Activity Reason:1. There is enough leisure/camping in this area. We need to promote nature, walking and cycling.2. It would be nice to have leisure amenities for the benefit of local villages3. Infrastructure- road for access unsuitable for additional visiting traffic- no.4. Create an opportunity to promote the health and wellbeing of the countryside and nation; the natural wildlife area should be extended to eventually provide a forest, with walks. Cycle tracks should extend over the recently built bridge to Torksey and then beyond along the Fosse to Saxilby and Lincoln and beyond- it goes as far as Woodhall Spa and beyond.5. No camping - Perhaps include the Forestry Commission, National Trust or other association in the development of this brownfield site.6. This site has a prime riverside location and is suitable for a number of healthy leisure activities; water sports, moorings, marina, riverside walks, joining up to national cycle tracks- but no camping please7. Site turned into a Learning Centre for future generations eg MAGNA – it is a shame that the Control Centre is to be on display elsewhere – future development and Sundown represents joined up thinking1. DEFINITELY NOT This area is rural and does not have the capacity/facilities for this. Additional traffic associated with such a development would be detrimental to all existing residents, traffic management and necessary road repair/infrastructure. Remain rural; rural living is why we chose to move out of town2. Our concern is that up to 1600 homes would relate to infrastructure challenges; roads, flooding, and where would all these residents work? There is little opportunity for employment.3. Concerns over this proposal. There are few opportunities for employment- where would the occupiers work? The local infrastructure would be unable to cope with large scale demands. A significantly smaller development may be more appropriate for this rural area and only if it was in combination with a wildlife protected area (Support?)4. A maximum of 450 dwellings with all the appropriate amenities- school, medical services, community hall, church, public house, store- as described in the Draft Local Plan, would be acceptable (Support?)5. We are really opposed to more houses. They are not needed or suitable for land that floods. An extra 2 cars per household would add pressure to the already busy roads. Carbon footprint, climate change?6. We feel that housing in this area is needed and if that brings more amenities to the area then it would be an advantage. Also, it would bring the housing to an existing brownfield area and take proposed housing pressure off the villages in this area. (Support?)7. Too much development would ruin the rural nature of this area. To create a balanced addition to Cottam and to other nuclear villages any development should be no bigger than 50 dwellings. (Support?)8. Existing communities could not cope with all the additional traffic; medical services etc are already stretched to limit.9. There is</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area no infrastructure for the housing that is not needed (Retford housing stock is adequate?)10. Lack of infrastructure does not support building of 1600 houses and related construction, nor is this necessary-housing stock for Retford is at least adequate.11. The area floods and is not suitable for housing and there is insufficient infrastructure to support.12. Site not suitable for housing. Flood plain and contaminated ground, asbestos, oil etc. Already enough daily traffic through the village due to Rampton staff. Roads in a terrible state and enough housing in Retford already.13. Housing would produce too much traffic, would need new roads in and out of new community and a regular public transport service reintroduced14. 1600 homes vastly increase carbon footprint; 2 vehicles per home, inadequate local transport- where is this new community to work? Few opportunities for employment locally.15. This would lead to traffic disruption, location - distant from supporting services and road infrastructure totally inadequate- totally the wrong place for housing development. Where are occupants going to work?16. I would support a selection of retirement bungalows and council dwellings that would help Cottam and the surrounding villages in many ways to develop a supportive community.17. The building of homes for me is preferable but I would need to know that the amenities- school, medical facilities, shops etc were to be planned to serve the early inhabitants of such a development.18. I would support some development in Cottam- but not in front of Floss Lane. The village needs more recognition to bring the community and its people together.19. Lack of infrastructure does not support the building of 1600 houses and related construction- nor is it necessary in Retford according to the numbers in the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan.20. Infrastructure not suitable for this.21. Community medical facilities and schools are at capacity- additional facilities would not be made available to early occupants of this development22. Extensive, possibly unaffordable improvements to road infrastructure required to safely join up to local communities- before any development begins- to keep the communities and current highway users safe.23. BDC have a responsibility to ensure health and wellbeing of all residents and if this goes ahead, I fear that this development's unsustainability will render the proposed Cottam Garden Community a blight, rather than something to be championed.5. A combination of the non-negotiable Wildlife Area, renewable energy installation, leisure and housing development 1. This combination is preferable. But- we have ample Leisure facilities for our community. We wish to remain rural and not be a part of a large town.2. Remain rural; rural living is why we chose to move out of town. No leisure facilities eg camping – just walking, cycling tracks etc. Get the nation active.3. This option would fit into the existing local environment and benefit the local community rather than having a huge impact on it. It would make the area more attractive to families who wished to relocate into the existing Trent Villages.4. This is possibly the best solution for all in the surrounding area, but the number of homes should be kept to a minimum and should complement the character of the existing dwellings in Cottam and the surrounding villages5. Infrastructure inadequate to serve such development6. Definitely no Renewable Energy installation needed; already got the Gas Station - don't want any more.7. Additional, improved walking/cycle routes to join up nearby communities- community cohesion8. Developer to provide new playpark facilities and easy access foot/cycler paths from nearby communities.	
REF363	Resident	The plan to develop 450 houses on the Cottam Power Station in this plan period whilst maybe admirable it is in my submission not feasible. Cannot see any developer wishing to fund the infrastructure improvements required. The building of a school, community facility, shop and road improvement would make it unprofitable. If all these improvements were not provided in the early stages the impact on the surrounding roads would be intolerable.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, infrastructure and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
			plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.
REF368	National Grid	Asset map provided	Assets noted.
REF386	Resident	Endorse developing brown rather than green field sites Cottam is for too isolated a rural area which is hemmed into the east by the River Trent – a river very prone to flooding. The transport links are virtually non-existent and the current roads are narrow. To cater for 400-500 new homes would be bad enough. The planned large increase later on would be unjust unless all roads are widened and unsustainable and the road bridge created over into Lincolnshire. Fear for wildlife in the wetland areas. No amount of improvement to allow greater public access could enhance this wildlife habitat. The thought of hundreds of people gaining access and thus improving their health does not add up. Wildlife is not improved by mass human intervention for the purposes of leisure. Support therefore a small scale regeneration project with 400 a maximum figure and it would be excellent if the old railway line could become a passenger line to link to west and east. Support any schemes that are sustainable and which address climate change but implore the Council to do more pro-active work in addressing the big roadside litter problems currently faced in the countryside. An extra few hundred people seems to equal more anti-social behaviour/ littering. Has any thought been given to this very real problem and how it can be solved?	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, infrastructure and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Wildlife Site and habitats and species on site will be appropriately protected through any future proposals. Options to investigate the re-opening of the railway line for passenger rail should be explored by the site promoters to determine whether it is a feasible alternative to the car.
REF401	East Markham Parish Council	Cottam regeneration scheme represents a disproportionate spend on the site for little in the way of benefit. It is difficult to see this representing an attractive site for either developers or residents. Also difficult to see either Cottam or High Marnham being attractive to business. Each site is remote and has poor transport links. The funds proposed for each of these two sites would be better-used improving infrastructure elsewhere within the district.	Future development at Cottam would be developer led. Therefore any infrastructure provided or improved would be as a result of development at Cottam. The Council is not committing any funds to the regeneration of Cottam.
REF475	Resident	ST5 – very costly conversion of site, lots of local improvements required.	Thank you for your comments
REF480	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Taken at face value BDCs statement that the site at Cottam is viable for housing. Been contacted by several local residents who state (after working at the location) otherwise. Due to the current information provided cannot support the proposal at Cottam. When completed the town will be larger than Bawtry and have no additional guaranteed Transport Infrastructure. The impact on local communities will be immense. Question how environmentally sound the proposal is in relation to other areas. Can only see the main employment hubs being in Sheffield, Worksop and Lincoln which all would involve residents using personal cars to commute. Concerned that the plan can not clarify at this stage where additional school places and medical support services would be located. Concerned with the impact on already overstrained local amenities. The community suggestion of a renewable energy park needs to be explored at depth. With the governments (and as far as I am aware all major parties) commitment to a carbon neutral economy by 2050 it seems short sighted to lose such a strategic site that could benefit all the residents of Bassetlaw and the UK.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, infrastructure and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise. The proposal included employment land on site. Infrastructure provision for any site develops alongside the production of the Plan thorough negotiations with infrastructure partners so that it can be tailored to meet the developments needs.
REF484	North Notts and Lincs Community Rail Partnership	It is noted that the existing railway to the site is protected. Provision for suitable mode of transport across the Trent using the Sustains route to Torksey (for bus connections to Lincoln and Gainsborough) should be considered for those unable or unwilling to walk or cycle. It is a distance of 1.5 miles.	Options to improving the Trent crossing should be explored by the site promoters to determine whether it is a feasible alternative to the car.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
REF491	Stone Planning Services	<p>This is a relatively isolated site served off a series of minor roads which is allocated to serve 1,600 dwellings and 14.4 ha of B1, B2 and B8 employment. Do not consider this to be a commercially attractive site to employment investors or a sustainable location. The site as originally developed as a power station because of the proximity of the River Trent and rail infrastructure and its relative isolation from residential areas; these are bespoke locational criteria and not sustainable criteria for a mixed use residential and employment allocation. Notwithstanding the existing river defences the site is partially in Flood Zones 2 and 3. However, a Flood Risk Assessment has not been undertaken to determine if the site is suitable for housing, a particularly vulnerable use, and employment. Resolving flood issues is a prerequisite to allocating the site. There is a significant amount of demolition to be undertaken and inevitably contamination to remediate. Delivery of any employment at this site to be hugely optimistic. The Viability Appraisal shows a net Viability Margin of -£16.35m when assessed against CIL. The Council should not rely on employment delivery from Cottam Power Station.</p>	<p>The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, infrastructure and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST6 - Provision of	Land for Employment Development		
1180212	Resident	One reservation is to ask if the figures are over-optimistic. It is notoriously difficult to predict labour market figures and a cautious approach is surely preferred.	The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment 2020 provides the basis for the jobs growth figures and approach taken to policy development.
1189264	Resident	It really depends on what type of employment Bassetlaw want to encourage. If you simply want to expand on the number of large warehouse developments, employing large numbers of unskilled or low paid workers then no, that is a bad idea. If Bassetlaw want to encourage towns and villages to prosper and flourish through better investment, increased interest in grass roots businesses, innovations and entrepreneurship then yes that's what this area needs.	The Local Plan aims to support a step change in the local economy by diversifying the economic base and providing the right type of land at the right time to meet business needs and to provide more better paid, higher skilled jobs. This includes support for local business growth and Policies ST11-ST13 supports economic growth in the rural area.
1189633	Resident	The economic assessment analysis is very likely to be over-optimistic and undue weight has been placed on it when housing numbers have been calculated. Never seen an accurate assessment of economic growth and great caution should surely be exercised with the findings of Bassetlaw's commissioned report. If the number of houses is too large and not delivered, likely to face national government penalties.	The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment 2020 provides the basis for the jobs growth figures and the housing and jobs balance. This informs the approach to policy development. Housing delivery rates have been reviewed to reflect the current position in the District.
1193061	Resident	This again is aspirational. Though we may have sites in the district that once housed major employers, would need more evidence to support the fact that these would do the same again. The possibility for employment in construction is likely but is this sustainable beyond 2037?	The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment 2020 provides the basis for the jobs growth figures and approach taken to policy development. Seven of the general employment sites have planning permission and two sites are under construction. DHL have recently completed at Manton Wood.
REF089	NEDDC	Bassetlaw's spatial strategy is focussed 'on delivering sustainable development and growth' that amongst other things 'meets the evidenced need for new homes and jobs...' The Draft Plan states that 'the spatial strategy promotes a 'step change' in the District's economy to reflect the priorities of the D2N2 Strategic Economic Plan and Bassetlaw's Industrial Strategy to; reduce levels of out-commuting; retain employment and skills locally; increase productivity; address affordability issues and improve infrastructure capacity,...'. On the issue of employment needs it is stated that 'future employment needs consider completions trends as well as economic forecasts from Oxford Economics, Cambridge Econometrics and Experian'. It then says that 'the evidence identifies job growth of 3,400 to the year 2035, which when projected forward to 2037, to balance with the housing requirement, totals 5,500 jobs in B1, B2 and B8 use and for other employment uses.' The Draft Plan acknowledges that 'the District has a high level of employment permissions and available employment land (at least 108 ha) – it is generally accepted that 75% will come forward in the plan period (81 ha)..." and 'on that basis, Policy ST1 identifies sufficient land to balance with Bassetlaw's housing requirement'. Policy ST1 of the Draft Plan proposes an employment land target of 108 ha for the period 2018 to 2037, which provides for an average 5.7 ha of 'general' employment land over the 19 year plan period. The Draft Plan also makes provision for a further 199.6 ha of 'strategic' employment land. This strategic employment land recognises the need to support strategic distribution which capitalises on the district's locational advantage in proximity to the A1, A57 and M1. It is being made available only to meet footloose national and regional business investment or the significant expansion of local business subject to certain policy criteria. The employment evidence that underpins the Draft Plan considers a number of economic scenarios and produces a large range in potential future employment need of between 52.4ha and 187.8ha in the period up to 2035. It is not clear from the evidence presented how the Council has arrived at the employment land requirement figure of 108 ha; or how the figure has been extrapolated to cover the period to 2037. Do not object in principle, to the scale of development proposed. However, these questions need addressing if are to understand the potential future implications for this district and wider HMA; and indeed support the proposals through an updated Statement of Common Ground.	The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment 2020 provides the basis for the jobs growth figures and the housing and jobs balance. This informs the approach to policy development and will provide the basis for duty to cooperate discussions.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST6 - Provision of Land for Employment Development			
REF122	Resident	These representations are in relation to the land at Shireoaks due to be approved for employment purposes under application reference 18/00413/OUT. Policy ST6 sets out proposals to provide employment land to ensure an attractive and flexible supply of employment land to deliver the Council's employment strategy. The policy lists sites under construction, sites with planning permission and proposed Local Plan Allocations. Land at Shireoaks Common is identified as EM002 to provide some 15.4 ha for B1, B2, B8 uses. The recent outline application includes provision for B1/B2/B8 employment uses and also ancillary uses to provide a pub/restaurant, drive-thru restaurant and petrol filling station with an ancillary convenience store. The policy does not refer to the ancillary uses approved on the site and merely refers to B1/B2/B8 uses. For the avoidance of any future confusion, the policy should be amended to make appropriate reference to the provision of a pub/restaurant, drive-thru restaurant and petrol filling station with ancillary convenience store within the policy.	Comments noted. Policy ST8 will be amended to ensure supporting ancillary uses are appropriately referenced.
1194992	Resident	Support employment but it should be high quality employment not just distribution centres with low quality, low paid jobs as this will just lead to more people commuting for work not less. Lack of affordable housing for workers in low paid jobs also an issue. ST7 green energy should not just be in these areas but district wider with an initiative to make use of poor quality agricultural land for use as solar farms or for drainage eg using natural reed beds and wind turbines.	The Local Plan aims to support a step change in the local economy by diversifying the economic base and providing the right type of land at the right time to meet business needs and to provide more better paid, higher skilled jobs. Other policies support renewable energy generation including solar energy in the appropriate circumstances subject to policy criteria.
1195111	Resident	Object to employment at the Cottam site on the basis this is connected to the proposed residential development	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site can be suitably mitigated. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.
1195356	Resident	EM005 Proposed Carlton Forest would add danger and overcrowding to an already busy and dangerous road which has had no upgrade to its infrastructure even with the uppage of Peppers Warehousing the amount of HGVs that use that road is dangerous and even queue up at times to access Peppers . This cannot be allowed to be expanded any further	The Carlton Forest employment site has planning permission. Therefore the Local Highways Authority are satisfied that the vehicle movements associated with the development can be safely accommodated on the road network.
1195356	Resident	Facts should be corrected as Bassetlaw is not part of the Sheffield City Region Trade and Investment Plan, Sheffield City Region, 2019 Sheffield City Region Statement of Common Ground, Sheffield City Region Combined Authority, 2019	The Sheffield City Region Trade and Investment Plan identifies Harworth as being within the Doncaster Sheffield Airport Corridor. The Council are a signatory to the Sheffield City Region Statement of Common Ground and the Council is a non-constituent member of the Sheffield City Region Combined Authority.
1195356	Resident	While i agree the links to roads are ideal the A1 is ill equipped to cope at the moment and the slip roads are a continual accident hotspots as they cant cope with the amount of traffic so adding even more HGVs will only add to this issue	Highways England are a statutory consultee for the Local Plan and have been involved in the production of the Bassetlaw Transport Study Part 2 which informs the development of the Local Plan. This assesses the impact of development identified in the Local Plan on the strategic road network, including the A1 and identifies mitigation. For this plan period no mitigation has been identified for the A1.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST6 - Provision of	Land for Employment Development		
REF182	DHA Planning	<p>As set out in our previous representations, consider that the site should be formally allocated for B1, B2 and B8 employment development under Policy ST6. Such an approach would then be consistent with that taken by Bolsover for the remainder of the site which, as set out above, has been formally allocated for these uses. See no good reason for excluding Explore Industrial Park from a formal allocation under this policy. Whilst it is recognised that the site is already in use for employment purposes, it currently benefits from planning permissions for more intensive employment uses – both in the form of the 2010 masterplan permission, and also the detailed planning permission for the AMF building. It should be formally allocated under policy ST6, an approach which would be consistent with the allocation of sites EM001 to EM005 in particular.</p>	Explore Steetley will be identified as a general employment site by this policy. The policy will be amended to ensure supporting ancillary uses are appropriately referenced.
REF198	Consultant	<p>This is generally to be supported but there should be other identifiable sites. The A1 is identified as being very important to the district yet one of its existing hubs, Markham Moor, is not considered for growth. Why ever not? It currently has more service facilities than the Apleyhead junction which, unless put them there, is devoid of service. There is plenty of land and sites available at Markham Moor, some of which your Council is aware of but once again it has been overlooked. Transport related opportunities should be taken at this location.</p>	The sites submitted to the Council have been assessed by the LAA and EDNA. The reports conclude that the sites are some distance from labour supply, others have heritage constraints and others do not form a critical mass of B class employment. The EDNA/LAA consider that these sites are not as attractive to the market as others in the District identified as potential allocations.
REF199	Cushwake	<p>Further commercial development is also planned for Shireoaks, which will further extend the settlement development limits in a northerly direction linking up with the A57. An application by Hallam Land Management, a developer with a good delivery track record, for an employment led development of B1, B2 and B8 uses with a pub-restaurant, Drive-Thru restaurant and petrol filling station with ancillary convenience store has obtained Member support at committee. This development will further expand the facilities available in Shireoaks.</p>	Comments noted.
REF222	Notts CC	<p>It is recommended that, as part of the policies linked to Delivering Economic Prosperity, prioritising the creation of supported employment opportunities for people with mental illness and/or learning disabilities, and that priority be given to care leavers as part of Nottinghamshire's role as a corporate parent for this group.</p>	Use of an Employment and Skills Plan will ensure that appropriate training and job opportunities are made available to local residents. This could include the people identified.
REF222	Notts CC	<p>The plan also allocates the former High Marnham Power Station and Trinity Farm sites (EM006 and EM007) for employment use. Both of these sites fall within the MSA/MCA for sand and gravel. As per Policy SP7, any applications will need to demonstrate the need for non-mineral development and where this is shown, the applicant should consider the feasibility of prior extraction and so prevent the unnecessary sterilisation of the mineral resource. This is of importance at Trinity Farm, including the housing allocation under Policy 22, as mineral operators have indicated interest in extracting sand and gravel 240m to the west of the allocated mixed-use site. The Draft Minerals Local Plan (July 2018) did include this site (Botany Bay), as an allocation to help meet the required demand under Policy MP2r. This site has now been removed from the Publication Version of the Minerals Local Plan and is no longer allocated. This is due to changes to the mix of site specific allocations identified across the County and not due to the site being withdrawn by the operator. Would recommend that Policy 22 highlight the presence of the MSA/MCA and that any future application will need to demonstrate the need for non-mineral development in this area and if this can be demonstrated, consider prior extraction so to prevent the sterilisation of the resource. Policy ST6 also identifies EM002, Shireoaks Common as employment land. As noted in the planning application response (15/00971/OUT), the Northern part of the sites lies adjacent to Serlby Quarry. Whilst mineral extraction has ceased, the site is still to be restored and remains of interest to the County Council. Application 1/17/01035/CDM under consideration by NCC sought to extend the timescale of importation of waste until 2027, it has recently been withdrawn, a further application is expected to detail the proposed restoration of Serlby quarry. Whilst the quarry is well screened, NCC would wish to ensure any development on the proposed employment allocation site does not prejudice the restoration of Serlby quarry. To the West of the proposed site boundary, there is a current application at the former Harworth Colliery site to import 6.2 million cubic metres of restoration material to restore the former colliery. This application is yet to be</p>	Policy ST7 and Policy 22 will make reference to meeting the need for non minerals development. EM002 has outline planning permission for employment use - NCC would be consulted upon any reserved matters applications to ensure the development does not adversely impact upon the restoration of Serlby Quarry. The Council consults Environmental Health on all relevant applications to ensure that implications for dust, noise are addressed.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST6 - Provision of	Land for Employment Development		
		determined by NCC. Considering the volume of inert waste that is anticipated to be required to restore the colliery, it is likely the potential employment allocation may be able to detect some environmental impacts from the waste management site, if the application was to be permitted. Bassetlaw may wish to seek advice from their Environmental Health Officer on any potential implications on this proposed site in terms of dust and noise and consider potential phasing of development so to reduce any potential land use conflict. Such comments are also applicable to EM003, Symmetry Park.	
REF253	Fisher German	8 ha of employment land at Trinity Farm is supported. The pragmatic approach taken by the Council seeking only 5 ha of the 8-ha total to be brought forward within the Plan period is also supported. As the Council is aware Trinity Farm is immediately adjacent to Trinity Park, Randall Way, Retford, a successful business park which has been built out over the previous decade. Trinity Hospital has been instrumental in bringing forward the Trinity Park site and are committed to the next phase. The site is sustainably located, being adjacent to the Retford urban area and is well located to deliver some additional employment land, alongside residential development over the next Plan period. The delivery of the 5 ha of employment land at Trinity Farm will be dependent upon demand and long-term financial commitment to the site. Speculative development is not always easy to progress, in locations away from major arterial routes (e.g. the A1). Occupiers are not prepared to wait and often want built units, whereas developers/investors often want pre-lets before investing in the site. Trinity Hospital has been a Retford based charity for circa 350 years and are committed to its investment in the town. If necessary, to support the development of the employment land, Trinity could create serviced plots or deliver a small commercial scheme. The ability to deliver this would depend on the overall site viability.	The policy takes a pragmatic approach identifying 5ha of the consented land for E and B uses. This should enable the employment uses, supported by employment generating uses on the remaining employment land to be delivered on site as part of a viable scheme.
REF256	Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council	Additional text is requested to part of policy ST6 set out below: Section A point 2 A further 199.6ha of strategic employment land is identified as available only to meet the specific needs of footloose national and regional business investment or the significant expansion of a local business, as set out in Policy ST8. This land would only be used for this purpose if there were no other allocated sites within the Sheffield City Region that could accommodate this requirement.	Following consideration of comments it is not considered that a sequential approach is evidence based and can be justified. Effectively the proposal is requesting that sites in Sheffield City Region be prioritised which is considered to be unjust and without merit.
REF269	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Additional text is requested to part of policy ST6 set out below: Section A Point 2 A further 199.6ha of strategic employment land is identified as available only to meet the specific needs of footloose national and regional business investment or the significant expansion of a local business, as set out in Policy ST8. This land would only be used for this purpose if there were no other allocated sites within the Sheffield City Region that could accommodate this requirement.	Following consideration of comments it is not considered that a sequential approach is evidence based and can be justified. Effectively the proposal is requesting that sites in Sheffield City Region be prioritised which is considered to be unjust and without merit.
REF282	National Trust	National Trust objects to the proposal at part A.2. of this policy to allocate 'a further 199.6ha of strategic employment land' over and above any identified need or demand. This figure is not supported by the proposed growth in housing in the local area. The inclusion of land at Apleyhead Junction would result in urban sprawl, bringing Worksop all the way to the A1 junction and proposed Garden Village. It would result in the unjustified loss of good-moderate agricultural land. It would generate further traffic and pollution on the A57 corridor, while impacting on the character of the wider area. It would also present a risk to the remediation and development of brownfield sites in the district and farther afield.	The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment 2020 provides the basis for the jobs growth figures and the housing and jobs balance. This informs the approach to policy development. Housing delivery rates have been reviewed to reflect the current position in the District.
REF298	Axis PED Ltd	Policy ST6 sets out that the Council will ensure that a flexible supply of employment land is available to deliver the Council's strategy for economic prosperity, job growth and inward investment. Presents sites in three categories, which are: those with sites under construction 2019-2020, sites with planning permission, and local plan allocations. Identifies 108.38ha of general employment land available during the Plan period. This includes a number of sites with planning permission totalling 36.25ha of employment land. Land at Carlton Forest is included within this total, however, this relates to the site to the south of FCC's site which is	Planning permission exists for part of the site and an occupier is in place to develop the remainder in 2022. On that basis, there is no need to allocate the site a tenant is lined up to occupy. Therefore there is no need to allocate this land. The planning permission and development management process is addressing the needs of the site

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST6 - Provision of	Land for Employment Development		
		shown on the Policies Map. 2.4 ha of FCC's site benefits from planning permission (ref: 18/01093/OUT) for employment uses. It is unclear why this is not included within Policy ST6 under 'sites with planning permission'. This omission is presumed to be an error which should be corrected. In addition to the 2.4ha of land to the east of the Site which currently benefits from planning permission, FCC contend that the remainder of the site is also suitable for employment uses and should be included as a Local Plan Allocation (within the third tranche of sites in Policy ST6). Part of the Site is previously developed land and the entire site is of low environmental value and currently underutilised. Despite being outside of the settlement boundary, the entire Site is well connected to the existing settlement and the adjacent allocation (HS1 and EM005).	
REF299	Gladmans	Policy ST6 seeks to ensure an attractive and flexible supply of employment land is available in the District to ensure the Council's strategy for economic prosperity, job growth and inward investment is achieved. The inclusion of Bevercotes Colliery as an additional Priority Regeneration Area aligns with the ambitions of Policy ST6 and the Plan overall. Bevercotes Colliery has the ability to form a comprehensive mixed-use Priority Regeneration Area that includes B1, B2 and B8 uses alongside residential development. The site is less than 1km from the strategic A1 corridor and therefore represents an excellent location for strategic employment development.	The former Bevercotes Colliery is covered by Local Wildlife Sites and is identified by the Bassetlaw HRA as having the potential to host breeding and foraging protected bird species associated with the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. Allocating the site is therefore contrary to legislation and national planning policy. However, the site has planning permission for employment development which is considered to be deliverable as a mitigation package has previously been agreed.
1197264	Resident	Do not need more distribution centres in the area. Mention an increase in jobs, but at the majority of land is to be used for more distribution centres, which will mean the majority of new jobs created are for packer/distributor roles, the majority of which will most likely be filled by migrant labour. Would very much like to work locally, however the lack of higher level jobs in the area means we have to commute further afield to surrounding cities and towns.	The Local Plan aims to support a step change in the local economy by diversifying the economic base and providing the right type of land at the right time to meet business needs and to provide more better paid, higher skilled jobs.
REF323	Emery Planning	Welcome the recognition in the Plan of the importance of local businesses as an integral factor in creating and sustaining a diverse and strong local economy. Such businesses are essential to the continued prosperity of the District and a strong local economy is vital to improving living standards and quality of life for Bassetlaw's residents. J G Pears is one such business which is ideally placed to assist the Council in enhancing its economic prosperity. Note a typographical error with the referencing of the High Marnham Energy Hub allocation which is referred at paragraph 6.1.12 and within Policy ST6 as site reference 'EP006', however, in Section heading 6.2 and within Policy ST7 (which allocates the land at the Former High Marnham Power Station as an 'Energy Hub') the site reference is given at 'EM007'. This drafting error is also reflected in other evidence base documents such as the Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan. For clarity and consistency this matter needs to be addressed across the full suite of documents. Support the allocation of the land at the Former High Marnham Power Station as an employment allocation for B1, B2, B8 - Energy Hub energy and low carbon generation related business. The requirement for development proposals in employment allocations to enter into a site related Construction Job Employment Strategy in order to support local employment and skills in the construction industry is noted and J G Pears are committed to enhancing local employment opportunities and increasing skill levels across the workforce. Note the reference to the use of Planning Performance Agreements and whilst these can be a useful tool in some circumstances these should not be a mandatory requirement of development proposals.	Support for the policy approach is noted. High Marnham Energy Hub will be consistently referenced across all Local Plan documents.
REF325	Resident	Policy ST6A and B should be amended to include the site between the A57/A1 south.	The Economic Development Needs Assessment 2019 assessed a range of available sites and concluded that this site was not required to deliver the economic growth ambitions of the District in this plan period.
REF346	Doncaster Council	Additional text is requested to part of policy ST6 set out below: Section A point 2 A further 199.6ha of strategic employment land is identified as available only to meet the specific needs of footloose national and regional business investment or the significant expansion of a local business, as set out in Policy ST8. This land would only be used for this purpose if there were no other allocated sites within the Sheffield City Region that could accommodate this requirement.	Following consideration of comments it is not considered that a sequential approach is evidence based and can be justified. Effectively the proposal is requesting that sites in Sheffield City Region be prioritised which is considered to be unjust and without merit.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST6 - Provision of	Land for Employment Development		
REF347	NJL Consulting	<p>Policy ST6 carries forward the key employment land policy thread from ST1. Although the strategic vision of securing growth across 308ha of employment land is fully supported, it is not necessary to specify the specific market sectors to deliver this quantum of employment. The draft Local Plan objective is to bring forward allocations that provide a balanced portfolio of employment land supply across Bassetlaw that is sufficiently flexible to attract and satisfy the needs of established businesses and investment at a subregional, regional and National level. The approach in ST6 (which then leads to ST8) unhelpfully creates two classes of employment land when in fact both types of land are essential to meet growth ambitions, sub-regional economic objectives and occupier demand. For the Local Plan's strategic vision of delivering step change growth to be realised, the total employment land being proposed must be met. If any part of this need is not delivered, then the overall vision and economic growth objectives for Bassetlaw would be unfulfilled. ST6 is also inconsistent with ST1 in some of the terminology and wording in respect of the ambitions for the site. For example, ST1 refers to 'sub-regional/regional employment need and/or the significant expansion of a local business' whereas ST6 refers to footloose national and regional business investment. These inconsistencies are unhelpful to the implementation of the policy and will only serve to confuse and potentially deter market interest which in turn would compromise the Council's vision.</p> <p>Suggested policy changes: A. To ensure an attractive and flexible supply of employment land is available to deliver the Council's strategy for economic prosperity, job growth and inward investment 307.98ha 308ha of employment land is recognised of particular value to the economy and will be available for development. 1. to 2037:108.38ha of general employment land available for development during the plan period, an annual average of 5.7ha per year 2018 to 2037. 2. A further 199.6ha of strategic employment land is identified as available only to meet the specific needs of footloose national and regional business investment or the significant expansion of a local business, as set out in Policy ST8. B. All These key employment sites are identified on the Policies Map for development in the following classes and other identified employment sectors in accordance with site specific policies as identified in the plan. Add new site EM010 Apleyhead Junction to list of sites. (Parts C and D remain unaltered)</p>	The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment 2020 provides the basis for the approach taken to policy development. This site is identified is additional to local employment needs and is proposed for allocation on that basis. Terminology will be addressed to ensure consistency in approach.
REF387	Resident	Retford requires land allocation for more employment provision in and around Retford.	5ha of land is identified for employment use in Retford over the plan period. In addition five existing employment sites are protected to support ongoing employment use and the expansion of existing businesses. This approach reflects market demand for employment development in Retford over the last few years.
REF475	Resident	Support. Good locations suggested for big employment sites.	Support noted and welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Marnham Energy Hub			
REF043	Consultant	<p>To take advantage of the strong grid connection, potential transport via the railway and local manufacturing skills base I would suggest the following rezoning of the former High Marnham Power Station. Note that this rezoning would see a similar electricity generation from solar and also facilitate the creation of jobs in low carbon industry and attract businesses to develop our local energy economy.</p> <p>A – unchanged B- unchanged C: unchanged</p> <p>D: Open as a potential manufacturing zone for low carbon industries with local planning requirement for rooftop solar generation. Valid industry to include organisations in manufacturing of low carbon products in electricity, transport and heat. Could be used to attract battery manufacture, automotive, railway works or producers of solar/wind. Council to seek national grant funding to provide incentives to attract business. Possible reopening of line for freight to be discussed with Network Rail</p> <p>E- unchanged</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>
1193338	Resident	Questionable why this hasn't been considered earlier as High Marnham was decommissioned in 2003. Very much supportive of this development with electricity links already in place and the location ideal.	Thank you for your comment
REF111	Resident	I am speaking for myself and my husband as residents of Ragnall we are concerned about what is being proposed for High Marnham and our local area, as our house is very close to the A57 & only a couple of miles from High Marnham site. The A57 needs more than just upgrading the junction it also needs the traffic slowing down IE; traffic lights or a roundabout because the traffic is horrendous it can take 5-10 minutes to cross the road at times. Also the volume and speed of traffic as increased significantly recently as Collingham as a 7am-7pm weight limit on it now so a lot of traffic from Girton quarry takes a short cut through Ragnall to get to the A1 instead of going along the A57 to Tuxford to get on the A1. this road is an unclassified road, we have had some repairs in recent months but with recent weather it is breaking down again in places also its not wide enough for all these heavy goods vehicles. A very good friend and neighbour to us had her son killed on A57 3 Christmases ago how many more people have to die before something is done, also with the proposed building of houses on Cottam site it means there will be even more traffic using the A57 junction. Would the junction improvements also mean that the road through our village would be improved also because as it is now it is not of a quality for safe travel for all the extra traffic the proposal will generate. The traffic for J G Pears and the proposed site already runs 24/7 and causes sleep disturbance so if this was to be allowed we would get a significant increase in noise pollution, not to mention the increase in odour pollution that already causes distress to many.	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07	High Marnham Energy Hub	In principle I fully support and endorse Green Energy production, (I work in the generation business) it's what the proposal really means in relation to the other developments on the site that are the key factor. I have experience of a battery storage project and fully understand the UK needs to secure electricity supply post 2025 through renewables along with other low carbon generation. I fully support the UK being self-sufficient and not reliant on interconnects from Europe. Just for information UK demand today is 36 Gig, Wind is producing 13 Gig, Gas 9.5 Gig, Coal 1 Gig, Nuclear 6 Gig, Biomass 2.5 Gig + other Further to my emails last night I have a few initial questions and concerns regarding the draft proposal. I feel it would be beneficial if you came to the meeting prepared to answer these and address any concerns of other local Councillors . Are we correct in thinking that J G Pears will be the main promoter / developer for the "High Marnham Energy Hub" they currently lease the site with an option to buy? This fact is important to local residents due to the fact Pears operate their current business in a reactive manner and are not proactive. For many years residents have suffered awful odour from the rendering plant, only when Pears were faced with legal action did they invest in a thermal oxidiser to address odour issues. More recently the CHP plant is the main odour abatement technology, however its only when the EA issue corrective action plans that any improvements are carried out. Two families with children have been forced out of their homes in Low Marnham due to odour, how this can morally be right..... Can it? I have over 20 years' experience on the Parish Council, dealing with Pears constantly, the local residents' concerns are reinforced by historical factual data. Assurances need to be given, and enforced in the planning application to ensure compliance with any requirements. I have been asked by several residents for clarification of the different sections, especially "B" and "C", please could you expand on these? The closest residential property is only 300m from area B "Energy efficient business use" and 450m away from area A "Low carbon energy production" Noise from both of these area's is a major potential concern which local residents don't feel Bassetlaw fully appreciate due to the fact Bassetlaw have already issued Pears a 24/7 operating licence for the storage facility on this site. Along with this the current access to the site passes through residential areas, noise at night? Area's C, the site ceased electricity generation in 2003, the northern area of the site (Adjacent A &B) was the old coal plant so little demolition works were required. As a result with the site being secure it has become a haven for wild life protected from "people" Area C, which is adjacent area D is the old site access road, this as I have previously commented is planted with trees. This is already established woodland and should be protected, along with additional planting. This would have been planted when High Marnham opened in the late 1950's so 70 years of tree growth needs to be protected. The area East of B is a flood risk area. The old power station site has quite a substantial flood bank and in the worst floods of 2000 didn't encounter and flooding (I worked on the site at this time) In the proposal is quotes: "the site promoter, who has significant experience in using energy generation and low carbon uses to minimise the carbon emissions from their current business operations"	The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny
REF112	Resident	J G Pears have had major issues with their CHP plant, to such an extent that it was shut down for several months at the end of 2019. (it is less than 2 years old) It was reported that they had issues with tube leaks within the boiler. Working in the Power Industry this clearly demonstrates their lack of experience and knowledge in Power Generation and thus Pears ability to run and maintain a power generation source. These problems will (I am sure) have been caused by poor water chemistry, which is basic operational procedure of a power generation boiler, the comment "significant experience" is not justifiable. In the proposal is quotes: "Measures to ensure amenity of local communities from noise, light, glare, smell, dust, or emissions are in accordance with relevant environmental standards" From their existing site JG Pears omit odour with continuous complaints, even to an extent of forcing people from their homes. Light pollution is extensive but complaints over ruled by the needs of Health and Safety. In the proposal is quotes: "Transport and Movement a) A scheme of an appropriate scale, layout and form supported by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan" Rather than duplicate this issue I will leave Ragnall and Dunham councillors to expand on this. I do feel that the bridge at Grassphorpe is also of major concern I have copied this to other councillors along with a few local people who care about our	The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny
REF112	Resident		

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Manrham Energy Hub		<p>local community. I am sure others will comment in a constructive manner. One final note, employment? How many local people are employed at the existing Pears site? None / (very few to my knowledge). Manual type labour is provided by Eastern European workers. More specialised tasks are not carried out by local personnel. Solar farms, battery storage and other low carbon generation plant require very limited staff. JG Pears already demonstrate that low grade employment needs are met by foreign workers. These are facts that cannot be disputed Pears have already set a president. Therefore the application can not, and should not quote employment for local people.</p>	Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny
REF115	Canal and River Trust	<p>We welcome the consideration given to this site within the Local Plan, which should help to provide certainty to future developers and decision makers with regards to how this large brownfield site will be brought back into use.</p> <p>The site lies to the immediate west of the River Trent, which the Trust manage as Navigation Authority. Whilst the Draft Plan makes reference to the need for a Transport Assessment, we are concerned that paragraph 6.2.8 focusses upon the likely demands upon the Highways Network, which has the implication that alternative transport to deliver materials to the site are not being considered. The River Trent is a navigable river, which is capable of handling vessels that could deliver materials to and from the site. It provides a direct link to the Humber Estuary and associated ports. Development will require the delivery of building materials and solar panels, which may include abnormal loads which could be accommodated via the River Trent, reducing the potential burden on the local highway network. The river also has the potential to transport fuel stock to the proposed energy hub by barge, which would help to reduce the long term importation of materials to site by road. As highlighted in our response to Policy ST5, efforts to mitigate against the adverse impacts of traffic are promoted by paragraph 102 of the National Planning Policy Framework and in, in the case of larger loads, in the government's water preferred policy for the movement of abnormal loads. Correspondence from the Department for Transport to PINS highlights the policy position for the movement of abnormal indivisible loads by water, and the advisory role of Highways England. https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/wpp_letter.pdf Paragraph 148 of the NPPF highlights that the planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future. The use of waterborne freight can help accord with this aim, as carbon emissions by water are demonstrably lower when compared to other forms of transit, such as road transport. Research by the Commercial Boat Operators Association (CBOA), using a case study of the transport of steel by water, highlights that carbon emissions of transport by water can be 45% lower than that of comparative transport by road. http://www.cboa.org.uk/downloads/environmental_impact_report.pdf We therefore believe that the Local Plan should require the potential of waterborne freight to be considered in any future assessment of the transport plan concerning this site. This could be done through expansion of paragraph 6.2.8 to require an assessment to be undertaken with regards to the feasibility of winterbourne freight to deliver materials and fuel stock to site. Failure to take account for this could result in the potential use of this water resource being ignored, which could reduce its effectiveness in mitigating against the adverse impacts of traffic generation. Policy ST7 We therefore respectfully request that the policy is expanded to ensure that future decision makers consider the use of the River Trent to transport construction materials to the site (and to export any waste materials from the site). This could be undertaken through the expansion of part 2 (Transport and Movement) of the policy with the following suggested text "b) Consideration should be given towards opportunities to utilise the River Trent for the transportation of construction and waste materials to and from the site during redevelopment.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Marnham Energy Hub		<p>1. Is there no possibility that the Robin Hood rail line will extend to Lincoln given current DOT 'noise'? This could affect the development. 2. If not, the west end of area C should incorporate a car park for users of the cycle / walking track. Currently there is no place to park and the ad-hoc grass verge parking is a bit risky from the Fledborough approach when coming over the bridge. Continuing on transport – both northern and southern HGV approaches are currently far from ideal for residents of Ragnall, Fledborough, Normanton and Sutton on Trent with existing HGV traffic. More would render it intolerable.3. It would be a pity if the existing well established spinneys on the south and east boundaries of the switchyard and area B were not retained. They are substantial wild life refuges in an area not 'over-treed' (I ran the village shoot for nearly 20 years which extended over all of area D down to Sutton on Trent so know them well)</p> <p>4. Area A. Low carbon energy production. I can think of nuclear, hydro, wind, solar (area D already) none of which would seem to be an option for area A. However, there are fertile and technically ignorant minds out there so who knows? 5. Area B. Energy efficient business area. Gym? Treadmill for convicts? Perhaps not, but CO2 neutral offices or small industrial units would be welcome 6. Area C. Energy intensive land uses..... Aluminium smelter? Electric arc steelmaking? Cement works? Paper mill? Pottery factory? I don't think so. What we all fear is another stinking, noisy rendering plant as per existing..... Remember North/South Clifton school is downwind at about 1250m and the long-suffering (JGP blighted) residents of High Marnham even nearer when a north wind blows.</p> <p>7. Suggestion - why not some housing to provide 'walk-to-work' employment. Winners all round. May I ask who is the promotor? Strawsons – OK. JG Pears – we fear the worst!</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>
REF123	Resident	I have read the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan. I am supportive of the council looking for opportunities for low-carbon and renewable energy development opportunities, however any development opportunities must not be taken at the cost of safety, health and well-being of local people and the preservation of the local environment. As a resident of Ragnall I am particularly concerned about the following sections relating to site EM007 and policy ST7 (pages 55-58): "The Bassetlaw Transport Study: Part 29 sets out recommendations for transport mitigation measures. These include capacity improvements to the A57 junction at Dunham on Trent/Ragnall crossroads. A Transport Assessment will provide a more detailed assessment of the impact of development on the highways network." "Transport and Movement a) A scheme of an appropriate scale, layout and form supported by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan, and advice of the Local Highways Authority, which further details: i. Contributions towards improvements to the A57 junction at Dunham on Trent/Ragnall crossroads;ii. That vehicular traffic generated by the development, including lorry movements can be safely accommodated." These sections suggest that the council intends to allow the increase the volume of traffic, including more heavy vehicles using the road through Ragnall, with the development of a High Marnham energy hub. This raises serious concerns for the safety and health of residents due to road safety and air quality impacts. It also impacts upon amenity of residents due to noise and smell associated with increased industrial traffic. A further increase in industrial traffic is unacceptable in this situation. For these reason I object to these draft plans. I would expect the council to prioritise the safety and health of residents and the impact on residents daily lives in consideration of any plans, and to revise the local plan to prevent these serious negative impacts upon residents. I look forward to reviewing the revisions to this plan, and will be as actively involved as required in helping the council maintain focus on the safety, health and best interests of residents, so please keep me updated.	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>
REF139	Resident		

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Marnham Energy Hub			
1195350	Resident	<p>TRANSPORT & MOVEMENT</p> <p>Whilst it is mentioned in the Policy a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan will be conducted with improvements at the junction with the A57, it has been considered that this junction is the first access into Lincoln, after Newark & Gainsborough. With proposals of increased housing at Cottam, this will additionally impact also on the access across the River Trent, with potential traffic delays at Dunham Bridge also at this junction is an infant and junior school. This is a rural school and services the villages of Dunham, Ragnall and Fledborough. Most families have to drive their children to school because of the distance from their homes and there currently is no pedestrian crossings. During school start and finish times and when parents visit school for other events, a good stretch of this road is blocked on one side by parked vehicles. Currently there is no alternative for them. Warehousing usually employs high numbers of staff, adding this to all the additional traffic generated by suppliers and customers will certainly lead to an overall steady stream of vehicles accessing the B8 site. Without a doubt this will put further pressures on the existing road systems in this area and surrounding areas. It's also worth noting here that already the route from this site to the A57 has very regular traffic (HGVs and slow moving tractors) operating 24 hours from JG Pears at Marnham and used regularly by other HGV's wanting to take a short cut from the A1 to the A57, there are further burdens when the A1 is closed and alternative traffic routes are sought by road users. Along this route particularly in Fledborough there are tight corners and properties with accesses on blind corners.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>
1195851	Resident	<p>I oppose the plan to develop High Marnham power station site. Road access is poor using narrow lanes. Any increase in traffic level is a backwards step. The proposed use seems to have appeared from thin air to benefit only one company. Little to no consideration seems to be paid to anyone who lives near any of the large housing developments or the Marnham "power hub"</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Marnham Energy Hub			
REF193	Residents	<p>employment land. This has been calculated as a future requirement of 63.0 ha with higher need under scenarios subject to strong performance in transport and distribution. 3. Whilst the Local Plan might want to pursue a growth strategy, policies ST6, ST7, ST8 and S98 collectively allocate some 302.98 ha of employment land which is some 4.8 times larger than the evidential requirement. The plan suggests that 199.60 ha of this is in strategic inward investment. 4. There is no evidence submitted to demonstrate that there is a need to allocate land that exceeds the need put forward in the Bassetlaw Economic Needs Assessment. In the absence of any cogent or substantive evidence underpinning the Local Plan for the period 2018 to 2037; this does not justify the allocation of inappropriate or unsuitable sites. As such there is no unmet strategic employment need requirement to justify the allocation of site EM007. 5. Even ignoring the two strategic sites in Policy ST8; policy ST6 allocates 103.38 ha which far exceeds the identified future requirement of 63.0 ha. Removal of the 38.4 ha site at High Marnham would still leave 64.98 ha under Policy ST6 which meets the future need identified; with the 199.60 ha of land in Policy ST8 as additional buffer for strategic inward investment. 6. The Bassetlaw Economic Needs Assessment identifies in Table 17 that the High Marnham site is "Not in a commercially attractive location." As such the evidence underpinning the draft Local Plan does not support the allocation of this site in terms of quantum or location. In fact the Bassetlaw Economic Needs Assessment concludes the policy recommendation as being: "Not included in supply." Despite this the Local Plan allocates the site. 7. Paragraph 6.1.14 of the draft Local Plan states: "In addition, Policy ST6 makes a positive policy intervention to ensure the regeneration of two former coal fired power stations sites at High Marnham and Cottam. Their closure directly affects employment in the rural area, and indirectly affects local supply chains. New employment land is regarded as essential to support those local communities and make best use of these significant brownfield sites in the longer term." However this statement is misleading, High Marnham power station was decommissioned in 2003 some 17 years ago and the main demolition took place in 2004 and 2006; the cooling towers as the final structures were demolished in 2012 some 8 years ago. According to BBC News the power station only employed 109 people prior to closure and it has provided no employment now for 17 years. Accessibility 8. High Marnham represents a poorly accessible location, the power station was sited there for operational reasons needing to be next to the river. Like most of the coal fired power stations it was connected to the rail network which was used for the delivery of coal. It had direct rail connection to most of the collieries in North Nottinghamshire. 9. The site no longer has a rail connection, although the High Marnham Test Track which houses Network Rail's 'Rail Innovation & Development Centre' (RIDC) runs to the western side of Ragnall Road. The Test Track doesn't connect to the national rail network, although through use of the mineral line for the former Thoresby and Bevercotes Collieries it can connect to the Robin Hood Line at Shirebrook. The former railway trackbed eastwards from the site across the Fledborough viaduct over the River Trent, through Clifton to Doddington & Harby forms an off-road part of National Cycle Route 647 which is part of the National Cycle Network. 10. The site entrance gate is 3.5km from the A57 along a 'C' classified road; this route takes vehicles through the villages of Fledborough and Ragnall. There is a 6.1km route westwards along a 'C' classified road to the A6075 past the Tuxford Academy but this has a low bridge height limit of 4m. The A1 is 7.9km south of the site entrance along a 'C' classified road; however this route takes vehicles through the villages of Grassthorpe, Sutton on Trent and Carlton on Trent; including a narrow bridge over Grassthorpe Beck which is susceptible to regular flooding. The only large settlement within 5 miles of the site is Tuxford, otherwise Retford is around 10 miles away, none of the villages within this part of Bassetlaw provide any sizeable populations; as such it is poorly related to locations where people will live.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Marnham Energy Hub		<p>11. The Bassetlaw Economic Needs Assessment discounts sites at Markham Moor which are significantly closer to Tuxford and Retford for being: "some distance from nearby labour supply." The proposed allocation is even more remote from the local labour force. 12. The site cannot be reached by public transport, the nearest bus stop is at Gracefield Lane in Normanton on Trent some 1.7km from the site access and some 2.5km from the centre of the site. This bus stop is only served by the 37A service which provides a school time service only to/from Newark; the 40 service which provides a school time service only to/from Tuxford; and the 339 infrequent daytime service which only links to Tuxford and South Muskham. This latter service does not run at peak hours so is unsuitable for most employment uses.13. The site is not within walking and cycling distance of local settlements where any sizeable amount of housing exists. As such employment on this site would be entirely dependent upon the use of private vehicles for employees and the use of HGVs or vans for deliveries etc. 14. The proposed allocation therefore does not reflect the spatial strategy, and undermines the attempts of the spatial strategy to achieve the most sustainable pattern of growth. The Local Plan claims that the focus will be on developing land for major new employment uses in sustainable locations. The proposed High Marnham allocation is in an unsustainable location. The Local Plan through Policy ST7 does not propose any measures to improve the accessibility of the site by sustainable modes of transport. 15. The site could be regenerated as a renewable energy generation hub without the need to locate B1, B2 or B8 businesses. It could also operate for rail related purposes with a short connection to the existing Rail Test Track. 16. Previously promoted large scale sites in similar remote locations such as the former Bevercotes Colliery (Vertical Park promoted by Gladman) have not attracted any interest and remain vacant. This site despite previously having planning permission appears not to have even been assessed in the Bassetlaw Economic Needs Assessment. The site will offer employment but in a location the evidence says is remote from the labour supply as such the economy and skills criterion is over scored. We consider that the proposal has a 'mixture of positive and negative effects'.19. In terms of accessibility to public transport the SA incorrectly says that part of the site is within 400m of a bus stop. As identified earlier the nearest bus stop is at Gracefield Lane in Normanton on Trent some 1.7km from the site access and some 2.5km from the centre of the site. This bus stop is only served by school and infrequent daytime services which are unsuited to employee use. As such transport will have a 'significant negative' effect. 20. In terms of climate change although the site is proposed to generate renewable energy, as an employment location the site is not accessible by public transport or other sustainable means of transport. It will be wholly reliant upon use of the private car and HGVs as such as a location it will result in transport movements that contributes to harm to climate change. Consequently we consider that the proposal has a 'mixture of positive and negative effects'. 21. In terms of landscape the site is prominent being in the Trent valley, it is particularly prominent from South and North Clifton to the east; as well as from High Marnham and Fledborough. The site is highly visible from the National Cycle Route 647 and the Fledborough viaduct over the River Trent. The policy sets out no specific mitigation measures for mitigation from all of these viewpoints as such the allocation would have a 'negative' effect on the landscape. Conclusion 22. Consequently the proposed allocation would fail the tests of soundness as explained earlier and it would not constitute sustainable development. Change Requested23. Delete the proposed site EM007: High Marnham Energy Hub for employment.</p>	The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny
REF193	Resident	Policy ST7 page 57 This is to be supported and encouraged with whatever means the LPA have at their disposal.	Thank you for your comment
REF198	Consultant		

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Manrham Energy Hub			
REF201	Severn Trent	<p>Whilst Severn Trent is supportive of the general principles and the inclusion bullet point 3.c) “the protection of water quality of the River Trent;” the plan does not provide any mention of the drainage hierarchy. The site is situated adjacent to the River Trent therefore the need to connect surface water to the foul sewers should not be required, this is a key element of ensuring that the development is sustainable and resilient to the future impacts of climate change etc. Recommended wording for the considerations are covered under our response to the Bassetlaw Garden Village.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>
REF203	Residential	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this development. I would like to begin by endorsing all the comments made by the previous correspondents. It seems natural to exploit the assets which this site already has.1. Because of the electrical apparatus left behind by the Power Station, it would be easy to adapt the area for a Solar Farm and Large Scale Electrical Battery Storage when that Technology becomes available. 2. At the same time, the cycle way along the disused railway line and the adjacent woodland [Area C] could be enhanced as a local amenity in a manner like the Monsel Trail in the Derbyshire Peak District. At present, there is limited access with extremely poor signage and no publicity about this facility. There is no car park and a very hazardous road to cross. This could be combined with the Common Land [Area E] as a Park for walking,cycling and horse riding ; I am aware that the area along the River Trent is already in use as a Water Ski and boating area.3. Nevertheless, I feel that I should draw your attention to the potential Health Risk emanating from the site of the old Ash Plant Site and the disturbance of that site. There is a body of Medical Evidence about the Risks to Human Health from Coal Ash and the need for its safe disposal.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Marnham Energy Hub		<p>Strategic Highways</p> <p>Part C, 2, a), (i) The A57 junction improvement should be secured as part of the development rather than by way of a contribution. Part C,2. A fourth bullet point is needed to address pedestrians, cycling, and public transport.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>
REF222	Notts CC		
1196681	Resident	<p>The proposals for developing this site at the former High Marnham Power Station are commendable with its aim of producing a low carbon economy. However the source of the energy that would be produced is not specified and the implication is that materials would be brought from elsewhere, therefore increasing the commercial traffic on routes that are unsuitable, being narrow and winding. This site would only be viable if there was a dedicated new access direct to the A1 which did not impact on small rural settlements, north and south, reducing the their quality of life. Improving the junction of the A57/ and Main St, Ragnall is not the answer.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Manrham Energy Hub			
REF237	Resident	<p>Why would you rob local residents of the chance to protect themselves? By enshrining into policy a plan for this site that includes so many elements. Solar Low Carbon Energy Production B1 B2 & B8 You give "the prompter" a free pass, to burn, build, transport, disturb, and disrupt the lives of local people. If the scheme is off such merit "the prompter" should be invited to submit an application for planning permission which can be scrutinised, discussed and debated by elected officials with the welfare of their electorate at heart. It should not be the role of the council to further the commercial interests of one company. Locally it is believed that the prompter is J G Pears – a company who are reviled for their lack of care and consideration for their neighbours. Pears applied in 2015 to build a CHP plant, burning chicken litter, at their exiting site at Low Marham. The application was denied permission by Bassettlaw; the subject of a planning appeal and eventually submitted to the Secretary of State for a decision. At the time local people were horrified and galvanized into campaigning against the plant. Subsequent planning applications, including a recent one at the High Marnham site, also attracted objections. This proposal makes reference to "Low Carbon Energy Generation" – yet the fuel isn't stipulated. Whatever the fuel, it will be trucked to site – along road described in your own research as unsuitable in trucks burning diesel. We are not comforted by the promise of a Transport Assessment as statutory consultees only ever consider the application before them and not the cumulative impact caused by a now sprawling industrial plant in the heart of the countryside. 330 vehicles passed our home in a 24 hours period one day last week, 114 of these were HGVs. The site is lovely. It's been allowed to re-wild since the demolition of the power station. The deciduous avenue of mature trees along the drive on the site is such a joy and rare in this intensively farmed area. Surely a range of housing would be a better use of this site. I urge you not to rob us of the ability to protect ourselves.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>
REF254	Resident	<p>Generally supportive. We are in favour of environmentally friendly and sustainable development. If this site has to be developed at all, we applaud the Council for identifying these type of activities as suitable. Some specific comments: 1. Must avoid diluting the ambition by granting any type of heavy/polluting industrial usage on the site. The reference to the type of businesses using the green energy production should be clarified to make it clear what type of business is being referred to. 2. The plans must be sensitive to the limited local infrastructure, including narrow country roads. Local concern about increased traffic are valid. Can the site be encouraged to have some local amenities? 3. Council should consider independent advice and/or verification of the green credentials - eg from an appropriate NGO.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Manrham Energy Hub		We'd like to see a bullet point added under section 1 'Good Quality Design and Local Character' which clearly states the requirement for 'the comprehensive remediation of any contaminated land in accordance with relevant environmental standards'. We feel that this change is necessary given the current and historic use of the site.	The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny
REF258	Environment Agency		
REF263	Resident	<p>My comments will focus on: the proposed Energy Hub at High Marnham; the impact of the Cottam housing development traffic; Energy Hub traffic within our parishes and I believe, a couple of errors in the plan. Energy Hub Recognise it is necessary to attach a planning framework to this site in order to control planning applications, but this site offers so much more. It is a terrific opportunity for BDC to do something really positive in an area that feels both forgotten and let down by Bassetlaw, particularly with the history of handling of JGPears. The east side of Bassetlaw has very little in the way of public amenities: following your green energy theme, you could make the site a wildlife sanctuary with a car park for those wishing to walk the area and for those wishing to walk/cycle the wildlife corridor which runs adjacent to the site. There could also be another car park at the river side to allow public access to the River Trent. The only other parking currently available is for fishermen at Dunham Bridge (approx. 5 cars) and 4/5 miles away. One suggestion could be to broaden your horizons and consider an Energy Village not just an Energy Hub. By doing this you could incorporate both housing, employment and leisure activities. Referring to the current plan for the site it strikes odd that you place an industrial site right next to the wildlife corridor identified in the plan. Surely there should be a green buffer belt running the length of the track to allow the wildlife to flourish? There would then be a green 'circle' around any 'hard' development in the centre of the site. Then the current industrial area identified on the map (blue) wouldn't be under water as it is now, plus it would 'hide' the uglier developments of industry. However the involvement of Pears with the site strikes a worrying and fearful note in the hearts of local residents. Sadly we have suffered for years with this company. The headings in your proposal of* Low carbon energy production and storage creating an energy hub plus*Energy efficient business uses plus*Energy intensive land uses harnessing power and heat from the energy hub Sounds like heaven for Pears - through their actions and their representatives have shown an arrogance borne from confidence that whatever they apply for will be granted, regardless of the cost to the local surrounding communities. What a stitch up! It is so vague as to allow any kind of development so long as it taps into the energy hub. This must be tightened up so as to stop a) anymore Pears/odorous businesses developing and b) more heavy traffic related to these businesses. The best energy hub for the local residents would be to have solar panels and battery storage. This would not add smell, dust, light, glare, noise or emissions pollution to the area nor significant traffic to an unclassified road. Marnham is a Key Council Plan priority however the Draft Local Plan doesn't even list Ragnall crossroads, a junction that will be significantly impacted by this development, as part of Bassetlaw Infrastructure Delivery Plan ST49. There are 12 projects listed, yet not one of them supporting this Key priority and there have been two fatalities at these crossroads in the</p>	The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07	High Marnham Energy Hub	<p>last 3 years. Bassetlaw DC appear to have looked at a site and only at the site. Marnham on the face of it, offers a brownfield development but that's as far as it goes. As you are aware, the land is contaminated and may have landfill, has sand/gravel/limestone on site, is within 100 metres of a wildlife site, some distance from local services, and has part of the site in Flood zone 3 and 2. It is in a rural setting, served by an unclassified road where traffic going north would travel through four small agricultural hamlets. Traffic going south would pass through Grassthorpe and have to cross the completely unsuitable bridge. Not the best place for a significant Energy Hub without meaningful changes to the proposals outlined in the Draft Plan. West Burton power station site served by the close proximity of an A road offers a far safer, more acceptable and more economical solution to an Energy Hub centre. The site has direct connection to the national electricity grid from the high voltage electricity infrastructure on site.</p>	
REF263	Resident	<p>Traffic in Dunham, Ragnall, Darlton and Fledborough will suffer badly with additional traffic based on the Large Rural Development at Cottam and the Energy Hub. The unclassified road running north/south at the crossroads is already used as a rat run to the A1. Large agricultural vehicles have to use this road to access farms and as already expressed, we have the added heavy goods vehicles associated with JG Pears. Over 110 lorries used the road in one day during the 'quiet' month of February. Parts of Dunham, Fledborough and particularly Ragnall villages already experience high heavy goods traffic 24/7. The B8 designation of the site encourages distribution so more traffic: this has got to be limited or better still eliminated. If the Energy Hub was to be developed then there should be a new road built avoiding Ragnall where a relatively recent death occurred on the bend. At the bend, most traffic crosses on to the wrong side of the road, especially lorries. What is needed is the creation of a safe junction whereby traffic can enter and exit the A57 and avoid this hamlet altogether. In other words a new road that would reflect the value of investment and high profile Bassetlaw are giving this Marnham site. And this new road would have to be built before the site was developed. The villages of both Darlton and Dunham would experience increased traffic from the site, and worryingly traffic going directly north would pass the already mentioned local village school. Traffic going due east and west has already been mentioned in relation to Cottam. Very worrying times for our communities.</p>	<p>The allocation of High Marnham for renewable energy and employment development makes a sensible use for a former power producing site. The development of the site will be controlled through the preparation of a Local Development Order. The impact of traffic from the site will be assessed through the preparation of the masterplan when the type, use and level of proposed development has been agreed. NCC Highways will also be a stakeholder in the preparation of the masterplan.</p>
REF273	Anglian Water	<p>Policy ST7: Site EM007: High Marnham Energy Hub Policy ST7 as drafted cross refers to employment proposals on the above site meeting the water efficiency standards specified in Policy ST45 of the Draft Plan. Policy ST45 of the Draft plan states that development proposals should meet the optional higher water efficiency standard and water re-use measures should be included in development proposals wherever possible. However the water efficiency standard relates to residential development proposals as such it is unclear what standard for water efficiency is being sought. Consideration should be given to setting out a specific standard e.g. BREEAM for employment proposals in Policy ST45. In addition reference could be made to an integrated approach to water management as suggested for the Bassetlaw Garden Village policy.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Marnham Energy Hub			
REF282	National Trust	<p>National Trust supports in principal the concept of redeveloping the former High Marnham Power Station to create a green energy hub, bearing in mind its existing grid connections and contaminated status. However, this is subject to the development being of an appropriate scale in order to keep impacts on the neighbouring hamlet, road network, landscape, heritage and the River Trent within acceptable limits. Bearing in mind the relative isolation of the site, and depending on whether any green travel arrangements can be secured, it may be appropriate to restrict the size of the 'business area' as B1 type office use is typically high employment density and is generally more suited to urban areas. Part 1(b) of the policy states that the scheme should not result in an increase in flood risk to this site or land elsewhere. As parts of the site are within Flood Zone 3 it may be appropriate to go further and explore whether there is any opportunity to incorporate flood betterment, helping to alleviate flood risk elsewhere on the River Trent corridor. Part 3 of the policy refers to protection of a Local Wildlife Site and a landscaping scheme to avoid significant adverse effects. However, there is a clear opportunity for this to be an aspirational scheme and to deliver biodiversity net gain.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>
REF283	Resident	<p>ST7 56 6.2.8 Although junction improvements on the A57 at Dunham crossroads are anticipated, no account is taken of the impact on the inadequate road through Ragnall village. An alternative would be to extend northwards the existing HGV route to the nearby JG Pears plant at Low Marnham, which would avoid disturbing any other communities.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Manrham Energy Hub		<p>It is stated that development of this site will 'be sensitive to the Fledborough to Harby Local Wildlife Site on the site which should remain outside the developable area, as well as the adjoining Old Trent Local Wildlife Site. Their nature conservation interests must be preserved during and post-construction.' Local Wildlife Sites are afforded protection due to their substantive nature conservation value. Their selection takes into consideration the most important, distinctive and threatened species and habitats within a national, regional and local context, making them some of our most valuable urban and rural wildlife areas. We are of the opinion that it is not sufficient to just protect the LWS. We advocate significant buffering to enhance its wildlife value. Planning application 19/00818/FUL was accompanied by a Preliminary Ecological Assessment (BSG ecology 2019). Section 4.5 states 'the wider survey area (former power station site) has potential to meet the criteria for open mosaic habitat on previously developed land (OMH)'. This is a Habitat of Principal Importance under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006. Section 41 of The Act requires the Secretary of State to publish and maintain lists of species and types of habitats which are regarded by Natural England to be of "principal importance" for the purposes of conserving biodiversity in England. Section 4.6 states 'The site itself shows limited spatial variability, mainly supporting ephemeral short perennial vegetation / sparsely vegetated bare ground and hard standing. It is not assessed to form a particularly important area of habitat given the abundance of this type of habitat within the context of the former power station site; however, it does form part of the wider OMH habitat component'. It is recognised therefore, that development of this site will result in a net loss in the extent of this habitat. Any development of the site would need to consider and evaluate the OMH habitat.</p> <p>The associated landscaping schemes of the proposed development should use native species, preferably of local provenance, and create/restore habitats found within the Trent corridor, especially habitats that are a priority in the Local Biodiversity Action Plan.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>
REF293	The Wildlife Trust	We welcome section 3 of the policy wording which protects ecological interests and makes provision of a multi-functional green infrastructure network.	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>
REF300 -	Natural England		<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Marnham Energy Hub		<p>1. As a member of the local community, I feel that that any buildings / development in the proposed Energy Hub are not merely hidden behind a green area, but utilise the latest environmentally and eco friendly building design and material availability to ensure once completed the Energy Hub does not detract from the visual appeal of the rural area in which the communities are situated and which for many community members is the reason for living in the area. Any buildings should not breach the height of the proposed Zone E area as per point 4 below and should be kept to a minimum of 4 storeys tall, for all planned or future buildings. 2. Any proposed business operation should not be granted permission to neither draw water from or discharge effluent into the adjacent River Trent. 3. The area designated as Zone C in figure 12 below is designated for use by Energy Intensive Land Uses harnessing power and heat from the energy hub,</p> <p>Zone C however; 3.1. Includes the Local Wildlife site (ST36) as indicated in the figure below and with reference to and taking into account Policy ST34, point 6.266 of the Sustainability Appraisal Report for the Bassetlaw Local Plan ; My concern is that, although mentioned to the contrary in 6.2.9, unless clearly stipulated in the plan, if allowed, Zone C would effectively be allowed to override the Local Wildlife Site designation and therefore destroy the Local Wildlife Site, which is an area that is home to many animal, bird and wildlife species that were not present whilst the High Marnham Power Station was in operation.</p> <p>3.2. Is positioned directly alongside the well utilised Fledborough to Harby disused Railway Line, a Zone C area would discourage the community from utilising the from the disused railway line, in this regard and with reference to and taking into account Policy ST34, points 6.265 and 6.267 and ST35, point 6.272 of the Sustainability Appraisal Report for the Bassetlaw Local Plan, at the minimum the area of the designated Local Wildlife Site should be extended from it's current width and length to a minimum width of 100m / 330 ft and a length that includes the entire length of the proposed High Marnham Energy Hub situated alongside the Fledborough to Harby disused Railway line. This is indicated in the figure below. 4. In addition to the extension of the Local Wildlife Site, there should be an area designated to Zone E between the proposed Extension and Zone C and around the perimeter of the site as indicated below 5. Further thought needs to be given to the inclusion of a carpark in the proposed Hub for the users of the Disused Railway Line, there are residents in the surrounding communities who do not use the line as a result of poor parking availability and the associated dangers of parking vehicles on a main road. 6. As a result of existing heavy industry close to Low Marnham the volume of heavy traffic heavy traffic along the Fledborough road is already a safety and noise concern and risk to local residents utilising the access roads to High Marnham, Low Marnham and Normanton on Trent, therefore access to the High Marnham Energy Hub should be limited to the existing road utilised to access the High Voltage Yard and should not be allowed to positioned further along the road towards High Marnham (see figure below), 7. All buildings and business operations should at the very least be required to be Zero Net Energy Users and preferably produce an excess amount of energy from there operations. Further due consideration could be given to ensuring that the Energy Hub is a net energy generator, meaning that the sum of the energy balance equation of all existing and new/proposed businesses need to ensure that the Energy Hub does not draw energy from the National Grid in any way, but that the Energy Hub is self-supportive as far as energy is concerned. 8. There is already low use activity on the site and the exact classification of this usage is not known in terms of the development zonal classification (Zone A – Zone E) as found in section 6.2.5. or in terms of Economic Use classification B1, B2 or B8 as detailed in Policy ST7. Any potential development in this area will need to assess current activity on the site to ensure adherence to the classifications mentioned above. 9. The Hub needs to be designated as a zero emissions site for waste, noise and smells.</p> <p>10. To align to policy ST41 and ST 42, particularly referencing Sustainability Appraisal Report for the Bassetlaw Local Plan points 6.289 and 6.294, an area could be developed for use by Scout, Cub and Brownie packs operating out of Normanton on Trent and other Bassetlaw villages close to the Hub, for example a scout activity ground, a permanent headquarters for meetings, activities and equipment</p>	The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny
REF322	Resident		

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07	High Manrham Energy Hub	<p>storage. Potential could also be explored for allowing access to the River Trent via the Hub for water activities for these groups. Local Schools could also benefit from such a youth-based activity area. (Depicted in Figure Below).</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Marnham Energy Hub REF323	Emery Planning on behalf of J G Pears	<p>.1.4 The site is a major previously developed site with a lawful use for employment purposes. Planning permission was recently granted at the site for erection of a storage building (application reference: 19/00818/FUL).1.5 Emery Planning previously made representations on behalf of our clients to the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Plan for the period 2018 to 2035 promoting the site as a major previously developed site with potential to be developed for employment purposes.1.6 Since this time various correspondence and meetings with the planning policy team has culminated in the allocation of our client's land interest under Policy ST7 - High Marnham Energy Hub. We welcome this allocation and look forward to working with the LPA to secure delivery of this site. We are also in communication with the land owners, E-on, who have advised they are also supportive of the allocation and will be making separate representations to that effect. This joint commitment to the delivery of the site as allocated serves to provide certainty that it can be delivered and assist the Council in meeting its aims and objectives as set out through the Plan.1.7 Having reviewed the document as a whole, together with the supporting evidence base, we would like to support the strategy put forward and welcome the Draft Plan which plans positively and proactively for the future of the District to ensure the delivery of sustainable development.1.8 In our view, the Plan as presented is fundamentally sound and provides clear and evidenced justification for the strategies and objectives included which are consistent with national policy, particularly with regard to the reuse of previously developed land and the transition to a lowcarbon future.1.9 Notwithstanding the above, we reserve the right to make further representations, including oral representations to the Examination in Public, if so required. 2.12 Paragraph 6.2.1 of the Plan highlights that "Supporting its [Former High Marnham Power Station] comprehensive redevelopment is a Local Plan objective and a key Council Plan priority" this is welcomed and supported by both our clients, who have a leasehold and option interest in the site, and the land owners, E-on. E-on's representatives at Cushman & Wakefield have written separately in support of the site's inclusion as an allocation in the Plan. This joint support of the allocation helps to provide certainty as to its future delivery. 2.13 The allocation of this site is in line with the NPPF's encouragement of LPA's to identify suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy sources and supporting infrastructure, where this would help secure their development (NPPF, paragraph 151)</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Marnham Energy Hub		<p>. 2.14 We would support the comment that the site provides a unique opportunity to support this expanding market given its optimal location: with direct connection to the national electricity grid from the high voltage electricity infrastructure that remains on site. This is further supported by J G Pears own direct grid connection from their nearby combined heat and energy (CHP) plant at Low Marnham, which currently inputs surplus energy into the grid, but could potentially be harnessed directly by future development on this site. 2.15 The allocation also serves to meet a priority of the D2N2 Strategic Economic Plan and emerging Local Industrial Strategy. 2.16 At paragraph 6.2.5 we would suggest that the word 'only' in the first sentence "... employment uses in the renewable and low carbon sector only, such as battery and data storage, and associated power generation" is superfluous and should be removed – the aims of the policy are clear and any development proposals would need to demonstrate their low carbon/renewable credentials as part of any planning submission. Likewise, we would suggest the requirement for proposals to be 'fully compliant' in the second sentence "Proposals must also be fully compliant with the principles and zoning set out in the masterplan framework for the site" is unnecessarily restrictive as there would be no harm arising if uses compliant with the aims of the policy were to come forward within the previously developed part of the site but outside of the 'zone' locations identified in figure 12. In such a case each application should be considered on its own merits in accord with the relevant material considerations. 2.17 The reference made at paragraph 6.2.10 with regard to integration of proposed development into the wider landscape is noted and initial landscape work undertaken on behalf of J G Pears by Randle Thorp, Landscape Architects, has concluded that the site as a whole is very well screened from the wider landscape with only very limited views into it. For information a photograph of the site with operational and historic and present aerial photographs, together with a copy of the photographic study of the site and local area prepared in support of the recent planning application for the storage building is provided at Appendix EP1 and EP2. 2.18 Given the scale of the site as a whole it is considered opportunities for biodiversity net gain will be able to be harnessed in line with local and national policy requirements at the time of any application. 2.19 The requirement for a project level Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) screening to determine potential impacts on the Sherwood Forest ppSPA is noted. As is, the requirement for developers of the site to contribute to necessary infrastructure works. At present these are considered likely to be primarily limited to road improvements at the A57 junction at Dunham on Trent crossroads and possible water supply improvements. However, it is noted there is an established mechanism for developers under the Water Industry Act 1991 to pay Anglian Water directly to supply water to their site. 2.20 The inclusion of the Former High Marnham Power Station site as a strategic employment allocation is strongly supported by both J G Pears as lease and option holder and E-on as landowner. This is a major previously developed site and we welcome the recognition of the LPA that its development would be in full accord with the aims of the NPPF to make best use of land and deliver sustainable development. 2.21 The overall positive approach to the delivery of the site for employment purposes within this and the next plan period, is welcomed and it is considered that J G Pears is well placed to support the initial development of the site as specified for uses within the renewable energy and low carbon sector.</p> <p>2.22 The requirement of the policy for a comprehensive masterplan to be produced is noted and supported. However, it is also important to acknowledge that the timing of production of such a masterplan, indeed, also the timing of adoption of this Local Plan, should not prohibit planning applications which are compliant with the principles of the Policy and overall objectives of the Plan coming forward on this brownfield site prior to adoption.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Marnham Energy Hub		<p>ContextUniper own and operate the Cottam Development Centre (CDC), a combined cycle gas turbine centre power station with a generating capacity of 435MW. The site extends to 7.2 hectares and adjoins the former coal fired power station operated by EDF. A red line plan showing the extent of the Uniper site is attached for your information. The CDC will remain operational for the life of the Local Plan (2037) and beyond. Uniper made a significant investment in the CDC site in 2017 and continues to make significant investments in the UK. Uniper has recently won several contracts in the UK to help decarbonise the National Grid. It is, therefore, of key importance to Uniper that Policy ST5 does not allow development on the former Cottam Power Station site (owned by EDF) that could restrict existing operations at CDC or prevent further Uniper investment in the site. Uniper is broadly supportive of policy ST5 in principle, as the regeneration of the area is a sound policy approach. However, it is critical that existing site constraints and opportunities are taken into account in drafting this strategic site policy in order to ensure it is deliverable. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CDC is served by a gas pipeline that runs across the former Cottam Power Station allocation site. • Uniper has a water abstraction and discharge permit to the River Trent which is routed through the EDF Site with associated easement rights. • Uniper has access to the dock for unloading of abnormal loads and subsequent access rights for transport through the EDF site. • Uniper will continue to discharge surface water through the EDF site. • The CDC has connections to the 400KV National Grid sub-station. • Uniper has access rights to the Cottam Power Station site for access, operation and maintenance purposes. • Uniper has rights to lay conducting media and HV cabling across the EDF site. • During major outages between 400 and 500 employees can be present on the CDC site. • The CDC requires 24 hour working and permissions (including environmental permits) allow essential operations, which must be taken into account when planning to introduce sensitive uses (e.g. residential) within the area covered by Policy ST5. Uniper is committed to working collaboratively with Bassetlaw District Council, EDF and other partners to assist in the drafting of the policy and subsequent masterplan. The CDC provides an opportunity to support the redevelopment of the former Cottam Power Station site. For example, the provision of power, steam and chilled water, or district heating schemes on the site. 	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>
REF324	UNIPER	E.ON is the freehold owner of the site at High Marnham and previously operated former Coal fired Power Station prior to the station's closure and demolition. The extent of E.ON's ownership covers the entire policy area as outlined in figure 11 on the draft Local Plan. E.ON granted a lease and option to acquire the acquire the site freehold in September 2018 to JG Pears in order for this significant brownfield site to be brought forward for redevelopment. E.ON is supportive of policy ST7 in principle, as the regeneration of the site is a sound policy approach and E.ON is committed to supporting the delivery of the planned development. In order to provide clarity on the delivery of the policy, E.ON recommends that the comprehensive Masterplan is required to be submitted with the first planning application for the redevelopment of the site. E.ON is committed to working collaboratively with Bassetlaw District Council and other partners to assist in the delivery of the policy.	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>
REF328	E.ON		

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Marnham Energy Hub			
REF354	Sutton-on-Trent Parish Council	<p>The Parish Council is reassured to note that the draft plan for the site at the former High Marnham Power Station does not include a proposal for the 1,500 dwellings it is believed the site has the capacity for. Instead an Energy Hub is proposed which, whilst it would not generate the large number of additional cars accessing the site through Sutton on Trent that a residential development would, it is believed the volume of heavy traffic and lorries would increase to a level that is unsustainable with the existing road network and unacceptable to the small rural communities through which they would travel. Similar arguments apply to the High Marnham site regarding the road network as already mentioned above for the proposed Cottam development. Policy ST7 states that a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan for High Marnham would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) 'Contributions towards improvements to the A57 junction at Dunham on Trent/Ragnall crossroads; and ii) That vehicular traffic generated by the development, including lorry movements can be safely accommodated'. Whilst the Parish Council commends the plan for proposing to include improvements at the A57 crossroads at Ragnall, it is of the opinion that the additional levels of traffic generated by the development at High Marnham cannot be safely accommodated by the existing and already overstretched road through the villages of Ragnall, Fledborough, Grassthorpe and Sutton on Trent. Sutton on Trent Parish Council would welcome the opportunity to further discuss the proposals included in the draft plan and I understand that another meeting with the Parish Councils impacted by these two developments is to be arranged within the next few weeks. I look forward to receiving details of this meeting. 	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>
REF355	Dunham-on-Trent with Ragnall, Darlton and Fledborough Parish Council	<p>This Parish Council feels that the current proposals could be more ambitious and innovative, particularly around the development of the High Marnham site in relation to social, environmental and some economic needs of the eastern side of the District. This could also bring benefits to the adjoining district of Newark and Sherwood. The site has not been identified for housing due to the infrastructure, most notable the highway network and there is little opportunity for any improvements to be made to take any additional traffic. It does therefore seem a little peculiar that business development for the site is being considered, including B8 which is storage and distribution. If the roads are unsuitable to take additional cars, it is not clear how the road are suitable to take additional lorries. There are currently locations where the road is not sufficiently wide for 2 cars to pass each other and significant damage is therefore being done to the existing road network with the existing lorry usage of the roads, additional lorries will simply exacerbate this situation. The District Council has sufficient land allocated for business use in the draft plan without the need for any business use on this site and should therefore remove this allocation from this site which is clearly better suited to other uses. The proposals that the Parish Council would like to put forward for the site, it is believed would be welcomed by everyone as it could address material planning considerations for future proposals in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Design and visual impact ➢ Noise, smell, pollution ➢ Access / traffic ➢ Health / Health and Safety ➢ Ecology, landscape ➢ Economic impact ➢ Cumulative impact <p>Whilst the foreword of the document states "This Plan promotes an innovative green agenda helping the District better adapt to the impact of climate change. Significant new tree planting, new wildlife habitats and a unique Energy Hub at the Former High Marnham Power Station site will put the District on the map in terms of renewable and low carbon technology development. This Plan places a new emphasis on healthy, green places, where high quality design will protect the fabric of our heritage and distinctive villages and promote the sense of place that helps communities to thrive." The Parish Council believes that further and more ambitious options should be considered as part of this plan development. Site EM007: High Marnham Energy Hub Whilst the site is predominantly brown field (in planning terms) as it has previously been developed, since the power station ceased production in 2003 there is now a significant wildlife presence and a wildlife corridor has been established on the site. The site is in flood zone 2 and 3 and some of the site where the old coal tips were, has formed natural lakes which provides excellent wildlife habitats which should be further enhanced in these plans. There is currently little tourism attraction in the locality in the east of the District, although there is significant evidence from other wildlife sites, both nationally and locally that this could easily be built up in the area,</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07	High Manrham Energy Hub	<p>providing significant health and ecological benefits for everyone to enjoy. This is particularly evident with the increase in cycle use across the country and this site could link very easily to the existing cycle infrastructure across the Fledborough viaduct and onto Lincoln or Newark. The route to Newark is currently being enhanced through the construction of the Trent Vale Trail which would provide an off-road route between Fledborough and Newark in addition to the off-road route already in place to Lincoln. This provides a great family day out in the fresh air and countryside at minimal cost for both cyclists and walkers as well as those with impaired mobility and horse riders. The provision of such a facility would also bring economic benefit as this could facilitate the provision of a café for refreshments, cycle hire etc. providing local jobs for local people, without the need to travel significant distances. This could also help with the District Council goal to "promote the sense of place that helps communities to thrive". In providing enhanced cycle provision for the area, a suitably designed car park could be considered which would remove the need for inappropriate and dangerous parking which currently takes place on the highway at the end of the current off road section at the Fledborough Station House. The site has a distinctive heritage being a former power station which may include a heritage center as part of its redevelopment which could help "protect the fabric of our heritage". It would also be possible to link the sites agricultural past with possible education/research facilities and/or tourism</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Manrham Energy Hub		<p>The boundary of the site is adjacent to Fledborough, which currently boasts of "dark skies" which provides an excellent habitat for wildlife, but also provides a rare opportunity for those who might want to learn about and enjoy the dark and the stars you can see as a result. This could mean getting out for an activity such as cycling, walking, or running at night, attending a stargazing party, or taking part in a daytime event, learning more about star constellations or making a rocket. These opportunities are rare and should not be overlooked as part of the proposed redevelopment of the site for the Local Plan period including the health, wellbeing and economic benefits for the area that such a facility could provide for generations to come. The Parish Council is not averse to the use of the site for energy generation of cleangreen energy (up to 50 megawatts) but believe that the currently proposed zoning should be considerably reviewed to include the above ideas for social and economic benefit. In summary for this (the High Manrham) site the Parish Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • do not wish to see further employment land or distribution (B1, B2, B8) nor does it wish to see housing, both of which would be detrimental to the already fragile and unsuitable highway network which would provide the access routes. • Is extremely supportive of the Draft Local Plan policies around Tourism, Health, Heritage and green spaces, which would bring significant benefit to the area which "is next to the 50% most deprived neighbourhoods in the country". • Would accept if suitably designed, energy production of such a type which would not have any detrimental impact on the noise, landscape of the surrounding area, which has a rural nature and significant wildlife habitats which must be preserved. <p>With regard to other items contained within the Draft Local Plan: The proposed development of the former Cottam Power Station site for housing development. Some of this development is proposed for this plan period with further expansion for future local plan period. The development of this site is likely to have a significant impact on the A57 Dunham Crossroads. Whilst it is understood that there has been no traffic impact assessment undertaken as yet, the site does have a serious/fatal accident history and any additional traffic wishing to access the site will inevitably be using this junction for access. Consideration will therefore need to be given to the improvement of the junction in the rural location, where the provision of traffic signals would be inappropriate due to the significant visual impact on the surrounding landscape. It should be noted that Laneham Road already has a speeding problem and parking issues relating to the primary school located on it. A significant increase in vehicles as might be expected from a development of the size proposed, needs to be mindful of the risks that an increase of vehicle flow of this nature is likely to have on this local amenity and be mindful of the mitigation required in order not to exacerbate the existing problems. With regard to the future housing allocations of 39 new homes for Dunham on Trent. The Parish Council would like to see this number significantly reduced, if not removed completely, as it is not clear why so many additional houses are required or where they would be located. There are currently empty homes in the village showing that there doesn't appear to be a need for any additional housing. The current facilities are very limited for such a potential increase with the primary school being currently full, there is no shop, there is no public transport (other than "on demand" by phone) and the nearest doctors is in Tuxford for which the capacity is uncertain as it is removed from the parishes. In addition to the lack of facilities, much of the parish is in flood zone 3 and therefore at the highest risk of flood, it therefore seems inappropriate for additional housing allocations to be given to this Parish. The Parish Council are looking forward to working with Bassetlaw District Council and the surrounding Parish Councils/Meeting to develop a sustainable long term vision for the Eastern side of the District and part of Newark and Sherwood, which will bring significant social and health benefits to residents to a wide area of both districts and the county.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>
REF355	Dunham-on-Trent with Ragnall, Darlton and Fledborough Parish Council		

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Manrham Energy Hub REF356	Grassthorpe Parish Meeting	<p>Re-use of the High Marnham Power Station site.</p> <p>The redevelopment of this site as a whole will have a detrimental effect on the safety and quality of life for residents and on the fabric of properties as well as the road itself between Sutton-on-Trent and Ragnall. This road already struggles to accommodate current traffic evidenced by the breakdown of the road edges and verges especially on its many bends and narrower stretches. Area C in the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan has 're-wilded' in the years since the power station was decommissioned creating a wildlife haven and an enjoyable buffer to the now well-used cycle route. This rewilding should be preserved. More trees need to be grown to offset climate change that has become more obvious over the past few years. This type of development is required by National Policy to provide net ecological gain. The cycle path is also used regularly by walkers but roadside parking is becoming a problem so the provision of a small car park adjacent to the road could alleviate this. The cycle path also links with several Sustrans long distance routes and provides cyclists with the only traffic free crossing of the River Trent between Newark and Scunthorpe. These measures would contribute to the objectives within the Bassetlaw Core Strategy for Recreation, the Natural Environment and Transport and Accessibility. Areas A and B should be dealt with sensitively so that they do not impact on the re-wilded area with noise and light pollution which would disturb fauna. Climate change is a reality which we all need to address and low carbon developments can only help if they are truly sustainable rather than just renewable eg. not involving long distance transport. The site was linked to the rail network and this link could be reinstated without much re-engineering. Any development should be required to depend on this form of access rather than road transport. Any essential road access should be by a designated access route which does not affect residential communities. Perhaps some use could be made of the river as well. Measures such as these would contribute towards the very necessary changes required to meet action for climate change.</p> <p>Historically Areas D and E have been agricultural land, distinct from the Power Station site. These areas should not be used as mitigation for development of the rest of the site. A few years ago a scheme was proposed to increase the size and scope of the Electricity Sub Station, but this was abandoned. The eastern part of this area is situated within the high flood risk zone as designated by the UK Government Website. This area should remain unprotected from flooding as part of the natural flood plain along the River Trent to help alleviate risk to riverside communities.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Marnham Energy Hub		<p>There have now been two reports that a covenant was placed when the Power Station ceased generation, it is alleged that the land had to be returned to farmland. We would please ask that this be investigated and, if proven, what effect this will have on the current situation. In principle the Parish Council (PC) fully support and endorse Green Energy production. As discussed, greater clarification of each "zone" is required and, what the permitted development within each area is? The PC welcomes a plan that controls "add hoc" planning applications; a five year plan has been requested from Pears on more than one occasion in previous years! The PC fully support a battery storage project. Low carbon generation? A nuclear power station falls into this category, which the PC would not support. Other low carbon generation needs to be assessed for the possible impact of noise, light pollution, odour from fuel sources and so on which are all of major concern, it needs to be considered the nearest residential property is only 300m from area B. "Energy efficient business use" and 450m away from area A "Low carbon energy production" Local residents don't feel Bassetlaw fully appreciate their concerns due to the fact Bassetlaw have already issued Pears a 24/7 operating licence for the "storage" facility on this site. These areas are adjacent to significant wildlife, light pollution along with noise, which all are of great concern. "Measures to ensure amenity of local communities from noise, light, glare, smell, dust, or emissions are in accordance with relevant environmental standards" From their existing site, JG Pears omit odour with continuous daily complaints, even to an extent of forcing families from their homes. Light pollution is extensive, and complaints are simply overruled by the needs of Health and Safety. Pears is high on the EA lists of sites to "closely monitor". Should I known, existing polluter, who the EA has evidence of breaches along with many complaints be allowed to propose further development so close to more residential properties? There will be better access to the countryside and an improved range of open spaces for local people to enjoy. A car park and picnic area were proposed adjacent to the cycle track, there is an old railway siding adjacent that could be used as car parking. Development in appropriate locations and in helping to protect the countryside, important green spaces and the built and natural environment from inappropriate development, thus enhancing the quality of life for people and communities. As shown with the many photographs, area "C" has been taken over by wildlife, the power generation ceased back in 2003. The PC feels that with the trees and wetlands in area "C" , this should be maintained and improved. Southern border of area "B" also has extensive tree growth. To: reduce levels of out commuting; retain employment and skills locally Any development increases this, it's a rural community with few residents that would be employed. How many local people are employed at the existing Pears site? None to our knowledge. Manual type labour is provided by Eastern European workers. More specialised tasks are not carried out by local personnel. Solar farms, battery storage, and other low carbon generation plant require very limited staff. JG Pears already demonstrate that low grade employment needs are met by foreign workers. These are facts that cannot be disputed. This is important for this Local Plan which promotes a significant amount of previously developed land for reuse. The Former High Marnham Power Station is predominately brownfield with a legacy of contamination due to its historical association with a coal fired power station and associated infrastructure. The PC fully supports reuse of previously developed sites in suitable locations, however you have extensive photographic evidence that clearly shows large areas of this site, which are classed as "brown field" have now been taken over by nature and should now be considered as "Green Field" There is work to do to improve existing infrastructure to the site and ensure impacts upon nearby communities are minimised The road network cannot sustain any additional traffic without improvement; A57 cross roads, traffic though rural communities, bridge at Grassthorpe. Unclassified small roads are simply not suitable. A development proposal of 300 houses on this site clearly identified this so how can the road network be suitable for additional HGV traffic, on size alone and not just numbers. Yes, it was an industrial site previously - the fuel, Coal, came in by rail, and the finished product went out on overhead wires. Hence there was little impact on the road network.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>
REF357	Normanton on Trent Parish Council		

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Marnham Energy Hub		<p>Compared to the size of the site (Power Station) very few people were employed to run / operate the business. g) A suitable lighting scheme that minimises light pollution to the surrounding communities and biodiversity; h) Measures to ensure amenity of local communities from noise, light, glare, smell, dust, or emissions are in accordance with relevant environmental standards. The site promoter, PEARS, I think I can say without any issues there is historical evidence of all the above standards / regulations being breached. EA have evidence, CAR's reports, of breaches being made, failures of odour abatement, the list is endless. 32 miles by car, 38 miles HGV route is not in our opinion "close proximity to the M1" 6.3.5 Market interest also reinforces the policy approach. There is a growing demand for transport and distribution in the District: DHL are developing 50,005sqm of distribution floorspace on the A57, close to the A1 Why is this comment made? These distribution centres are approx. 3 miles away from the A1, an "A" class road with no residential property links them directly to the A1. The complete opposite to the Marnham and Cottam sites. This Plan places a new emphasis on healthy, green places, where high quality design will protect the fabric of our heritage and distinctive villages and promote the sense of place that helps communities to thrive. From the meeting, I believe you have gauged the feeling of the community towards J G Pears and how their existing site completely goes against the above statement. Families with children have been forced to leave the community due to Pears' activities, and local business suffers (Fishing lake) due to offensive odour. Detrimental impact on our local schools and community.</p> <p>It was also discussed and proposed at the meeting that green houses or similar agricultural uses should also be considered for the site using the low carbon energy. We are given to understand that EDF have carried out a study and put a business case forward not to develop a solar farm on the former Cottam site based on that fact it's not financially viable? I ask the question if this is the case, on a brown field site, why is green field (farmland) being considered at Marnham. The PC represents the community who have little / no trust in Pears. Therefore, we view this with great concern that a potential change of the application will be seen. Green fields should be maintained. In addition to this, the land proposed for Solar energy is prime agricultural land - are there not areas of poor quality land (brown field sites) which would be more suitable? We have also been made aware that a third party who wishes to develop the solar energy area have contacted at least three other landowners in the area. Clear evidence that the development is going to be considerably greater than that of the "plan" How is the local community to trust Bassetlaw to control this development, it's not even been proposed yet and the developers are pushing the boundaries?</p>	The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny
REF357	Normanton on Trent Parish Council		
REF359	South Clifton Parish Council	<p>We are in support of the area being developed, particularly in the area of Low Carbon Energy production, including solar and green energy. We are concerned that this energy production should be on site (solar and wind/ energy and data storage) and that this process does not require transport movements to the detriment of residents of the Fledborough and Ragnall villages. We would not support energy produced from burning animal bi products - oils, fats or chicken litter or anaerobic digestion due to the high number of lorry movements required to transport the substrate for this process. We do support the ethos of the plan to provide local employment particularly using heat or energy produced on the site. We are concerned about the vagueness of the 'business area' and feel there needs to be greater clarity regarding what sort of business is to be involved. At present the policy is sufficiently open to permit locally produced rendered waste to be used as a fuel. Ideally businesses on the site should be able to demonstrate that their presence will contribute to a reduction in the areas traffic and ideally be able to utilise the proximity of the Trent to receive and distribute their raw materials and products. We welcome the fact that in par 6.3.1. this site is not considered as a Strategic Employment Site. Page 57 1h - we welcome measures to protect the amenity of local communities from the listed factors but are concerned that emissions are not just in accordance with environmental standards but should set a new standard for excellence particularly in regard to any smells produced.</p>	The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Manrham Energy Hub			
REF361	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>Again if this site had not been previously developed with designation as Brown Field Land, the location would not have been attractive for industrial, commercial, devolvement. With the grid transport infrastructure the site is especially attractive as a Energy hub with production as in Zone use A and Zone use D. There are leisure opportunities and tourismn potential on this site. It is noted that a large area of agricultural land has been incorporated into the curtilage of this site to the West and South , and as this is in the middle of nowhere this idea should be rejected. Otherwise the proposed uses would cause dangers, congestion, noise, Diesel fumes along the access roads. The communities here are already complaining about the existing lorries accessing the Trentside road. A survey showed that 90% of the lorry traffic was for access. The accesses are not of a standard where the other suggested uses should be expanded here. Again unsustainable to travel miles into nowhere to do what is suggested. Much needs to be done next to a Main A road. Neither can upgrading access to make it safer and easier be justified with the proposed uses. Access through the village of Sutton on Trent and Grassthorpe is a negative. The Tuxford access has been discouraged anyway, as there is a large residential element and a school at the Tuxford end. As well as an additional primary school on the A1 exit North at Tuxford, along Newark Road. Dunham on Trent A57 crossroads junction is probably the most suitable but the Ragnall access has many bends with a considerable number of residences close to the road. Normanton Village is definitely unsuitable for travelling through and Power station traffic was always discouraged form traveling through Normanton and past the primary school. The draft report has acknowledged that the Dunham crossroads would need improvement, but exactly what. I have investigated obtaining a safety scheme for this dangerous junction and the is no money , with many more dangerous road schemes ahead of it in the queue. There is now congestion in Tuxford at rush hour and requests to reduce the heavy traffic using Tuxford for industrial commercial access, safety and air quality are the concerns already expressed. All routes are likely to be opposed on these reasons when the communities learn of the draft plan proposals.</p> <p>The remote location of this site is not justifiable on environmental and sustainability grounds</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technonly which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council beleive that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>
REF363	Resident	<p>Similarly the plan for the former High Marnham site suffers from poor highways access. Heavy lorries visiting and leaving the site would be using roads not designed to take this kind of traffic. This was noticed in the 1984 strike when the power station was supplied by lorry. O consider the site is not well connected to the type of amenities that people working in the high tech industries you envisage as a necessity.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technonly which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council beleive that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Marnham Energy Hub			
REF367	Resident	<p>We would like to bring the following to your attention. In the early 1950s when the power station was constructed - we believe that in the documents there was a clause that stated when the power station was to be decommissioned at a future date, the area would be returned to agricultural usage, as it was previously. This would obviously need some further research to check whether this was the case. If it cannot be returned to full agricultural usage (ref above point). • The brownfield site (the former power station) needs to be re-developed sympathetically and small businesses attracted to the area. However, as farmers, we are opposed to good fertile agricultural land taken up with hectares of solar panels. This land could be used to produce good tonnages of cereals/ or for mixed farming, producing goods for consumption in this country or for export. • We believe that the type of business encouraged to the hub should be carefully monitored - we do not need another huge J G Pears enterprise on our doorstep. • There is a need for a tree planting scheme along the highway(the road from Dunham-on-Trent to Sutton-on-Trent) going north to south. The plan, as it stands) has taken account of tree planting along the southern and eastern boundaries but the development will be clearly seen from the adjacent highway. • If solar panels are to be erected - are there such framework and panels that blend in with the floral and fauna, rather than dull utilitarian dismal dark grey we so often see.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>
REF368	National Grid	Asset map	Thank you for your comment
REF377	Resident	<p>We wish to express our support for the efforts of Bassetlaw DC to produce a Local Plan and SA. We believe that the Marnham Energy Hub (ST7) and the Garden Village (ST3) are excellent ideas.</p>	Thank you for your comment
REF484	North Notts and Lincs Community Rail Partnership	<p>The existing railway that reaches the site from the west is currently the Network Rail test track. NCC have plans to open the line to passenger traffic as far as Ollerton. With the development of High Marnham as an employment and energy site the line should be retained with a view to possible extension across the existing (but disused) bridge over the Trent into Lincoln. The line of route should therefore be protected. In effect it is protected as St36 a local wildlife site.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Manrham Energy Hub REF491	Consultant	<p>This is a significant employment site covering some 60 hectares. Policy EM07 with regard to High Markham Energy Hub sets out a number of criteria that must be met and Part 2 relating to Transport & Movement sets out the need for contributions to the A57/Durham on Trent/Ragnall crossing. Delivering this very large site require significant front-loaded infrastructure investment. The Council will need to be satisfied that the site is capable of being delivered and is viable. We note that delivery of High Marnham is partly dependent on the submission of a Flood Risk Assessment; we are disappointed that this work has not been undertaken prior to allocation. It may well affect the degree of delivery.</p> <p>Part 1 of the policy sets out the range of employment activities that will be delivered at the site. It is clear that this site is for a niche of uses and we consider that it should be excluded from the general employment requirement as set out in Policy ST6. It is not generally available.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technonly which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council beleive that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST8 - Strategic 1194992	Employment Sites Resident	<p>Pg 59 refers to logistics businesses but infrastructure especially roads not adequate for this. Need roads to be improved maybe a motorway extension from M1 before this is possible. Need to improve movement from Newark, Lincoln and Doncaster etc also. Also stated in report earlier that there has been limited success in terms of regeneration of Worksop so why would businesses invest just down the road? There are alreday lots of vacact industrial units for let, should be used first before more being built.</p>	<p>The Bassetlaw Transport Study Part 2 considers the transport impacts of the development proposed by the Local Plan on the existing transport infrastructure, and identifies mitigation where appropriate. This does not identify the need for an extension to the M1 or improvements to any other towns outside the District as being necessary to deliver the development identified by the Local Plan. The Economic Development Needs Assessment 2019 identifies that many vacant industrial units are not fit for modern day purposes or are not situated in optimal locations to meet the</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST8 - Strategic	Employment Sites		
			needs of modern day businesses so alternative sites have to be identified.
REF198	Consultant	Policy ST8 page 59 This should be extended to include Markham Moor.	The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment 2020 provides the basis for defining a Strategic Employment Site. It states that there is only one site in the District capable of meeting these needs. That does not include Markham Moor.
REF255	Sheffield City Region	<p>The Spatial Strategy set out in the Draft Bassetlaw Plan is based upon a good appreciation of the relationship between Bassetlaw and the SCR, with strong economic and social connections linking Bassetlaw and all four the South Yorkshire districts. Support the Draft Local Plan's emphasis on this relationship and the common interests it identifies, particularly in terms of the logistics corridor, and the relationship of the AI to this, as well as for opportunities to develop the major growth area around Doncaster Sheffield Airport. It will also be important to continue to work together so that the developing Local Plan and emerging SEP continue to be well aligned. In principle, support this aspect of the Draft Plan and recognise the role that the policy could play in helping to attract large scale inward investment to the benefit of South Yorkshire as well as D2N2. In practice, however, implementation needs to be more carefully considered as the Plan develops with further discussion and development to ensure that the operation of Policy ST8 meets the aims of the Draft Plan. Suggest that Policy ST8 and the site-specific Policy 9 on Apleyhead Junction (as well as supporting text) could be strengthened and improved with the inclusion of three further points: A sequential test: taking a sequential approach to assessing applications on the two strategic employment sites, ensuring that any proposals for Snape Lane and Apleyhead cannot reasonably be accommodated on existing sites in other parts of South Yorkshire and D2N2 city regions; Demonstrable added value: the need for any proposals at Snape Lane and Apleyhead to demonstrate that they will bring gross value added to both South Yorkshire and D2N2 areas, as well as locally to Bassetlaw, with specific evidence available to demonstrate this; and Comprehensive development: so that proposals at Snape Land and Apleyhead maximise their potential by seeking comprehensive development of each site, rather than piece meal development which could be accommodated elsewhere.</p>	<p>Support for approach welcome. Acknowledge that further work with SCR is needed moving forward in relation to large scale investment at Apleyhead. Following consideration of the three recommendations it is not considered that a sequential test is evidence based and can be justified. Effectively the proposal is requesting that sites in Sheffield City Region be prioritised which is considered to be unjust and without merit. The policy does require schemes to bring gross value added to the District but D2N2 and Sheffield City Region will be added. To maximise the gross value added to both sub regions it is important that the policy approach is flexible to ensure the right end user(s) are secured. .A phased development may help achieve greater economic benefits to the sub-regions.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST8 - Strategic	Employment Sites		
REF256	Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council	<p>Specific amendments are requested below to policy ST8: Strategic Employment Sites. Requested changes are highlighted in red with proposed deletions shown struck through and proposed additions underlined.</p> <p>As currently drafted in respect of Part B criterion 3, the supporting text does not provide sufficient guidance on how this criterion would be satisfied by a developer. We are seeking the rewording of this criterion. Suggest that the policy should focus on comprehensive rather than piecemeal developments.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.3.5 in the supporting text refers to planning permission being granted at SEM2 Snape Lane. Welcome clarity on whether this permission is for the full site. A. Development proposals for strategic employment development within the B use classes, either as a standalone proposal or an extension of an existing business, will be supported considered on land at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SEM1: Apleyhead Junction, Worksop (118.7ha) for logistics 2. SEM2: Snape Lane, Harworth (80.9ha) for B2, B8 <p>B. Proposals will be supported where it can be demonstrated through an economic assessment, that all of the following apply:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are significant economic benefits generated by the scheme, in terms of development value and gross value added for the District, Sheffield City Region and D2N2; 2. The development would provide a significant number of new, permanent jobs, including a significant proportion of highly skilled jobs; 3. The proposal does not compromise the economic growth of authorities in the D2N2 or the Sheffield City Region, or the priorities of the D2N2 Strategic Economic Plan or the Sheffield City Region Strategic Economic Plan; In the case of a major inward investment, the needs of the business cannot be reasonably met on allocated employment land within either D2N2 or Sheffield City Region. 4. In the case of an existing Bassetlaw business seeking to expand significantly: the needs of the business cannot be reasonably met on other allocated employment land within the District; 5. The proposal would not compromise the viability or deliverability of sites allocated for development that are identified within Policy ST6; 6. The development can be satisfactorily accommodated in relation to the capacities of critical infrastructure, and timescales associated with investment works. <p>C. Use of a Planning Performance Agreement will ensure that a dedicated, specialist officer team is in place to progress each site through the planning system.</p> <p>P 58 supporting text 6.3.1 The National Planning Policy Framework⁴ requires policies to recognise and address specific locational requirements of different sectors, including provision for storage and distribution operations at a variety of scales and in suitably accessible locations.</p> <p>6.3.2 Policy ST8 identifies sites capable of accommodating significant indigenous growth and national and regional investment to meet exceptional, unanticipated needs over the plan period. Consistent with national planning practice guidance¹¹ this Plan recognises that the logistics industry has distinct locational requirements that should be considered separately from those relating to general employment land.</p> <p>6.3.3 On that basis, Bassetlaw's existing employment land portfolio and allocations in Policy ST6 must remain the focus for the District's general business development. This will ensure this Plan delivers a sustainable spatial strategy and a balanced approach to housing and economic growth.</p> <p>6.3.4 The Economic Development Needs Assessment² recognises the need for further land to support strategic distribution in the District. Bassetlaw benefits from being within the A1 and the A57 corridors and in relatively close proximity to the M1: a logically favourable location. This is reinforced by the Sheffield City Region who identify Harworth as being within the Doncaster Airport Growth Area for logistics as well as the A1 logistics corridor.</p> <p>1.6.3.5 Market interest also reinforces the policy approach. There is a growing demand for transport and distribution in the District: DHL are developing 50,005sqm of distribution floorspace on the A57, close to the A1; a speculative development of 32,377 sqm B8 floorspace was completed at EM004: Symmetry Park, Harworth; and full planning permission has recently been approved for logistics at SEM2: Snape Lane, Harworth.</p> <p>6.3.6 On that basis, Policy ST8 allocates two sites to provide for strategic distribution operations, specifically non rail served provision. This will help diversify the District's economy, increase local employment and reduce unemployment levels locally. Evidence² indicates that SEM2: Snape Lane, Harworth should be considered as meeting a sub-regional level of demand which is attributable to the A1M, spilling over from the Doncaster market / M18 interchange. Meanwhile SEM1: Apleyhead Junction (Policy 9) forms a logical extension to the</p>	<p>The whole of Snape Lane has planning permission for B1, B2, B8 uses. Acknowledge that further work with SCR and neighbouring authorities is needed moving forward in relation to large scale investment at Apleyhead. Following consideration of the three recommendations it is not considered that a sequential test is evidence based and can be justified. Effectively the proposal is requesting that sites in Sheffield City Region be prioritised which is considered to be unjust and without merit. The policy does require schemes to bring gross value added to the District but D2N2 and Sheffield City Region will be added. To maximise the gross value added to both sub regions it is important that the policy approach is flexible to ensure the right end user(s) are secured. A phased development may help achieve greater economic benefits to the sub-regions.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST8 - Strategic	Employment Sites		
		<p>existing longstanding and expanding logistics sector along the A57 corridor, at a key junction with the A1.6.3.7 An important part of planning for strategic logistics investment is consideration of the functional economic market area (FEMA). The FEMA reflects the way the economy works; it is not constrained by administrative boundaries the relationships between where people live and work, the scope of service market areas and catchments.6.3.8 The Economic Development Needs Assessment2 recognises that parts of Bassetlaw are strongly related to the Sheffield City Region, but that other parts of the District have equally strong links to parts of Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire.6.3.9 The Council has signed a Statement of Common Ground with the Sheffield City Region Combined Authority12. This acknowledges that each Council is responsible for identifying employment needs and land supply to meet their own economic needs and growth priorities. It adds that the approach taken to the FEMA in the Economic Development Needs Assessment2 – that at a practical, local level Bassetlaw does not have a separate FEMA in its own right – should be recognised.6.3.10 However, the Statement of Common Ground12 adds that the authorities should work collaboratively to give further consideration to formalising a strategic FEMA for the Sheffield City Region and understanding the operation of it primarily for logistics. On that basis the Council will continue to work collaboratively to ensure any benefits associated with this policy are not lost to the City Region at a strategic level, and at a local level do not adversely impact upon the economic growth strategies of the District or any other authority.</p>	
REF269	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	<p>Specific amendments are requested below to policy ST8: Strategic Employment Sites. Requested changes are highlighted in red with proposed deletions shown struck through and proposed additions underlined. As currently drafted in respect of Part B criterion 3, the supporting text does not provide sufficient guidance on how this criterion would be satisfied by a developer. We are seeking the rewording of this criterion. Suggest that the policy should focus on comprehensive rather than piecemeal developments.</p> <p>Policy ST8 A. Development proposals for strategic employment development within the B use classes, either as a standalone proposal or an extension of an existing business, will be supported considered on land at: 1. SEM1: Apleyhead Junction, Worksop (118.7ha) for logistics 2. SEM2: Snape Lane, Harworth (80.9ha) for B2, B8 B. Proposals will be supported where it can be demonstrated through an economic assessment, that all of the following apply: 1. There are significant economic benefits generated by the scheme, in terms of development value and gross value added for the District, Sheffield City Region and D2N2; 2.The development would provide a significant number of new, permanent jobs, including a significant proportion of highly skilled jobs; 3. The proposal does not compromise the economic growth of authorities in the D2N2 or the Sheffield City Region, or the priorities of the D2N2 Strategic Economic Plan or the Sheffield City Region Strategic Economic Plan; In the case of a major inward investment, the needs of the business cannot be reasonably met on allocated employment land within either D2N2 or Sheffield City Region. 4. In the case of an existing Bassetlaw business seeking to expand significantly: the needs of the business cannot be reasonably met on other allocated employment land within the District; 5. The proposal would not compromise the viability or deliverability of sites allocated for development that are identified within Policy ST6; and 6. The development can be satisfactorily accommodated in relation to the capacities of critical infrastructure, and timescales associated with investment works. C. Use of a Planning Performance Agreement will ensure that a dedicated, specialist officer team is in place to progress each site through the planning system. P.58 Supporting Text 6.3.1 The National Planning Policy Framework4 requires policies to recognise and address specific locational requirements of different sectors, including provision for storage and distribution operations at a variety of scales and in suitably accessible locations. 6.3.2 Policy ST8 identifies sites capable of accommodating significant indigenous growth and national and regional investment to meet exceptional, unanticipated needs over the plan period. Consistent with national planning practice guidance11 this Plan recognises that the logistics industry has distinct locational requirements that should be considered separately from those relating to general employment land. 6.3.3 On that basis, Bassetlaw's existing employment land portfolio and allocations in Policy ST6 must remain the focus for the District's general business development. This</p>	<p>Acknowledge that further work with SCR and neighbouring authorities is needed moving forward in relation to large scale investment at Apleyhead. Following consideration of the three recommendations it is not considered that a sequential test is evidence based and can be justified. Effectively the proposal is requesting that sites in Sheffield City Region be prioritised which is considered to be unjust and without merit. The policy does require schemes to bring gross value added to the District but D2N2 and Sheffield City Region will be added. To maximise the gross value added to both sub regions it is important that the policy approach is flexible to ensure the right end user(s) are secured. A phased development may help achieve greater economic benefits to the sub-regions.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST8 - Strategic	Employment Sites		
		<p>will ensure this Plan delivers a sustainable spatial strategy and a balanced approach to housing and economic growth. 6.3.4 The Economic Development Needs Assessment2 recognises the need for further land to support strategic distribution in the District. Bassetlaw benefits from being within the A1 and the A57 corridors and in relatively close proximity to the M1: a logically favourable location. This is reinforced by the Sheffield City Region who identify Harworth as being within the Doncaster Airport Growth Area for logistics as well as the A1 logistics corridor1. 6.3.5 Market interest also reinforces the policy approach. There is a growing demand for transport and distribution in the District: DHL are developing 50,005sqm of distribution floorspace on the A57, close to the A1; a speculative development of 32,377 sqm B8 floorspace was completed at EM004: Symmetry Park, Harworth. Paragraph 6.3.5 in the supporting text refers to planning permission being granted at SEM2 Snape Lane. We would welcome clarity on whether this permission is for the full site. 6.3.6 On that basis, Policy ST8 allocates two sites to provide for strategic distribution operations, specifically non rail served provision. This will help diversify the District's economy, increase local employment and reduce unemployment levels locally. Evidence2 indicates that SEM2: Snape Lane, Harworth should be considered as meeting a sub-regional level of demand which is attributable to the A1M, spilling over from the Doncaster market / M18 interchange. Meanwhile SEM1: Apleyhead Junction (Policy 9) forms a logical extension to the existing longstanding and expanding logistics sector along the A57 corridor, at a key junction with the A1. 6.3.7 An important part of planning for strategic logistics investment is consideration of the functional economic market area (FEMA). The FEMA reflects the way the economy works; it is not constrained by administrative boundaries the relationships between where people live and work, the scope of service market areas and catchments. 6.3.8 The Economic Development Needs Assessment2 recognises that parts of Bassetlaw are strongly related to the Sheffield City Region, but that other parts of the District have equally strong links to parts of Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire. 6.3.9 The Council has signed a Statement of Common Ground with the Sheffield City Region Combined Authority12. This acknowledges that each Council is responsible for identifying employment needs and land supply to meet their own economic needs and growth priorities. It adds that the approach taken to the FEMA in the Economic Development Needs Assessment2 – that at a practical, local level Bassetlaw does not have a separate FEMA in its own right – should be recognised. 6.3.10 However, the Statement of Common Ground12 adds that the authorities should work collaboratively to give further consideration to formalising a strategic FEMA for the Sheffield City Region and understanding the operation of it primarily for logistics. On that basis the Council will continue to work collaboratively to ensure any benefits associated with this policy are not lost to the City Region at a strategic level, and at a local level do not adversely impact upon the economic growth strategies of the District or any other authority.</p>	
REF270	Barton Willmore	<p>Land to the south of Snape Lane, Harworth has been promoted for circa 81ha of employment land and has been granted outline planning permission (LPA Reference: 15/00971/OUT) on 14th March 2017. A subsequent S.73 Application (LPA Reference: 19/00886/VOC) was supported at the Council's Planning Committee of 6th November 2019 and is subject to the signing of a S.106. Overall, we are supportive of the draft Local Plan's economic aspirations for Bassetlaw. Policy ST8 identifies sites capable of accommodating significant economic growth over the plan period. The 2019 EDNA recognises the need for further land to support strategic manufacturing and distribution sectors, and Bassetlaw benefits from its strategic highways within the A1 and A57 corridors and proximity to the M1. Strongly support the Council's approach to strategic employment growth across the district and support the strategic employment allocation for 'SEM2' which relates to our Client's site to the south of Snape Lane in Harworth. Harworth is identified as an employment growth area and the SEM2 allocation for 80.9ha of B2 and B8 uses at will generate considerable economic and employment growth within the District. Welcome this allocation as a strategic employment site and emphasise the role of our Client's site for</p>	Support noted and welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST8 - Strategic	Employment Sites	driving forward economic growth and employment opportunities in Harworth and the District as a whole.	
REF282	National Trust	National Trust also objects to Policy ST8. Part B.3 of the policy states that proposals will be supported provided that they do not compromise the economic growth of authorities in the D2N2 or the Sheffield City Region. We suggest that this ought to be established upfront (i.e. in justifying any land allocation) and also ought to take account of the potential for a large greenfield allocation to compromise brownfield development elsewhere.	D2N2 have confirmed their support for the site for footloose investment. As a site for such investment it is difficult to know upfront which company(s) would be developing the site. It is on that basis that this criteria is needed. The Plan supports the positive re-use of brownfield land. But to accommodate the growth required some greenfield land is necessary.
REF346	Doncaster Council	Specific amendments are requested below to policy ST8: Strategic Employment Sites. Requested changes are highlighted in red with proposed deletions shown struck through and proposed additions underlined. As currently drafted in respect of Part B criterion 3, the supporting text does not provide sufficient guidance on how this criterion would be satisfied by a developer. We are seeking the rewording of this criterion. We suggest that the policy should focus on comprehensive rather than piecemeal developments. Paragraph 6.3.5 in the supporting text refers to planning permission being granted at SEM2 Snape Lane. We would welcome clarity on whether this permission is for the full site. A. Development proposals for strategic employment development within the B use classes, either as a standalone proposal or an extension of an existing business, will be supported considered on land at: 1. SEM1: Apleyhead Junction, Worksop (118.7ha) for logistics 2. SEM2: Snape Lane, Harworth (80.9ha) for B2, B8 B. Proposals will be supported where it can be demonstrated through an economic assessment, that all of the following apply: 1. There are significant economic benefits generated by the scheme, in terms of development value and gross value added for the District, Sheffield City Region and D2N2; 2. The development would provide a significant number of new, permanent jobs, including a significant proportion of highly skilled jobs; 3. The proposal does not compromise the economic growth of authorities in the D2N2 or the Sheffield City Region, or the priorities of the D2N2 Strategic Economic Plan or the Sheffield City Region Strategic Economic Plan; In the case of a major inward investment, the needs of the business cannot be reasonably met on allocated employment land within either D2N2 or Sheffield City Region. 4. In the case of an existing Bassetlaw business seeking to expand significantly: the needs of the business cannot be reasonably met on other allocated employment land within the District; 5. The proposal would not compromise the viability or deliverability of sites allocated for development that are identified within Policy ST6; and 6. The development can be satisfactorily accommodated in relation to the capacities of critical infrastructure, and timescales associated with investment works. C. Use of a Planning Performance Agreement will ensure that a dedicated, specialist officer team is in place to progress each site through the planning system.	The whole of Snape Lane has planning permission for B1, B2, B8 uses. Acknowledge that further work with SCR and neighbouring authorities is needed moving forward in relation to large scale investment at Apleyhead. Following consideration of the three recommendations it is not considered that a sequential test is evidence based and can be justified. Effectively the proposal is requesting that sites in Sheffield City Region be prioritised which is considered to be unjust and without merit. The policy does require schemes to bring gross value added to the District but D2N2 and Sheffield City Region will be added. To maximise the gross value added to both sub regions it is important that the policy approach is flexible to ensure the right end user(s) are secured. A phased development may help achieve greater economic benefits to the sub-regions.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST8 - Strategic	Employment Sites		
REF347	NJL Consulting	<p>Policy ST8 carries forward the key employment land thread from ST1 and ST6 and identifies the Apleyhead Junction site as being suitable for employment uses. Although this strategic objective is fully supported and critical to the delivery of the economic vision for the District, Caddick are concerned that the detailed policy wording and the inconsistencies between policies as already identified for Policies ST1 and ST6 will serve to frustrate the much needed delivery of the site.</p> <p>ST8 – Part A There are inconsistencies within ST8 which must be corrected. Part A of Policy ST8 supports ‘strategic employment development within the B use classes’, whereas Part A1 then identifies the site as being suitable for ‘logistics’. This latter reference in Part A1 is presumably an error as delivering only logistics uses on the site would not achieve the mix of employment and ‘significant proportion of highly skilled jobs’ sought in Part B(2). That is not to say that a logistics only development cannot provide highly skilled jobs, more that it is self-evident that a wider range of employment uses is likely to deliver a wider range of jobs. Part A of ST8 should therefore be amended at Part A1 to reflect that the site could deliver a mixed B1(c)/B2/B8 (with ancillary B1(a)) Use development in order to maximise the significant benefits of development.</p> <p>ST8 – Part B This part of the policy is unclear as it could be read either that Part B refers to the requirements for sites identified in Part A or that Part B refers to further strategic proposals. We have presumed the former applies (that Part B refers to the sites listed in Part 1) and is commented upon on that basis. Caddick is concerned that Part B of Policy ST8 contains unrealistic and onerous expectations at too early a stage in the planning process. Several policy points in Part B are understandable, but it could prove to be very onerous for a major strategic site to be brought forward through an outline planning application and still be required to demonstrate accordance with specified criteria. Equally the requirements set out in Part B could discourage potential investors that the need to meet the requirements set out in B1-6 could introduce significant uncertainty and delay into the planning process. Part B states ‘Proposals will be supported where it can be demonstrated through an economic assessment, that all of the following apply’ (NJL Consulting emphasis) and then lists a range of policy and development aspirations. Part B – point 2 Of note, point 2 requires ‘...the development would provide a significant number of new, permanent jobs, including a significant proportion of highly skilled jobs...’. A development of this scale (4.5m sqft) is likely to be delivered in part through a hybrid or outline planning application with a portion of the site therefore being promoted ‘speculatively’ with occupiers for only the early phase. The type of jobs created will only be known once an occupier is in place and therefore the mix of jobs across the site is simply too variable to be demonstrated at this stage in the planning process. Major sites, such as Apleyhead Junction, will attract a wide variety of companies because of the type of product that can be delivered here as compared to other employment locations within the district.</p> <p>Modern day employment floorspace that is likely to be attracted to the site will incorporate a wide cross section of jobs ranging from manual positions to highly qualified employees. Terms such as “a significant proportion of highly skilled jobs” are inappropriate because they are inflexible and over-prescriptive, and the effect would be to deter much needed investment. Therefore, Caddick would strongly urge that criterion B2 be removed in its entirety or altered to remove reference to “a significant proportion of highly skilled jobs”.</p>	<p>The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment 2020 provides the basis for the approach taken to policy development. This site is identified is additional to local employment needs and is proposed for allocation on that basis. Terminology will be addressed to ensure consistency in approach. It is understood that at outline stage end users may not be in place and that flexibility is required to ensure end users have the confidence to invest in the site. But in order to allocate this site for strategic employment uses the Local Plan must ensure that relevant criteria are identified to provide certainty with deliverydifferentiate this site from the general supply. Reference to a significant proportion of higher skilled jobs will be amended to including higher skilled jobs, to reflect the priorities of the Council Plan and the objectives of the Local Plan.</p>
REF347	NJL Consulting	<p>Part B – Points 3, 4 and 5 7.12 The rationale and evidence base to support the release of sites in Policy ST8 provides the justification for the need for the allocation to be delivered as part of the overall economic objectives of the Plan. The strategic employment sites in Policy ST8 are an integral and vital part of delivering a step change in the future growth of the District and the delivery of these sites compliments the overall employment strategy.</p> <p>7.13 The very nature of the site in terms of locational importance and size will dictate that it is specifically geared to delivering large scale commercial units that would not be attracted to the sites set out under Policy ST6. Unnecessary and counterproductive to refer to the development of sites in Policy ST8 as needing to demonstrate that they would neither compromise the economic strategy of adjoining authorities nor the delivery of alternative sites within Bassetlaw as set out in Policy ST6, since this, by its very nature, would undermine the whole rationale for</p>	<p>The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment 2020 provides the basis for the approach taken to policy development. This site is identified is additional to local employment needs and is proposed for allocation on that basis. Terminology will be addressed to ensure consistency in approach. It is understood that at outline stage end users may not be in place and that flexibility is required to ensure end users have the confidence to invest in the site. But in order to allocate this site for strategic employment uses the Local Plan must ensure that relevant criteria are identified to provide certainty with deliverydifferentiate this site from the</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST8 - Strategic	Employment Sites	<p>Policy ST8. The wording of Point 4 and Point 5 effectively introduces a form of sequential testing to demonstrate that no other site in Policy ST6 would be capable, suitable or have enough market attraction to be considered an alternative location. At the very least, these criteria could act as a significant delay in bringing site SEM1 forward and, even more alarming, could act as a significant barrier to occupier interest and investment. In order to deliver the Local Plan vision in full (i.e. achieving step change growth and investment) all allocations within the plan must be delivered. The land at Apleyhead Junction would inevitably attract a different market sector and operator demand to smaller scale more local employment sites set out in Policy ST6. Its attractive location coupled with the much larger size of unit that the location would deliver, would naturally differentiate between the objectives behind policies ST6 and ST8 without the need for the level of requirements set out in points 4 and 5. Criteria 4 and 5, in effect, place greater importance on the employment sites specifically listed in ST6; note the Apleyhead Junction site is not currently listed in ST6 Part B but is referred to in ST6 Part A as a separate strategic site. Consider the ST8 approach, whereby general sites are prioritised over strategically important sites, to be unsound as it is not supported by evidence or logic. The local and sub-regional evidence base emphasises the importance of a rounded employment land offer which can meet a range of occupier needs (including specific larger scale needs). Part C refers to the use of a Planning Performance Agreement ('PPA'). Although a PPA approach can deliver certainty to the planning process and therefore can be useful for major sites, it is unusual for a PPA to be a specific policy requirement. Policy should be revised to avoid inferences that a PPA is required in order to deliver a policy compliant planning application. Caddick is concerned that ST8, as a key policy, is currently inconsistent in terms of how the various parts of the policy relate to, and are consistent with, other strategic policies and with the overall vision as set out in the Local Plan. These inconsistencies need to be addressed to ensure that Policy ST8 delivers on its objectives. Suggested policy changes Caddick suggest the following amended wording to Policy ST8.</p> <p>POLICY ST8: Strategic Employment Sites A. Development proposals for strategic employment development within the B-Use classes, either as a standalone proposal or an extension of an existing business, will be supported on land at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SEM1: Apleyhead Junction, Worksop (118.7ha) for logistics - SEM2: Snape Lane, Harworth (80.9ha) for B2, B8 B. <p>Proposals will be supported where it can be demonstrated through an economic assessment that all of the following apply:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are significant economic benefits generated by the scheme, in terms of development value and gross value added for the District; 2. The development would provide a significant number of new, permanent jobs, including an significant proportion of highly skilled jobs; 3. The proposal does not compromise the economic growth of authorities in the D2N2 or the Sheffield City Region, or the priorities of the D2N2 Strategic Economic Plan or the Sheffield City Region Strategic Economic Plan; 4. In the case of an existing Bassetlaw business seeking to expand significantly: the needs of the business cannot be reasonably met on other allocated employment land within the District; 5. The proposal would not compromise the viability or deliverability of sites allocated for development that are identified within Policy ST6; and 6. The development can be satisfactorily accommodated in relation to the capacities of critical infrastructure, and timescales associated with investment works. <p>C. Use of a Planning Performance Agreement will ensure that a dedicated, specialist officer team is in place to progress each site through the planning system.</p>	<p>general supply. Reference to a significant proportion of higher skilled jobs will be amended to including higher skilled jobs, to reflect the priorities of the Council Plan and the objectives of the Local Plan. Reference to a PPA will be moved to the supporting text.</p>

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

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

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

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST09 - Apleyhead Junction			
		<p>paragraph 6.4.2 states the Apleyhead Junction site can boost the housing market, particularly as it will be well connected to the proposed Garden Village. It is important that SEM1 does not infer the employment proposition is somehow linked to the garden village. Fundamentally, delivery of the employment site is not dependant on additional housing growth in the district nor is it tied to the garden village. Furthermore, the supporting text should also not infer the level of contributions needed to mitigate highways concerns. Paragraph 6.4.3 refers to works to the A57 (with reference to the Bassetlaw Transport Study and junction assessment work). However, it is notable that the council's junction assessment work, as part of the local plan evidence base, questions the necessity, viability and deliverability of major A57 works. Paragraph 6.4.5 refers to detailed visual, landscape, biodiversity and lighting matters. It is recognised this is policy supporting text rather than policy itself, nevertheless the text regarding development mitigation should be careful stated to reflect the scale and nature of development. For example, the paragraph states '...development should be seamlessly integrated into the wider landscape...', yet it is almost impossible to 'seamlessly integrate' a major employment development with circa 25m buildings into an area of limited apparent development (it is noted the existing Wilko and B&Q developments had existing substantial planting on the northern boundary).8.14 The policy supporting text should be updated to reflect the circumstances of the site and requirements of development.30 Suggested policy changes8.15 Caddick suggest the following amended wording to Policy 9. POLICY 9: Site SEM1: Apleyhead Junction, Worksop A. The Council will support the delivery of a strategic employment site at Apleyhead Junction, Worksop, as identified on the Policies Map. The site will be expected to deliver a minimum of 118.7ha of employment land for Class B1, B2 and B8 development within the Plan period (to 2037).B. The development will guide the creation of a sustainable and high quality working environment which will make provision for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Good Quality Design and Local Character(a) High quality, innovative design which makes the most of its prominent location, adds value to the local area, endures over time and reflects the design principles in Policy ST32 and the Design Quality SPD; b) A layout and design informed by the site context and responds to this context landscape character and ecological value and an archaeological desk assessment, to positively incorporate and enhance on site woodland, hedgerows, biodiversity value and landscape features where feasible and appropriate; c) Energy, water efficiency and sustainable construction to achieve BREEAM very good-excellent standards or any successor scheme; d) A comprehensive sustainable drainage system and maintenance arrangements; e) A suitable lighting scheme that minimises light pollution. <p>2. Transport and Movement(a) A scheme of an appropriate scale, layout and form supported by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan, and advice of the Local Highways Authority, Highways England and public transport providers, which further details, where feasible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. A reduction in reliance on motorised vehicles and a step-change towards promotion of sustainable and public transport, including the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. Provision of suitable footpath and cycle paths that link to the existing network; iii. Safe access to the site from the A57; iv. Contributions to improvements to the roundabout at A57/B6040; v. Contributions to improvements to the roundabout at A614 Blyth Road/A57/A1(T); vi. Contributions to capacity improvements at the A57; vii. Appropriate servicing and parking provision for each development parcel; b) Impacts of development on air quality through traffic and other emissions are mitigated and an air quality assessment is submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority as part of a future planning application. <p>3. Landscape, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure(a) The protection and enhancement management of Top Wood/Great Whin Covert Local Wildlife Site informed by an arboriculture survey and ecological survey;</p> <p>(b) Green infrastructure connectivity within the site and to neighbouring green infrastructure assets to support climate resilience;</p> <p>(c) An appropriate landscape buffers are considered; between the site and the A1 to the east and to the railway line to the north;</p> <p>(d) A project level Habitats Regulation Assessment screening in accordance with Policy ST36.</p> 	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST09 - Apleyhead Junction			
REF401 -	East Markham Parish Council	<p>6.3.6. Apleyhead does form a logical extension to the logistics of the A57 corridor but EMPC is concerned about the impact of any development on existing links and also Clumber Park.</p>	The impact of the development of the site to the A57 has been identified in the Bassetlaw Transport Assessment. It will require appropriate mitigation in the form of access into the site and an improved carriageway on part of the A57. There is no evidence to show that the development of the site will impact Clumber Park.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST10 - Existing Employment Sites			
1195486	Resident	Why are the industrial areas of the airfield at Gamston and Bevercotes not included as they were in the previous plan?	Policy ST10 protects Existing Employment Sites which are considered essential to the long-term economic success of Bassetlaw. The employment site to the south of the airfield is not considered to meet that definition. The land at Bevercotes has planning permission for employment use but there is no development on the site so it is not considered to meet the definition of an Existing Employment Site. However, the Gamston site is considered to be another employment site under Policy ST11 and can continue to operate in that capacity.
REF182	Consultant	<p>Would prefer that the EIP site is allocated under Policy ST6 nevertheless welcome the identification of the site as an Existing Employment Site under Policy ST10. This is a significant improvement over the previous Regulation 18 draft Local Plan since it now explicitly supports new or additional B1, B2 and B8 development or small-scale ancillary uses on the site. Support part A of the policy, although have some concerns about the presentation of this on the Policies Map. Concerns over the drafting of part C of the policy. No objection to the main principle, the wording as drafted may have unintended consequences by preventing otherwise acceptable employment uses. As drafted, this part of the policy states that any change of use or redevelopment to a non-B1, B2 or B8 employment use would only be permitted where certain criteria are met. It is not currently clear whether all of the criteria must be met in order to accord with the policy. It is entirely conceivable that a non-B1, B2 or B8 employment use, such as a <i>sui generis</i> employment use was proposed, which would have the same benefits as a standard B-class use. As worded, the policy would require evidence of 12 months' marketing and a viability assessment, which would seem unnecessary. However, if the word "or" was added to the end of each criterion, in this example it would still accord with the policy as the second criterion would be complied with. Request that the policy is amended in this way.</p>	Explore Industrial Park will be allocated as a general employment site under Policy ST6.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST10 - Existing Employment Sites			
REF182	Consultant	<p>Client controls Explore Industrial Park (EIP) and has been developing it for industrial development over the last few years. It is essential that the site is properly recognised as forming an important part of the Council's economic development strategy in the emerging Local Plan. EIP is a major cross-boundary employment site to the west of Worksop. The EIP site is a large former quarry, colliery and brick refractory site which was acquired by Laing O'Rourke in 2007. The site area is divided almost equally between Bolsover (Derbyshire) and Bassetlaw (Nottinghamshire). The area within Bassetlaw comprises the most developable land. Planning permission granted in 2007 for the existing pre-cast concrete manufacturing facility, in 2010 outline planning permission for a B1/B2/B8 off-site manufacturing hub on the wider EIP site. Due to the nature of the proposal, 10 years were allowed for the submission of reserved matters. Invested millions of pounds into the site to date. A new off-site manufacturing facility making pre-cast concrete products constructed in 2008 with a new access road onto the A619. Other enabling works have taken place, including decontamination of the site, ecology translocations and a substantial new ecological mitigation area, interim drainage works including the realignment of part of Darfoulds Dyke and structural landscaping. Development platforms have also been created. The substantial investment ensures it is ready and available for development. Planning permission been granted for a further large-scale manufacturing facility (the "AMF") to the west of the current factory, within Bassetlaw. Development has commenced. Two further development parcels available in the part of the site in Bassetlaw used on an interim basis as open storage and car parking (planning permission 2018). The longer-term plan is to develop industrial buildings. Overall, 16ha of employment land is available in Bassetlaw. C.270 people are employed at the existing facility. Once developed is likely to employ in excess of 1,000 people. The site does not benefit from any specific designations on the current 2011 Proposals Map. As a result, the site is treated as being in the open countryside. The adopted Core Strategy is silent in relation to the site so Policy DM1 (Economic Development in the Countryside) applies. This policy is aimed at rural employment uses generally, rather than a major employment development site such as EIP. Contrary to the incorrect summarisation of the site in Table 17 of the Economic Development Needs Assessment, EIP is not yet a fully-developed employment site. Whilst all of the plots in Bassetlaw are either in permanent or temporary use, some of the existing plots are used on an interim basis rather than the more intensive uses proposed in the masterplan. These plots remain available for B1, B2 and B8 uses. Laing O'Rourke regularly bids for major construction projects, some of which may require further facilities to be constructed at EIP, depending on the nature and location of the project. Laing O'Rourke has previously undertaken pre-application discussions with Bassetlaw District Council about plans for such potential buildings, although to date the buildings have subsequently not been required. However, in the event of a successful bid requiring a new facility to be constructed, it will often be necessary to erect the building quickly. As a result, whilst at present there are no detailed proposals for any of the under-utilised Bassetlaw plots, that position is liable to change rapidly should a particular contract require development of these plots. Off-site manufacturing restriction The current masterplan permission is limited to uses which form part of an off-site manufacturing hub concept. Condition 4 states:</p> <p>The Reserved Matters submitted in accordance with conditions 1 and 2 shall be accompanied by a Statement demonstrating the way in which the proposal forms part of the off-site manufacturing hub concept as described in the application documents (i.e. a centre of manufacturing excellence that will benefit from efficiency and sustainability gains through the use of shared resources on a single site".</p> <p>The site is now a well-established employment site with substantial investment having taken place as set out above. If the current restriction of off-site manufacturing uses was to be lifted and a general B1/B2/B8 allocation confirmed, this would allow greater flexibility, assist with investment decisions and encourage further job growth at the site. In this scenario, the landowners could market parts of the site for alternative employment uses where this would not conflict with the smooth operation of the existing site, further enhancing employment prospects. As set out further below, Bolsover District Council has agreed that it would be appropriate to lift this restriction in its emerging Local Plan.</p>	Reflecting this site's importance to the employment land supply for the plan period the Explore Industrial Park will be allocated under Policy ST6 as a General Employment Site.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST10 - Existing Employment Sites			
		<p>Emerging Bolsover Local Plan Bolsover District Council is at a very advanced stage in preparing its own Local Plan, with the Inspector issuing her report in January 2020. Bolsover's Planning Committee has recommended that the Full Council now proceed to adopt the Local Plan, and the plan is expected to be adopted in March 2020.</p> <p>The new Bolsover Local Plan allocates the developable parts of EIP within its jurisdiction for general B1/B2/B8 employment uses. These are not restricted to off-site manufacturing uses.</p> <p>To date, Bassetlaw and Bolsover District Councils have worked closely on all strategic matters relating to the EIP site. For example, the Councils collaborated closely on the outline planning permissions, which include the same conditions and wording on both permissions.</p> <p>We have welcomed the support of Bolsover District Council in allocating their part of the site for general employment uses, and we request that Bassetlaw takes the same approach in its emerging Local Plan. This would be appropriate, especially given that paragraph 9.9 of the Council's latest Economic Development Need Assessment recognises that EIP is one of eight important employment sites within the district.⁴ It goes on to note that:</p> <p>"These are good quality employment sites and there should be a presumption of retention for continued employment uses. However, it is recognised that some operational flexibility may be required."</p>	
REF198	Consultant	Policy ST10 page 63 This list of existing employment sites is incomplete, once again no mention of Markham Moor. This policy is therefore not sound.	The Economic Development Needs Assessment 2019 considers Markham Moor to be a mixed use area around the junction on the A1. However, the development opportunities are limited to relatively small parcels of land among the junction infrastructure and varied existing uses. It is therefore considered that the commercial attractiveness of the site is more limited than other sites along the A1. On that basis the area is not considered to be essential to the long term economic success of Bassetlaw so does not meet the definition of Existing Employment Site. Nevertheless, the relevant B uses within the area would be addressed by Policy ST11 as Other Employment Sites.
1197063	Resident	There is no mention of current large employment services in the area specifically NHS establishments such as Bassetlaw District Hospital and Rampton Hospital (Nottinghamshire Healthcare) and others. How have these organisations responded to the Local Plan? How are their development strategies included? Are they growing their services or declining? They are significant employers and may require more or less staff in the future and they need to be considered when developing the plan.	Policy ST10 only looks at sites that are in the B Use Class so offices, general industry or storage and distribution. While Bassetlaw Hospital and Rampton Hospital are important local employers they are not B Class development so fall outside the scope of Policy ST10. NHS Bassetlaw are a statutory consultee for the Local Plan. The impact of new development on their services has been taken into account in the production of the Plan.
REF289 -	Consultant	Endorse Policy ST10 allowing new and extended employment development to be provided (beyond those sites proposed to be allocated), subject to various criteria being met.	Support noted and welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST10 - Existing Employment Sites			
REF298	Consultant	<p>Policy ST10 protects employment areas that are both suitable and viable for continued employment growth. It confirms that existing employment sites are important drivers for the District's economy. FCC's site which has permission for employment uses should be identified within Part A of Policy ST10. The proposed employment development at FCC's site can come forward in a sensitive manner which reflects its location on the edge of the urban area. The supporting technical reports which accompanied FCC's application for the east of the site demonstrated that the Site can come forward without detrimentally impacting the environment and surroundings. Pre-application discussions have taken place with the Council regarding the remainder of FCC's site and an application for employment uses on this part of the Site is due to be submitted to the Council within the next few months. Given the very clear credentials of FCC's site, and for the reasons explained elsewhere within this representation, we believe that the whole site should benefit from an allocation under Policy ST6. Should the Council decide not to allocate the site for employment uses, then development on the western part of the site (the part without planning permission) might be considered favourably against Part B of Policy ST10. However, this policy is at odds with Policy ST11 which only allows for economic development outside the settlement boundary subject to very rigid policy requirements. This conflict should be corrected.</p>	An existing employment site is one that is in use for employment uses and are located in the strongest demand areas for ongoing employment uses. Whilst this site has planning permission it is not developed or in use. Equally it is not a location which the evidence base considers is essential to direct the long term growth of the District. However, the site benefits from planning permission so employment uses can be promoted on the site through that means.
REF325	Resident	<p>Alternatively, Policy ST10B (1-3) should be amended to permit new employment development outside the allocated employment sites either where (as currently drafted) there are no significant adverse impacts or (to be added) where adverse impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.</p>	Policy ST11 will be the appropriate policy to reflect these comments.
REF345 -	Councillor	<p>Why is Welbeck not listed here if you take into account the Garden Centre / Courtyard area, the old pit site, the Works Department, The Artists Workshops, the School of Artisan Food, The Brewery Yard Food businesses, The Farms Depts., The Water Businesses, The Woodland, The Housing, plus other sundry businesses Welbeck is a thriving Rural Industrial Estate (Don't just see it as a Heritage site). This view of Welbeck is WRONG.....the estate is a living thriving area and NOT JUST A HERITAGE SITE longer discussion around the possibilities here for the Visitor Economy, Rural Industry, Education and Training, Rural Leisure, Sustainable Living and Working need to happen before the final plan is created this is a massive missed opportunity.</p>	Policy ST10 only covers employment sites that can accommodate B class development. All of the commercial businesses listed generate employment, just not within those use classes. Visitor economy is covered by Policy ST12 and the rural economy by Policy ST11.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST11 - Rural Economic Growth			
1195911	Resident	<p>Object to criteria A3 of Policy ST11 as this is in direct conflict with NPPF paragraphs 83 and 84 which supports the sustainable growth of ALL TYPES OF BUSINESS IN RURAL AREAS as opposed to just those directly related to agricultural, horticultural or forestry operations and other activities, which by their nature would require a rural location. The policy as currently worded would inhibit farm diversification opportunity by effectively limiting the re-use or conversion of existing buildings for employment generating use that do not fall within the remit of criteria 3 or meet the criteria for permitted changes of use under Classes R and S of the GPDO. Understand why policy ST11 should be more restrictive towards stand-alone new build economic development that does not fit the criteria but to potentially limit conversions and new build opportunity within already established commercial locations in the rural areas would stifle rural enterprise and employment opportunity, lead to longer travel for rural employees and potentially lead to under-utilisation of rural buildings now unsuited to modern farming or horticultural use. There is the opportunity to reward this policy to ensure it is NPPF compliant and limit only free-standing, large scale new build economic development that is better located in allocated industrial areas.</p>	<p>The Local Plan must be consistent with the NPPF to be found sound. Policy ST11 will be amended to ensure it is applicable to all types of rural businesses. Permitted development legislation would still apply.</p>
REF198	Consultant	<p>How outdated can a policy be? This has been trotted out review after review and the proof that it is wrong is the continued identified decline of our rural areas to the benefit of the urban areas yet, when it suits the Council's purpose, a wholly new village can be promoted. The restrictions within this policy mean clearly that our rural areas will always be second or third best unless residents can take up low impact employment such as "yoghurt knitting", sawdust plaiting, weaving etc. These immensely restrictive policy ideas should be ditched and replaced with a logical approach to providing employment in the countryside that does fit in well but is not automatically rural by nature. Industries and employment can grow quickly in the rural areas if allowed simply because land values will be so much less. What also would help would be a better public transport system which the Council for many years have been saying we all should have but nothing has been done. It has been left to the individual bus operators to either serve the areas or not. Some of the CIL money could be spent towards providing this local bus service.</p>	<p>Policy ST11 will be amended to ensure it is applicable to all types of rural businesses. Public transport is largely a commercial enterprise, and outside the Council control. But the Council will continue to work with bus operators to ensure that public transport provision is appropriate in the rural area.</p>
REF215	Consultant	<p>Paragraph 3.2 of the Draft Local Plan sets out a fundamental concept: "The performance of the local economy is a key driver that shapes Bassetlaw into a successful and growing location" and then in Paragraphs 3.4 and 3.5 draws attention to the fundamental changes in the structure of the economy. Paragraph 3.5 notes: "...The logistics sector continues to grow, with significant investment taking place and market interest evidenced along the A57 and A1 corridors". Given the extent to which Bassetlaw is a substantial rural area it is surprising that Draft Policy ST1 does not address the extent to which the rural economy has been and will be called upon to support economic growth. Generally and partly by its very nature the A1 would normally be more associated with rural Bassetlaw than urban Bassetlaw. But there are a few locations that exemplify the changes from a rural area more than "North Blyth" given the extent that the developments already present are changing and the development permitted but yet to come will continue to significantly change the character of the area. Rural economic growth in Bassetlaw has a different dimension than might normally be expected in a rural authority. "North Blyth" offers an outstanding opportunity to not only strengthen the local economy but also appropriately locate other key elements of employment infrastructure i.e. housing without harm to any issue of normal importance.</p>	<p>Policy ST1 2a supports the growth of the Large Rural Settlements - which includes Blyth - and 2d supports development in the countryside necessary to the location, including those which support the rural economy.</p>
REF222	Resident	<p>Transport should be included specifically in section A i.e. to demonstrate that; the needs of pedestrians, cyclists, public transport users, and freight, can be addressed, that there isn't a road safety problem that cannot be removed, and local routes are suitable or can be suitably upgraded to carry the additional traffic and the types of traffic generated by the development.</p>	<p>It is important that all new development can be safely accessed. Policy ST11 will be amended accordingly.</p>
1196559	Resident	<p>There is very little opportunity to develop business with the SETTLEMENT of Bothamsall. Any growth would need to be within the Parish. We have already seen the closure of our basic amenities (Post Office and very small Shop) and the reduction of the Bus Service to one that is totally inadequate and of little use to the Residents of Bothamsall.</p>	<p>Policy ST11 will be amended to ensure it is applicable to all types of rural businesses.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST11 - Rural Economic Growth			
REF289 -	Consultant	Welcome Policy ST11's support for new employment development in rural locations and the creation of 'rural enterprise hubs', in particular. The policy should recognise, however, that the range of employment activities associated with such hubs is likely to be much broader than those listed under Part A, 4 of the same policy. Policy ST11 should, therefore, be revised to exclude Part A, 4.	Policy ST11 will be amended to ensure it is applicable to all types of rural businesses.
REF298	Consultant	FCC's site currently lies outside the settlement boundary of Worksop and whilst it is most closely related to the urban area of Worksop, for planning policy purposes, it is within the rural area. Despite this rural location, the site has a history of built development and in part benefits from planning permission for employment uses. The east of the site has planning permission (ref: 18/01093/OUT) and should be included within the employment sites listed within Policy ST6. It is anticipated that by the time the Local Plan is submitted for examination in December 2020 the entire site will benefit from planning permission for employment uses and that the submitted version of ST6 will reflect this. At present, the site does not benefit from an employment allocation and would fall to be considered against Policy ST10 and other relevant policies in the Plan, including Policy ST11. Whilst Policy ST10 could lend support for proposed employment uses in unallocated countryside locations, Policy ST11 as currently drafted is a prescriptive policy which seeks to limit rural economic growth to those developments which require a rural location. Whilst 'rural' is not defined within the Plan, FCC presume that 'rural' is all land that is unallocated land which is outside of the settlement boundary. This should be clarified. The current wording of the policy requires a number of criteria to be satisfied, which includes criteria relating to agricultural and farming which are clearly not applicable to B1, B2 or B8 uses. As such, employment development such as that proposed on FCC's site would not be able to meet all of the criteria as required by the Policy ST11 and thus would be contrary to the policy. This would preclude most types of economic development coming forward on a countryside (rural) site, including on sites which already benefit from planning permission for similar uses (such as FCC's site), and/or which comply with Policy ST10. Policy ST11 should be amended to allow greater flexibility for certain types of development in the rural area (land beyond the settlement boundary), particularly where compliance with Policy ST10 and other relevant policies is demonstrated.	Policy ST11 will be amended to ensure it is applicable to all types of rural businesses. See comments for Policy ST6.
REF327 -	Parish Council	Good to see proposals to enhance / protect the rural economy and employment levels, even if they are to be put in danger by the arbitrary nominal growth in Policy ST2.	Support noted and welcome.
REF339 -	Consultant	Welcome the positive approach to the historic environment within Draft Plan strategic policies such as Policy ST11: Rural economic growth.	Support noted and welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST12 - Visitor Economy			
1189777	Resident	Do not forget the possibility of new marinas on the Chesterfield Canal. Support the proposed new marina at Walkeringham.	Policy ST12 supports proposals which would provide facilities to enhance the visitor offer in the District. This would include marinas.
1191455	Resident	If our area become a serious a tourist attraction (and a provider of part-time & seasonal employment) them more strategic thought is need to link development and encourage visitors to stay in Bassetlaw. The Council will need to lead on this to encourage our existing attractions to work together and with new attractions to make visits to Bassetlaw a rewarding experience	Comments noted.
REF092	Consultant	Suggest that the following criterion is added to Policy ST12: The diversification of existing touring caravan pitches to static lodges or pods will be supported where: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the proposals are for the expansion of an existing business; • there are no significantly detrimental impacts on the area's landscape, ecology, amenity of neighbouring land uses, the historic environment, designated heritage assets and the character of the area by virtue of increased noise and impacts on light or highway safety and the operation of the highway network. Overall, and considering the above, policies must be sufficiently flexible to allow businesses to adapt to changing economic trends and changes in the demands of tourists. Policy must enable the Caravan and Motorhome Club to support the growth of the local economy by ensuring the ability of its existing sites to be developed and enhanced. Overall, this ensures the future viability of the business, and supports the tourist industry within Bassetlaw. Given the Club's ambition to operate in Bassetlaw for a long-term period in the future they need to guarantee the economic viability of their sites. In turn, wish to see the Council develop a policy to support the expansion and diversification of holiday and caravan sites.	To better enable the Caravan Club to support the District's tourist industry the policy will be amended as suggested.
1194992	Resident	Pg 66 restricting holiday homes, may have a negative effect on housing market as taking houses out of supply long term.	Planning conditions are used to ensure holiday accommodation is appropriately used for a short period of time and is not a way of developing/living in a home in a location which may be unsustainable.
REF198	Consultant	This policy is very short sighted and establishes numerous "hoops" that rural development has to jump through in order for it to be acceptable. Siting many of the rural operations adjacent to towns is not really an option. Acknowledge that Bassetlaw has much to offer the visitor and part of that is its rural setting and offering a more proactive Tourism sector within the Council would be a start. Springvale Fisheries at Bevercotes was quite vehemently objected to by the Council, Notts County Council and some, not all, nearby residents. This was a totally new standalone fishery, rather than making the best use of an extinct quarry but a purposefully designed and built visitor attraction. It is now one of the premier angling locations in the UK and is fully booked up for match fishing for the next 2 years at weekends and 75% booked for weekdays. It is a major success that would never have happened without an Appeals Inspector seeing beyond the restrictive policies. This policy is so far out of date it needs wholly rethinking and is not sound.	Policy ST12 reflects the town centres first approach to tourism development in national policy. However, Policy ST12 recognises the importance that rural attractions bring to the economy and are covered by part C of the policy. The proposed policy framework is very different to that set out within the adopted Core Strategy (against which Springvale Fisheries was assessed). It is considered that Policy ST12 provides a positive framework against which visitor attractions in the countryside should be assessed.
REF282	Resident	National Trust supports Policy ST12 which supports the visitor economy of the district, particularly Part E which supports developments that will enhance the environment or bring neglected or underused heritage assets back into appropriate economic use.	Support noted and welcome.
REF283	Consultant	6.7.3 Should include development of cycle routes linking visitor attraction sites to form attractions themselves, like the Derbyshire Peaks & Rutland Water.	Reference will be added to para 6.7.3 to include support for sustainable transport links to and between visitor attractions.
REF300 -	Consultant	Natural England welcomes paragraph 6.74 "Balance must be achieved between priority visitor experience and protecting unique qualities of natural and built environment". Suggest that this point should be emphasised within the policy wording itself to ensure protection of recreational sites, such as Clumber Park, which experience high visitor pressure threatening fragile natural habitats.	Reference to Clumber Park will be added to para 6.7.4. Ensuring the District's natural and historical assets are not adversely affected by visitor attractions is important. Reference to their appropriate protection will be added to Policy ST12.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST12 - Visitor Economy			
REF327 -	Parish Council	Para. 6.7.7 Visitor Accommodation should also include an item that will stop holiday accommodation usage turning into permanent accommodation via 12 month licences and rigid enforcement. Made Neighbourhood Plans can also be a delivery mechanism too, if visitor accommodation and economy is included.	Planning conditions are used to ensure holiday accommodation is appropriately used for a short period of time and is not a way of developing/living in a home in a location which may be unsustainable. This is referenced at para 6.7.7.

REFERENCE NUMBER	NAME	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST13 Town Centres and Local Centres			
1191455	Resident	To make our Town Centres viable, the Council needs to block any more large retail developments around Worksop or Retford	The Bassetlaw Retail Study identifies that there no large scale retail is needed for the plan period. Policy ST13 sets out the thresholds above which an impact assessment would be required. This will help ensure that any potential impact of new retail development outside the Primary Shopping Area are assessed in detail.
1192494	Resident	The provisions of this policy are welcomed and supported. The policy should also indicate what would not be allowed or encouraged outside the designated areas	Policy ST13 sets out the thresholds above which a retail impact assessment would be required. This will help ensure that any potential impact of new retail development and other town centre uses outside the Primary Shopping Area/town centre are assessed in detail. But for clarity further detail will be added to Policy ST13 on the type of uses that would be appropriate in each tier of the hierarchy.
REF085	Resident	Disappointing that the Draft Plan says very little about Retford town centre. The Council is to produce a development plan document for Worksop town centre. There is a reference to an emerging Retford Centre Business Neighbourhood Plan, but it is unclear how this would be produced, what it would cover, and what if any weight it would carry in planning decisions. The Society would welcome a forward-looking development plan document to guide and encourage development in the town centre and would wish to be consulted in its preparation. In the absence of such a document, consideration should be given to identifying in the Local Plan and drawing attention to sites within the town centre suitable for development which would benefit the local economy. Two areas that should be considered in this context are the land on the north side of Bridgegate and the two-car parks between Wharf Road and West Street. The Society welcomes the Draft Plan's identification of a Primary Shopping Area where all ground floor premises should have an active frontage. Ensuring that frontage uses all contribute to the vitality of the town centre is essential if the centre is to thrive and if its character is to be protected. The protection afforded by Primary Shopping Area status should be extended to Canon Square. This is visually and historically a very important part of the town centre. Any further loss of active frontages here would cause serious harm to its attractive character and should be resisted.	The Retford Business Neighbourhood Plan is being produced by the Retford Business Neighbourhood Plan Group. Once made it will form part of the development plan for the District so would have the same weight as the Local Plan and any other Development Plan Document when planning decisions are made. A new Town Centres Management policy will provide additional focus on the three town centres including Retford. The Retail and Leisure Study defines the extent of the Primary Shopping Area and annual monitoring has confirmed that approach, with some slight exceptions to reflect changes on the ground since the study was undertaken. These boundaries are considered to accurately reflect the Primary Shopping Area as the focus for retail growth.
1194992	Resident	Pg 70 There needs to be more retail in villages to create sustainable communities ie convenience stores so people don't need to drive places. Should also make use of village halls which are unused most of the time for education or other services eg electric charging points for cars, GP practices etc.	Policy ST13 B protects local shops and services and identifies the criteria that needs to be met to provide for a change of use. Community facilities are protected and new community facilities supported in appropriate circumstances subject to the criteria in Policy ST40.

REFERENCE NUMBER	NAME	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST13 Town Centres and Local Centres			
1196000	Consultant	Although there is a leaning towards ensuring shop fronts are maintained as a presence on the high street (agree that would be the preferred option), there is no obvious indication as to how the council intend to support that, as opposed to simply standing in the way of changes of use. The reality is that the nature of the high street is changing, due to changing lifestyles, the rise of online shopping and the increasing dominance of the supermarket chains. To be fair, aside from cutting business rates to small retailers, not sure what the council can do, but it would be futile to ignore the grim reality.	Policy 33 provides a positive framework to maintain and enhance shopfronts, signage and security particularly in the town centres. The policy balances heritage concerns with maintaining active frontages and supports innovative design that respects the character of the location. Such measures can be achieved in a cost effective way and can add value to the use of the building rather than being an obstacle to change.
1196559	Resident	Development within or close by the existing built environment is always the best option. Invariably Public Transport and Shopping/Medical facilities are already existing and will welcome the additional custom. Other infrastructure may need upgrading, but this should be far simpler than starting from scratch, as would be required on the proposed green field sites.	Comments noted.
1196860	Resident	ST13 is supported	Support noted and welcome.
REF272	Consultant	Despite being referenced in Policy ST13 A.1d little account appears to have been taken of the positive impact of the significant footfall created by people accessing public services such as health services e.g. Newgate Medical Centre in Worksop.	Policy ST13 recognises that outside the central retail core of the town centre uses such as health care facilities will be supported. Paragraph 6.8.7 refers to uses being supported in town centres that attract a reasonable level of customers and footfall as these can generate passing trade for other units in the town centre. By specifically highlighting health facilities (In D1 use) as being one of these appropriate uses, considerable weight is given for future development of such facilities in the town centre in future. But for clarity further detail will be added to Policy ST13 on the type of uses that would be appropriate in each tier of the hierarchy.
1197186	Resident	There are good ideas in this plan. Wonder if they fully address the changes in shopping & working habits. With more online shopping there may be more move towards niche businesses such as small shops/cafes offering something different. In Retford, Mama Giusi's, The Honey & Fig, BeerheadZ and The Barrister in Wonderland Bookshop are examples. Wonder if one way to protect our high streets is to introduce town centre housing as existed in the past. There are former town centre houses still in Retford even though the frontage and use has changed. If people are working more from home, therefore less commuting being needed, there may be a demand for business/work hubs being created. This allows people to socialise and work from one base across a number of companies. Secure high speed broadband is essential for this. ITV Calendar recently showed a good example of a hub in action and the benefits it brings to individuals, the town centre and the environment.	Policy ST13 provides a flexible framework to respond well to potential changing shopping, leisure and working habits. Policy ST13 also promotes active frontages so provides a flexible framework to supporting the full range of town centre uses within the town centre. Only in the Primary Shopping Areas would retail (shops) be the preferred use. But change of use to non retail uses may be supported where the criteria in the policy can be met. Policy ST13 supports opportunities for residential use above ground floor units in the town centres.
REF350 -	Resident	Welcome that the Primary Shopping Area (PSA) of the town centre has been extended to include the whole of the PSC including where the consented foodstore is proposed and that Policy ST13 states that "Proposals for retail use outside the Primary Shopping Areas or for other main town centre uses, outside the town centre boundaries will be required to demonstrate their suitability through a sequential test in line with the National Planning Policy Framework" Welcome the requirement for retail impact assessments for any retail proposals over 929sqm outside Worksop town centre given the need to ensure that such proposals do not have a significant adverse impact on the town centre. Note that paragraph 6.8.8 refers to the town centre being supported by a Development Plan Document for the Worksop Central Area (WCA) which will provide a framework for the regeneration of the area as set out at Policy ST4 of the draft Local Plan. Paragraph 5.4.7 of the Local Plan explains that the WCA includes four delivery areas including 1. New Sandhills; 2. The V2 Experience; 3. Concentrated Retail Centre (which includes the PSC); 4. Worksop Station Gateway; and 5. Old Town.	Support noted and welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	NAME	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST13 Town Centres and Local Centres			
REF475 -	Resident	Regeneration policies (ST5, ST13) – support	Support noted and welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST 14 Housing	Distribution		
1180212	Resident	<p>My previous comments are relevant to this point. I also think that the numbers suggested for Retford are very high. Many houses are now being built in retford and with the addition of the North Road site there will surely be adequate properties to house the local population and to revise housing targets for small rural communities.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Retford is the second largest town in Bassetlaw and contains services and facilities to support a higher level of growth than all other areas of the District, with the exception of Worksop. As such, it needs to deliver housing to support the growing population and to support the local economy.
1189633	Resident	<p>I do not know your policy numbers but I think you have over-estimated the number of houses required. I think the balance between rural and urban development is not appropriate. A considerable increase in car journeys from villages to Retford and Worksop is in conflict with your aim of sustainability.</p>	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is in the process of reviewing housing distribution and will make any necessary amendments.
1191848	Barnby Moor Parish Council	<p>I understand that the proposed new dwellings is quite a bit higher than the number required, This seems unfair to smaller parishes.</p>	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is in the process of reviewing housing distribution and will make any necessary amendments.
REF085	Retford Civic Society	<p>The Draft Plan proposes a scale of house building which is far in excess of what is required using the 'standard method' required by the government. This method is intended to establish a minimum requirement, but the Society sees no justification for exceeding it to the extent proposed.</p> <p>The more recent OPCS projections of need gave a much smaller housing requirement for Bassetlaw. Although it is government policy that this projection should not be used, it does give some indication of the direction of change likely as more up-to-date projections are made available.</p> <p>The Draft Plan indicates that between 2011 and 2018 the District's population increased by 3.4% and that it is projected to increase by 3.8 % by 2037. The annual rate of population increase is projected to fall significantly.</p> <p>Neither of these projections points to housing growth on anything like the scale proposed in the Draft Plan. On the contrary, they suggest that there is no justification for exceeding the minimum required under the government's 'standard method'.</p> <p>There is no reason to believe that the current output of housebuilders in Bassetlaw is significantly restricted by a shortage of land or that they could increase their output to the extent proposed in the Draft Plan.</p> <p>The scale of housing proposed in the Draft Plan is said to be justified by expected employment growth. We have looked at relevant background papers, particularly the G L Hearn report, and see no logical basis for this. Although the Draft Plan makes provision for new sources of employment, particularly by capitalising of access to the A1, there is no reason to expect a massive upsurge in the number of jobs actually provided. The Council has been striving hard to attract more employment since the miners' strike and before and these efforts have had considerable success. Efforts in the future may be a bit more successful, but they are unlikely to be dramatically so. Our leaving the EU and the end of the free movement of labour is particularly pertinent to this point. There is nothing in the state of the local or national economy or in the availability of public finance to suggest a change on such a scale as to require a substantial increase in the rate of house building.</p> <p>The Society considers that the scale of house building proposed in the draft Local Plan is excessive and that it should be reduced to around that required by the government's 'standard method' of assessment. If this is not done there will be an unnecessary and unjustified loss of greenfield land. Market considerations limiting what housebuilders can sell are likely to result in the house building rate failing to grow at the rate proposed. Housebuilders are likely to cherry-pick and develop the easiest and most profitable sites rather than more complicated ones with more community benefit.</p>	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is in the process of reviewing housing distribution and the evidence and will make any necessary amendments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST 14 Housing	Distribution	There is a substantial risk of under-delivery and this could lead to the Council being penalised and losing control over where development takes place.	
1193159	Resident	There are no provisions for adding infrastructure to support 250 new houses in Ranskill. The roads and school will not be adequate and there is little provision for any new businesses	Thank you for your comments which are noted. Infrastructure requirements have been, and will continue to be
1193555	Resident	House building is great but have you considered the schools and how they will be able to provide the spaces.	Yes, we have worked with Nottinghamshire County to ensure school provision is assessed and delivered.
REF089	NEDDC	3.1 On the strategic matter of housing the Draft Plan states that 'to ensure a sustainable strategy is delivered, the number of homes must be balanced with the number of new jobs expected to be delivered in the District. Jobs growth will generate a need for an increased labour supply to meet increasing employment demand. In turn this will lead to new homes to accommodate the new population'. 3.2 In proposing the District's housing requirement figure it is stated that 'on that basis, the Economic Development Needs Assessment, 2019 identifies that the housing requirement be increased to a minimum of 478 dwellings (per year) to support economic growth in the District'. 3.3 Bassetlaw is therefore proposing a total housing requirement figure of 9087 dwellings, i.e. 478 dwellings per year for the period 2018 to 2037. Officer Comments: 3.4 This Council supports, in principle, Bassetlaw's strategy to deliver sustainable development and growth; and to accommodate all its development needs within its own boundaries. However, it is noted that the Draft Plan's housing requirement figure is significantly higher than both the SHMA based OAN of 374 dpa, and 'Growth Scenario' of 417 dpa (the economic led housing need figure from the Growth Scenario 2014-2035 in the SHMA). It is also well above the figure of 390 dpa for 2018-2035 which is identified as the overall housing requirement figure to support the Oxford Economics Growth Mid-point scenario in the evidence base. 3.5 It is acknowledged there is a difference in time periods covered by the evidence and the Draft Plan, but it is unclear from the evidence presented exactly how the housing requirement figure has been arrived at. The relationship between jobs growth and the employment land requirement as set out in the Draft Plan is also unclear. 3.6 North East Derbyshire District Council does not object in principle, to the scale of development proposed. However, further and clear justification for the housing requirement figure is necessary to enable the Council to make an informed decision on the likely impacts upon this District and the wider HMA; and ultimately sign up to a new statement of common ground on these cross boundary strategic matters.	Thank you for your comments. The Council has undertaken an Economic Development Needs Assessment to inform the housing requirement. This evidence is available to view on the Council's website.
REF091	Consultant	We consider that my clients land (as outlined in red) has the potential to be a 'housing allocation' in the Worksop Area. The area is located outside of the Conservation Area and not affected by any 'designation' on the Proposals Map. The area measures approximately 13.9 hectares and is located within Flood Zone 1. We would anticipate that vehicular access could be established from Woodsetts Lane and Owday Lane which link with the A57 Worksop and B6041 Gateford Road. The site would be suitable, available and deliverable within the Plan Period and it is considered that the LPA should consider its development potential at this early stage in the plan making process.	Thank you for your comments. The Council will review the site through the Land Availability Assessment to determine if it is suitable for development. If the site is considered suitable, it will be assessed through the Sustainability Appraisal process and considered for allocation.
REF108	Globe Consultation	Whilst supportive of Policy ST14 in principle, Globe is disappointed to note the omission of their client's site at Blackstope Lane, Retford, which was put forward in January 2019 for its inclusion in any future Land Availability Assessment (LAA) review. Liaison with Planning Policy Officer Debbie Broad confirmed that this site was discounted and omitted from the LAA at Stage 1 of the site selection process due to its location within flood zone 3, coupled with the Council's opinion that Blackstope Lane does not achieve adequate highway standards. However, Globe would like to raise awareness to the ongoing liaison between Roy Lobley Consulting and the Environment Agency with regards to the site's flood risk. The most recent hydrological modelling undertaken by the Agency confirms that the risk of flooding at this particular site is much less severe than both that of the surrounding area and that had been assumed prior to the modelling (as is demonstrated by the attached document which shows the site is free from flooding barring a 1 in 75 year event). Accordingly, the omission of this site from the LAA on the grounds of flood risk is no longer justified by the available evidence and has been based on incorrect and now outdated information.	The site is located within the highest risk Floodzone (Floodzone 3b). As such, development would be contrary to policy. The Council has not taken it forward for further consideration due to the severity of the constraints.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST 14 Housing	Distribution		
REF114	Ranskill Parish Council	<p>The Parish Council would like to see further clarification in the plan as to why Bassetlaw District Council are seeking to build far in excess of the number of homes that is required under the NPPF Standardised Methodology. In "Housing Need" page 29 para 5.1.42, the Plan states that the NPPF Standardised Methodology results in a minimum housing need of 307 dwellings per annum. While it is understandable that the District Council would seek to build more than the minimum requirement the Parish Council does not understand why the proposal is to build such a large percentage more i.e. almost 56% more - 478 dwellings per annum a total of 9087 in the plan period (page 29 para 5.1.46). The figures for population growth given earlier in the Plan would seem to be at odds with the number of homes proposed to be built. On page 15 para 3.12 it states that the District population is "projected to increase by 3.8% by 2037 equating to more than 4350 additional residents". If this is the case, why is it proposed to build a further 9087 dwellings? (page 29 para 5.1.46) This does not appear to make sense. The Plan states that the minimum figure has been adjusted "to take account of local factors affecting migration and household formation rates and employment growth forecasts". However, this is not sufficiently transparent. The Plan should provide a clear, understandable summary of these "local factors", especially as it could reasonably be assumed by residents that the NPPF Standardised Methodology which resulted in the figure of 307 dwellings would have accounted for such variables. Based on the above comments, in the interests of transparency the Parish Council would also like to see clarification of the "Statement of Common Ground" which it is stated has been signed with the local authorities in the Sheffield City Combined Authority page 29 para 5.1.47. What does the statement referred to mean for the residents of Bassetlaw? Ditto the statement in para 5.1.43 on the same page "this means working with other local authorities in the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw Housing Area". Working in what way?</p>	<p>The standard method, based on Government guidance, is the minimum starting point in the calculation of housing need. The Council also needs to take into consideration economic growth. Evidence can be found in the Council's Economic Development Needs Assessment which indicates that a higher level of housing growth is required to support the economic growth proposed.</p>
REF136	A and D Architecture	<p>4) Policy ST14 should be modified to include sites to be allocated for Park Home static caravan site development. Preferably these should be new sites to ensure competition and choice of location in the market.</p>	<p>The Council does not consider it necessary to allocate sites for Home Parks. There are policies in the plan which can be used to determine applications for Park Homes.</p>
1195294	Resident	<p>Seems the council are pushing through mass house building, almost a thousand already underway, and thousands more all on green belt land and the majority on conservation areas. It's ok to stop some development because of it being placed in conservation areas but when the council get involved it's ok. The worry of many residents especially in Carlton in Lindrick the peaks hill development looks to have already been given the go ahead without consultation and this is providing your ok to the plan. Many people don't agree with this development as recently the Carlton in Lindrick plan was to have no more than the 2 developments one in costhorpe the other on the firbeck colliery site. Now the parish is being forced to accept another thousand plus development within the parish boundary. This is unacceptable and increasing what was a quaint quiet village into a town in its own right or merely merging Worksop and Langold. As an ecologist I'll record plants insects mammals amphibians and birds of the area and will definitely find great Crested newt has I've seen them before in that area. I've also seen Merlin in the summer breeding in the woods. If i record them here and the planning goes ahead it will be destroy the credibility of the council to protect the ecology and environment of the area. Which will be a big issue with the press especially bad in an area where there is little wildlife to speak of.</p>	<p>Bassetlaw does not have any areas of Green Belt land. Peaks Hill Farm is still a proposal, it has not been approved by the Council. The Council is required to deliver enough new homes to meet the needs of the District over the next 15 years. Peaks Hill Farm is considered to be a sustainable location and it provides opportunities to enhance infrastructure, including public open space, highways improvements etc. The Council continues to work with partnering organisations to ensure sites taken forward will deliver sustainable development.</p>
REF150	Resident	<p>Flexing Housing Requirement Numbers It is expected that the minimum housing requirement will be exceeded in several larger settlements, which will by-and-large be able to accommodate greater housing growth due to their proximity to services and availability of suitable housing sites. I would ask that the Council should therefore consider and explain how they will therefore reflect the need to accept lower than the minimum housing requirements in other, predominantly smaller and less well served, settlements i.e. how they will decide which settlements can accept lower housing unit targets.</p> <p>Despite the Rural Settlement Study and the draft Local Plan not using either a settlement's conservation status nor its availability/proximity to services as an initial filtering criterion (due to the Council recognising such an approach would be unsound at this stage), serious consideration should be given to reintroducing them at this more advanced stage, to prioritise which settlements could see their housing numbers reduced. Given Clayworth's 'enhanced' conservation status and its lack of basic services, either in the village or in any reasonable proximity, it should be prioritised for lower housing requirements.</p>	<p>The Council is reviewing the Rural Policy and will make any necessary amendments.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST 14 Housing	Distribution		
1195325	Resident	<p>I dispute the number of homes required in the plan period. Given the large number of houses being built at Harworth and Shirebrook I fail to see why 750 are required to the north of Worksop. Where and how are the numbers justified. The plan shows a disproportionate amount of housing to the north of Worksop i.e. 750 at Peakks Farm and 258 for the whole of the rest of Worksop. There are many unoccupied houses in Worksop kept vacant by absent landlords. These could help to meet the home numbers required rather than the easy option to build on open farmland. Would any brownfield sites be used for home? Unless the local plan pushes these areas develop as well always choose the easy option of open farmland. I am realistic and understand that some development will take place to the north of Worksop. When we purchased our bungalow on Rosedale we liked the fact we were near open countryside and there was then no indication of this very large 'large urban extension' being built nearby. Also the correct wording must be put in the local plan to ensure that BDC can control the development and resist any obtrusive forms of development for this 'rural fringe location,' with 'prominent natural assets'. The guiding master plan in 7.2.2 can only be as good as the wording of the local plan allows. e.g. C2a) page 78 starts with the words 'at least' 750 dwellings - what does this mean? A proposed developer could stretch this to a much higher figure. The local plan must have a top figure in order to control the housing development. As stated I believe 750 are too many never mind a lot more. Low density development should also be felt more appropriate for this area. 7.2.3 and 4. The retention of the trees and existing hedgerows on the site is an important with reference to its rural fringe location. Trees at Long Plantation should be protected and any proposed road should be designed to run along side the wood thereby not requiring felling of trees. There should be a tree frontage to the existing roads again due to its rural location and in keeping with the character of other road entrances to Worksop. 7.2.5. Bassetlaw's character with lots of villages is important and the green gap between Worksop and Carlton must be retained. Historically Carlton is a separate settlement. It is also important to retain the wooded and green open land to the East of Blyth road. This is a well used recreational space for the local community and Worksop as a whole. This area must link to the green gap and the Carlton road trees forming landscape corridors across the proposed development site incorporating Long Plantation and the trees of Eddison Plantation. Is essential to try to help the wildlife presently in this area. 7.2.6 refers to the development starting in 2026. With the current homes being built at the end of Thievesdale Lane, these between 2026 and 2036 with proposals for a further 750 (presumably in the next local plan, but this is unclear from the paperwork/press info.) you are subjecting our neighbourhood, inc. many senior citizens, to years of living close to a building site with all its noise and disruption. Stated before this is too big a development for this area. 7.2.7 This wording should clearly state what type of houses would be on suitable for this area e.g. No high-rise developments. Are Affordable homes appropriate for this area given the distance from the town centre and its facilities. 7.2.8 The wording of the local plan should ensure individual small scale business and employment sites in keeping with the character of the area. Other areas of office space (new-build and existing) are available in Bassetlaw and is there justification for yet more on this site? 7.2.9. A number of houses are to be built on this site then the local plan must ensure that the local Centre health and education facilities etc. are provided - often Developers prefer to sign Agreements to provide a lump sum to be used elsewhere. I am also concerned that the wider community facilities e.g. GP surgeries, the Hospital including A&E and the existing schools cannot cater for such a large population increase. Waiting times are already long enough. 7.2.10 If development proceeds I can see the need for a new road between Carlton Road and Blyth Road. But 750 houses will generate many more car journeys (property could easily have two cars) and the roads either side of the site are already well used and congested. Blyth road is particularly difficult with the hospital roadside parking. Many cars travelling along the new road would still use Thievesdale Lane Canon traffic lights or Kilton Hill traffic lights. These are already well used by local people and commuters from the wider area with queuing forming at busy times. 7.2.11 to 7.2.13 refer to many road alterations which will themselves adversely affect the character of this area in its rural setting. Retention of trees and hedgerows will help and should be stated in the wording of this section of the local plan.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The aims and objectives of the Bassetlaw Local Plan is to deliver the required amount of sustainable development based on evidence. It seeks to protect and enhance the environment through well designed, sustainable development which is required to provide a net gain in biodiversity.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST 14 Housing	Distribution		
REF169	Highways England	<p>In January 2017 Highways England provided comments on the initial draft version of the Local Plan, with a housing target of 6,525 dwellings and a minimum of 177 hectares of employment land, identified to come forward. While no specific sites had been identified, the majority of the development was expected to target the towns of Worksop, Retford and Harworth and Bircotes.</p> <p>With regard to the current version of the Local Plan, the housing target has increased significantly to 9,087 dwellings. This is shared over:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2,180 in Worksop; • 1,574 in Retford; • 2,000 in Harworth; • 1,764 in large rural villages and 1,090 in small rural settlements; and • 750 in Bassetlaw Garden Village, located adjacent to the east of the A57 / A1 / Blyth Road junction at Upper Morton. 	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
1195911	Aspbury Planning Limited	<p>We do not object per se to the allocations set out in ST14 yet consider that an insufficient number and variety of sites have been allocated in Retford to meet the housing requirement for the town and compensate for any under delivery at the New Garden Settlement within the plan period. We are particularly concerned by the omission of the site LAA138 at Welham Road, Retford, which is part within and part out with by the current (old) development boundary yet has been acknowledged in writing by the former Interim Development Team Manager Myles Joyce and subsequent officers as being 'read' as part of Retford rather than as part of the countryside. The latest Land Availability Information for the site with regard to its flood status is overstated in its reporting of the flood risk associated with the site which has previously had a residential consent. As recently as 2019 a subsequent mixed use application (19/00141/FUL) drew no objections from the EA or the LLFA. We have taken issue with the scope and extent of the FZ2 designation of the site and that the EA have acknowledged in communication dated 03/07/19 that they did not have current resources to update their modelling of the Retford Beck and its knock on impacts and so the reliability of the EA data on a site which we have undertaken extensive FRA remains highly questionable. We note that there are a number of allocated sites within policy ST14 that take in elements of FZ2 and FZ3. We question therefore why a previously consented site for residential with no flood risk objections from the relevant flood authorities should not be included at this stage.</p>	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial distribution of housing and will make any necessary amendments accordingly.
REF198	Consultant	Para 5.1.46 page 29 The housing requirement for Bassetlaw over the plan period is 9087 which the Council feel comfortable can be delivered, see 5.1.47 and 5.1.48.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
REF198	Consultant	<p>Policy ST14 page 75 This policy is flawed due to the lack of inclusion of the possible housing site at St John's College Farm. Site reference NP04 is a most incongruous addition being, as it is, right on the very entrance to the village in open countryside. The Tuxford allocations should be reconsidered also given that NP11 has provision for 60+ affordable/social housing with no full time market housing.</p> <p>Neither of these allocations appears to include the relevant number of senior citizen housing which has been identified both by Bassetlaw District Council and Tuxford Town Council/Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>This part of the policy is therefore not sound.</p>	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is proposing to enable the Neighbourhood Plan process allocate appropriate sites. The policy proposed for the rural area will support development which meets the policy criteria.
REF214	Oxalis Planning	<p>Overall, we agree with the Spatial Strategy for Bassetlaw insofar as it seeks to deliver development in the most sustainable locations throughout the lifetime of the Local Plan. In order to achieve sustainable development across the District, we agree that the most logical and sensible solution for the provision of development is to ensure that the larger 'main towns' remain the focus for the majority of development and that the Large Rural Settlements form the next tier in the hierarchy and will accommodate the majority of the rest of the District's housing need. However, we do not consider that the proposed use of Neighbourhood Plan allocations alone will provide the necessary strategic scale of sustainable development for the Large Rural Settlements and we believe that the Plan should contain built in flexibility to ensure that it can be responsive to change and therefore relevant throughout its lifetime. We also consider the arbitrary 20% cap on development for the Large Rural Settlements to be restrictive</p> <p>as it could impede the Council's ability to ensure that development is distributed and delivered in a sustainable way throughout the lifetime of the Local Plan. In this regard, we have proposed additional wording to be included in Policy ST1 and we believe</p>	The Plan is considered to be sufficiently flexible to enable sustainable development to occur in the rural areas.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST 14 Housing	Distribution	that the 20% cap should be revised to become a guide for the level of development that the Large Rural Settlements should achieve	
REF218	Central Lincolnshire	We note the intention of Bassetlaw to meet the District's housing and employment needs within the District area and would wish the support of the Central Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee to be recorded. We note that you are seeking to meet a need higher than the current nationally derived Local Housing Need for Bassetlaw in the Local Plan. Whilst we do not object to this approach, given the challenges in the region in maintaining land supply, it might be preferable to include a housing range in your plan where the nationally derived Local Housing Need figure is the bottom end of the range and the aspirational figure in your plan forms the top end. Changes to the Planning Practice Guidance now allows for this in Paragraph 027 (Reference ID: 68-027-20190722), specifically stating that for land supply calculations purposes you will be tested against the bottom end of the range. This will help your plan aspire to a higher level, whilst giving the greatest chance of success in maintaining a five year supply of housing land.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is looking to deliver economic growth and, in order to support this, there is a requirement to ensure enough homes are delivered. As such, given the fact that the Council can demonstrate a healthy housing land supply, it is not considered appropriate to adopt a range for the housing requirement.
1196560	Resident	Additional housing planned is in excess of the amount needed. There is sufficient housing proposed in Bassetlaw with the identified developments found by Neighbourhood Planning Groups, the proposed site at Upper Morton and potential for re use of existing building for there to be no need for a large housing development at Cottam. However, the council's own policies and aims are at complete variance with the strategies to develop in Retford and Cottam. The proposed new builds will have a damaging effect on the environment and the life of the community.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the Strategy and will make any necessary amendments. The Plan proposes policies which will seek to protect the environment/deliver sustainable development.
1196694	Resident	Parag 4.2 of the CIL Draft Charging Schedule notes that of the new developments: 81% are greenfield and 19% are brownfield. This is an appalling scenario for our environment. Bassetlaw is ahead of schedule to meet its targets for housebuilding by 2037. It should not be approving plans to build on so much greenfield land. It should continue to review what brownfield sites become available in the decades to come. There will be new brownfield sites available before (and after) 2037 which can be considered for residential building. 5.1.49 refers to building more quality housing than is required – this cannot be justified: once greenfield land is built on, it is lost forever; there is nothing sustainable about this approach. Building on greenfield sites to such a level as is proposed, especially at Peaks Hill, does not meet the definition of "sustainable development". The ability of future generations to meet their own needs for enjoyment of the natural environment, cleanair, space and nature will be adversely impacted by this huge development and the consequent growth in traffic. Parag 4.2 of the CIL Draft Charging Schedule notes that 20% of the greenfield units and 10% of the brownfield units will be affordable, ie 80% of greenfield and 90% of brownfield units will not be affordable housing. How is this meeting the local demand identified at 3.13: the huge percentage increase in over 65s and over 80s and the percentage decrease in the numbers aged 16-65? There is a need for smaller houses and for bungalows, not for large houses.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is seeking to deliver regeneration, and supports brownfield redevelopment. However, there are not enough available brownfield sites to meet the development needs of the District. Consequently both brownfield and greenfield sites are required for development.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST 14 Housing	Distribution		
REF249	Pegasus Group	<p>Housing Requirement Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy identifies a minimum housing requirement of 9,087 dwellings over the plan period (2018 to 2037). This is expressed as an average annual requirement of 478 dwellings per annum (dpa). The expression of the housing requirement as a minimum is supported and is considered consistent with the NPPF.</p> <p>2.5 The NPPF, paragraph 60 states.... The standard method for determining local housing need referred to within paragraph 60 is set out within the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). This suggests a minimum requirement of just 286dpa. Setting the housing requirement above the minimum identified by the standard method is supported.</p> <p>2.7 The PPG re-iterates that the standard method is the minimum housing requirement and identifies circumstances where greater levels of housing should be catered for. This non-exhaustive list includes; i. growth strategies for the area that are likely to be deliverable, for example where funding is in place to promote and facilitate additional growth (e.g. Housing Deals); ii. strategic infrastructure improvements that are likely to drive an increase in the homes needed locally; or iii. an authority agreeing to take on unmet need from neighbouring authorities, as set out in a statement of common ground; (PPG ID 2a-010-20190220)</p> <p>At least the first two reasons are appropriate in the case of Bassetlaw. The third will be dependent upon neighbouring authorities. This is discussed in greater detail below.</p> <p>2.8 The PPG (ID 2a-010-20190220) further notes that;.... In the case of Bassetlaw both additional reasons apply. With respect to the SHMA this is discussed in detail below. In terms of previous levels of housing delivery Bassetlaw has, on average, delivered significantly more than 286dpa, as illustrated in the following table. The long-term average delivery since 2001/02 is 318 dwellings. More recently, over the last 5-years delivery has improved to an average of 404dpa. To plan below the five-year average would be contrary to paragraph 59 of the NPPF which re-iterates the Government's continued objective of 'significantly boosting' the supply of homes. 2.11 It must also be recognised that the Government has committed to reviewing the standard methodology. This is intended to commence later this year. Given that the Government has re-stated its commitment to delivering 300,000 homes by the mid-2020s and the sum of the standard method falls well short of this requirement it would seem logical that a future iteration of the standard method would generally increase housing need across the country. The Draft BLP (para. 5.1.45) identifies that the housing requirement is based upon evidence provided within the 2019 'Economic Development Needs Assessment'. However, the 2019 'Economic Development Needs Assessment' identifies a range of housing requirements based upon differing economic scenarios. The outputs are identified in table 16 and summarised below. The differing scenarios suggest a large range in future housing need. It is, however, notable that none directly relates to the proposed housing requirement of 478dpa. Furthermore, the assessment dates 2018 to 2035 do not match the plan period 2018 to 2037. Prior to the next stage of consultation, it is recommended that the Council clarify its position with regards to the derivation of the housing requirement.</p> <p>2.14 The proposed housing figures is placed at the upper end of the identified range, this is supported. It is, however, notable that it sits comfortably below any of the 'High Growth' scenarios. The proposed housing requirement sits within the 'Midpoint Growth' range. This is surprising given the economic potential of Bassetlaw. The district sits within two Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs). These being the Sheffield City Region LEP and the Derby, Derbyshire, Nottingham, Nottinghamshire LEP (D2N2).</p> <p>2.15 Both LEP areas have significant growth ambitions. The Sheffield City Region LEP Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) seeks to provide 70,000 additional jobs between 2015 and 2025. Similarly, the D2N2 SEP has strong growth ambitions and whilst not having a clear jobs growth target it is anticipating significant growth in higher paid jobs. Given this backdrop a higher overall housing requirement would be justified. 2.16 It is noted that at this stage Bassetlaw has not been approached by any neighbouring authority to assist in taking any unmet housing needs. This will need to be kept under review.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is reviewing the distribution of housing and will make any necessary amendments.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST 14 Housing	Distribution		
REF249	Pegasus Group	<p>The Draft BLP identifies a housing requirement of 9,087 dwellings over the plan period (2018 to 2037). Over the 2018/19 monitoring year 434 dwellings were delivered. Notwithstanding our comments upon the housing requirement this The January 2020 Land Availability Assessment (2020 LAA) identifies that as of 1st January 2020, 6,984 dwellings benefitted from some form of planning permission. A further 540 dwellings are identified as allocations (without permission) within made Neighbourhood Plans.4.3 Table 7, replicated below, of the 2020 LAA identifies proposals to allocate 2,881 dwellings. The total deliverable supply over the plan period is therefore 10,375 dwellings (Gross) or 10,339 dwellings (Net). This provide a buffer of approximately 19.5% or 1,686 dwellings. Whilst at face value this appears a healthy buffer it is heavily reliant upon several factors.4.5 In addition, the Council has not factored in any non-implementation rate into the supply from sites with permission. Even a relatively modest non-implementation rate of 10% would have a significant effect upon the buffer reducing it by approximately 700 dwellings. Furthermore, the supply is reliant upon at least 750 being delivered at the New Garden Village. These are discussed in greater detail above (sections 3). This is a complex site which will take a significant time to commence and deliver. Any slippage in the delivery of these key sites will have a significant impact upon the identified buffer.4.7 On this basis a greater buffer is considered appropriate. Any additional buffer should be focused upon Retford to balance the level of development in this main town.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is reviewing the distribution of housing and will make any necessary amendments.</p>
1196860	Sheffield City Council	<p>We note that the Local Housing Need figure currently calculated for Bassetlaw is 307 homes per year, and that the Local Plan housing requirement of 478 homes per year is higher in order to reflect the need to support economic growth in the district. This housing target that is significantly above the 'baseline' LHN figure produced using the Government's standard methodology is welcomed in supporting economic growth in SCR and providing flexibility in relation to overall housing delivery across the SCR. We note that the document confirms that Bassetlaw is able to meet all of its housing requirement within the District. On this basis, we assume that Sheffield is not required to meet any of Bassetlaw's housing needs</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is reviewing this policy and is in the process of producing a Local Housing Need Assessment. Amendments will be made, where necessary, based on up to date evidence.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST 14 Housing	Distribution		
REF270	Barton Willmore	<p>Bassetlaw's Housing Need</p> <p>2.59 The NPPG states the minimum number of homes should use the NPPF Standardised Methodology for calculating Objectively Assessed Needs (SMOAN), resulting in a minimum need of 307 dwellings per annum over the plan period. This is not a housing requirement but provides a minimum starting point for LPAs which should seek to provide as much sustainable development as they can.</p> <p>2.60 With regard to the above, we agree with the Council at paragraph 5.1.45 of the Local Plan that there is a need to increase the minimum housing requirement considering economic growth assumptions in the borough and to ensure that enough homes are delivered to support that growth. However, we consider that there are several reasons why the Council has underestimated the level of uplift (478 dwellings) which it has sought to increase from the minimum SMOAN figure to account for economic growth. We set these out below.</p> <p>2.61 Paragraph 5.1.45 of the Local Plan notes that the Economic Development Needs Assessment (EDNA) 2019 within the evidence base identifies that the housing requirement be increased to a minimum of 478dpa to support the District's economic growth. We do not agree with that statement.</p> <p>2.62 The EDNA shows that the industrial market in Bassetlaw demonstrates strength in a number of aspects. The total stock is above average compared to other more rural authorities in the sub region and has shown 16% growth over the last 15 years, outperforming regional and county benchmarks. We note that the EDNA comments that industrial activity in the District is currently focussed around Worksop but that the A1(M) is considered an emerging or longer -term market with commitments at Harworth subject to securing occupiers. We support those conclusions and have provided evidence of such within our Client's planning applications at Harworth.</p> <p>2.63 The 2019 EDNA considers completion trends as well as forecasts from Oxford Economics, Cambridge Econometrics and Experian. Based on the strength of performance in the last decade or more in transport and manufacturing sectors, uplift scenarios have been applied to the baseline forecasts that are considered to more accurately reflect the district's performance (which the Council is aiming to surpass). A preferred scenario anticipated jobs growth of 3,400 to 2035 which has translated into a need of 63ha of employment land taking into account a flexible margin and mitigating for future losses. Considering past employment trends and current commitments there may be potential for growth above, this subject to monitoring.</p> <p>2.64 The EDNA considers that an economic-led housing need is identified in conjunction with the preferred scenario being of 390dpa. Although the Local Plan states an uplift to this figure has been made to 478dpa, it is not clear how this figure has been arrived at. Whilst we support an approach which seeks to increase housing land supply to take account of economic growth, we consider that the assessment does not go far enough and is simply not justified by evidence.</p> <p>2.65 The above concludes a modest level of growth which is essentially based on a District that is already starting to grow organically better than its neighbours and based on sectors which exist within the District forecasting further growth, particularly in transport and manufacturing. In essence, it appears that the EDNA is based on the District continuing to do what it has already started to do modestly well at economically and, therefore, the forecasts do not appear to reflect Bassetlaw's ambitions for a step-change in the District.</p> <p>2.66 We expressed in our previous representations that it was not clear why the EDNA sought to support the Oxford Economic (OE) 'mid-point' forecast for growth within the borough for 390dpa. Table 16 of the EDNA sets out a number of growth scenarios and demonstrates that the OE baseline, midpoint and high growth scenarios are significantly lower than those provided by Cambridge Economics (CE) or Experian forecasts.</p> <p>2.67 With regard to the above, whilst we support the uplift in housing from 390dpa to 478dpa, we suggest that the conclusion of the EDNA is unclear. From our analysis, the evidence base provided to justify the Council's previously suggested requirement and the newly emerging requirement appears substantially the same, but with a different conclusion reached. It is simply not clear how that alternative conclusion has been reached and, contrary to the assertion of the Local Plan, the figure of 478dpa is not a recommendation or the EDNA.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is reviewing this policy and is in the process of producing a Local Housing Need Assessment. Amendments will be made, where necessary, based on up to date evidence.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST 14 Housing	Distribution		
REF270	Barton Willmore	<p>For the reasons set out below, we do not consider that it represents a logical conclusion from the evidence provided within the EDNA. 2.68 We consider that the level of housing provided should be tailored around supporting a 'high growth' economic forecast (which the Council wants to achieve) which, across the forecasts, would provide between 6,500 (OE) and 8,700 (CE) jobs (7,533 jobs is the mean average of the 3 forecasts) which would require between 518dpa and 608dpa respectively (mean average of 560dpa across the 3 forecasts). As such, we would consider that an aspirational plan that sought to support the level of growth which could be achieved within Bassetlaw would provide for circa 560dpa or 10,640 dwellings across an 19-year plan period. 2.69 Notwithstanding a steadily rising rate of housing delivery, we note the continuing trend of the Council's evidence base to underestimate housing growth needs within the District. 2.70 As market conditions for economic growth improve within the District, and delivery rises, the Council's evidence base is demonstrating a concerning level of housing it considers needs to be delivered. We have significant concerns that underestimating the supply of housing needed over the plan period could constrain economic growth below the potential that the Council has helped to cultivate.2.112 Policy ST14 seeks to allocate land for housing in accordance with the Spatial Strategy. For the reasons set out above in detail, our Client objects to the housing allocations set out within the Local Plan and Policy ST14 which seeks to distribute that housing. It is our Client's view that this policy should be amended to include our Client's site to the south of Ordsall for the reasons set out in Chapter 3 of these representations.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is reviewing this policy and amendments will be made, where necessary, based on up to date evidence.</p>
REF285	Home Builders Federation	<p>Policy ST14 – Housing Distribution allocates land for a minimum of 1,703 dwellings at the following locations :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 sites (HS1 to HS6) (Policies 15 - 20) in Worksop for 1,008 dwellings ; • 3 sites (HS7 to HS9) (Policies 21 - 23) in Retford for 545 dwellings ; and • 2 sites (NP04 & NP11) (Policies 24 & 25) in Tuxford for circa 150 dwellings. <p>Under the 2019 NPPF, the Council should identify at least 10% of its housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare or else demonstrate strong reasons for not achieving this target (para 68). The Council should confirm its compliance with national policy. The Council's overall HLS should include a short and long-term supply of sites by the identification of both strategic and non-strategic allocations for residential development. Housing delivery is optimised where a wide mix of sites is provided, therefore strategic sites should be complimented by smaller non-strategic sites. The widest possible range of sites by both size and market location are required so that small, medium and large housebuilding companies have access to suitable land to offer the widest possible range of products. A diversified portfolio of housing sites offers the widest possible range of products to households to access different types of dwellings to meet their housing needs. Housing delivery is maximised where a wide mix of sites provides choice for consumers, allows places to grow in sustainable ways, creates opportunities to diversify the construction sector, responds to changing circumstances, treats the housing requirement as a minimum rather than a maximum and provides choice / competition in the land market.</p> <p>The HBF is supportive of the inclusion of a contingency buffer to overall HLS. There is no numerical formula to determine the appropriate quantum for a buffer but where a Local Plan is highly dependent upon one or relatively few large strategic sites or settlements / locations then greater numerical flexibility is necessary than in cases where HLS is more diversified. The HBF always suggests as large a contingency as possible to maximise flexibility.</p> <p>Land Availability Assessment January 2020 sets out as at 1st January 2020 the Council's estimated total HLS is 10,405 dwellings (or 10,339 dwellings less demolitions) comprising of :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sites with planning permission for 6,984 dwellings ; • Neighbourhood Plan allocations without planning permission for 540 dwellings ; and • proposed site allocations for 2,881 dwellings (Cottam deliver an additional 1,150 dwellings beyond 2037). <p>In 2018 / 2019, 434 dwellings were delivered so the District's residual housing requirement is 8,653 dwellings from 2019 to 2037 (Housing requirement of 9,087 dwellings minus 434 completions). If the overall HLS is 10,405 dwellings then there is a potential surplus of 1,689 dwellings (19.5%) assuming that all consents and allocations come forward exactly as predicted. The Council has not factored in any lapse rates or allowances for non-implementation. As set out in the 2019 NPPF, the Local Plan should include a trajectory illustrating the expected rate of housing delivery over the plan period. It is noted that there is a lack of detail in the Council's Housing Trajectory in Appendix 3. The HBF would not wish to comment on the merits or otherwise of individual sites proposed for allocation but it is critical that the Council's assumptions on lapse rates, non-implementation allowances, lead in times and delivery rates contained within its overall HLS, 5 YHLS and housing trajectory in Appendix 3 are correct and realistic. These assumptions should be supported by parties responsible for delivery of housing and sense checked</p>	<p>The Council will review the requirement for 10% of housing to be on sites of 1 hectare or less and make any necessary amendments. The Council is seeking to deliver a mix of development on a range of sites (small, medium and large).</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST 14 Housing	Distribution		
		<p>by the Council using historical empirical data and local knowledge.</p> <p>The Council should provide evidence of its 5 YHLS position on adoption of the Local Plan using 478 dwellings per annum as the basis for the 5 YHLS calculation. It is noted that the Bassetlaw 5 YHLS Report 2019/21 applies a 5% buffer however if under the 2019 NPPF the Council is seeking to formally fix a 5 YHLS through the Local Plan then a 10% buffer should be applied (para 73). At time of the pre-submission consultation if the Council provides additional evidence on HLS then the HBF may wish to submit further comments.</p>	
1197091	William Davis	<p>While there are no objections to the proposed housing allocations it is considered that, as noted above, additional housing allocations are required to provide flexibility given the reliance on new settlements and sites to be allocated by Neighbourhood Plans; this will ensure that the housing requirement is met. As set out in the Spatial Strategy, Worksop is the most sustainable settlement in the District and will experience substantial employment growth and regeneration during the plan period. Additional housing allocations in appropriate edge of settlement locations can help provide this buffer, contribute to providing a mix of dwellings across the area and assist in improving the vitality and viability of the town centre. As such it is considered that land north of Mansfield Road (LAA206) should be allocated for residential development. It is considered that the recent planning application (Ref 17/01356/OUT) robustly demonstrated that the site was sustainably located and could be accommodated in the landscape through good design with a less than substantial impact on nearby heritage assets subject to an appropriate design response being followed. No technical objections or reasons for refusal were also raised in respect of access, drainage or impact on local infrastructure.</p>	<p>The Council's approach to the proposed allocations in Worksop is considered appropriate.</p>
REF304	Pegasus	<p>4.1 The Draft BLP identifies a housing requirement of 9,087 dwellings over the plan period (2018 to 2037). Over the 2018/19 monitoring year 434 dwellings were delivered. Notwithstanding our comments upon the housing requirement this leaves a residual housing requirement of 8,653 dwellings from 2019 to 2037.</p> <p>4.2 The January 2020 Land Availability Assessment (2020 LAA) identifies that as of 1st January 2020, 6,984 dwellings benefitted from some form of planning permission. A further 540 dwellings are identified as allocations (without permission) within made Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <p>4.3 Table 7, replicated below, of the 2020 LAA identifies proposals to allocate 2,881 dwellings. 4.4 The total deliverable supply over the plan period is therefore 10,375 dwellings (Gross) or 10,339 dwellings (Net). This provide a buffer of approximately 19.5% or 1,686 dwellings. Whilst at face value this appears a healthy buffer it is heavily reliant upon several factors.</p> <p>4.5 The supply is heavily dominated by sites with permission (6,984 dwellings). This makes up over two thirds of the supply. The impact of the plan upon housing distribution is therefore severely limited. This has led to limited allocations and delivery in Retford (see para. 2.5 above). This hardly appears to be the plan-led approach advocated by the NPPF (para. 15).</p> <p>4.6 In addition, the Council has not factored in any non-implementation rate into the supply from sites with permission. Even a relatively modest non-implementation rate of 10% would have a significant effect upon the buffer reducing it by approximately 700 dwellings.</p> <p>4.7 Furthermore, the supply is reliant upon at least 750 dwellings being delivered at the New Garden Village (see section 3 above). This is a complex site which will take a 26 February 2020 MG P20-0395 Page 10</p> <p>significant time to commence and deliver. Any slippage in the delivery of this key site will have a significant impact upon the identified buffer.</p> <p>4.8 On this basis a greater buffer is considered appropriate. Any additional buffer should be focused upon Retford to balance the level of development in this main town.</p>	<p>The Council is currently reviewing the Spatial Strategy and will make amendments where necessary.</p>
1197187	Resident	<p>I have concerns about developments at Leafields, Sandhills and on the Trinity Estate on North Road. I feel it is important to maintain active green sites within communities. Allotments and wild parkland are great ways to allow people to be active close to where they live. It also protects wildlife under stress such as hedgehogs and some bird species. It allows wild flowers to cultivate themselves supporting insect life such as bees and vice versa. It gives a breathing space supporting our physical and mental well being within a built up area. The plan to move allotments on to the Trinity property will mean much further</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. 1st Council are reviewing 1st distribution Christopher housing and will make any necessary amendments.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST 14 Housing	Distribution	travelling for those living near Leafield and mean that those with mobility restrictions will have more difficulty in accessing that site.	
1197219	Resident	No properties should be built on a green field site which includes established woodlands. This proposed site contradicts Bassetlaw council's strategic objective 4.2. which in summary states that locations should make use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of high quality agricultural land.	There is a need to allocate enough land to deliver the number of new homes needed in Bassetlaw up to 2037. Given the lack of available brownfield sites, it is necessary to allocate greenfield sites.
REF316	Fisher German	The Local Plan proposes to allocate two sites for residential development in Tuxford, totalling some 150 dwellings, 100 dwellings short of the minimum requirement. Presumably the Local Plan is therefore relying on the shortfall in housing to be provided for through a Neighbourhood Plan. The Made Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan has not identified any site allocations for the village. It is understood that Tuxford Town Council are currently progressing a review of their Neighbourhood Plan in order to identify sites to allocate for housing. However, at this time there are no firm timescales to confirm how long it will take for this review to progress and when the revised Neighbourhood Plan will be adopted and unless this is rectified, there is a risk that the 100 dwelling shortfall for Tuxford will not be delivered. We believe that the allocation of sites in the Large Rural Settlements should not be delegated to Neighbourhood Plans when there is not any clear evidence to demonstrate when the allocations will be made. As such we believe the Council should be allocating the full housing requirement for Large Village Settlements within the Local Plan itself.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is reviewing housing distribution. The housing and will make any necessary amendments.
1197269	Resident	A very large rural extension rather than urban and Carlton in Lindrick has fully met their number. Rather than 'more'. Much more detailed evidence for transport will be needed.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council to ensure highway issues are addressed should the site be taken forward. The Bassetlaw Transport Assessment will inform decisions made on the Local Plan.
REF361	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Much of Bassetlaw is an attractive rural area, our existing villages were an attractive place to live. Much of the rural area is not too densely populated, and this helps wildlife in general. If the minor roads get busy, Barn Owls, toads and hares will be exceptionally affected as will birds of prey which are killed when hunting on the roads and verges and scavenging on road kill. 25% of Barn Owls can be killed on the roads for instance. Many other species from flowers to bumble bees and insects suffer from urbanisation. Mentioning mitigation in a draft plan does not magically reduce the damage that is done, but makes the planners and councillors involved with urbanisation feel better. Fragmentation of open country is damaging to all species, odd belts of trees as proposed do not break the fragmentation which is likely to occur around areas of proposed development such as Apley Head junction for instance. Urbanisation of our Bassetlaw garden villages will continue if the 20% increase in building permissions is incorporated into the plan. The Bassetlaw draft Plan appears to propose to supply much more residential land than needed by statute, and there is a suspicion that the proposed luxury provision of residential housing land is connected with the Sheffield City Region's wish to send people out of the City to live in Bassetlaw! An easy option for them, and councillors and planners wishing to co-operate rather than look at the needs and future quality of life in Bassetlaw for the existing residents. Little effort has been expended to ascertain where residences should be provided to minimise traveling, by establishing where jobs will be needed. Because the draft is expecting an increase in the elderly population and a decrease in the younger working population it is not clear why so much employment land is needed in the more rural areas. The Bevercotes colliery site and the existing Gamston Airfield employment areas should provide much of the land required, now that these sites have been rejected for residential development.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is reviewing housing distribution. The housing and will make any necessary amendments.
REF387	Resident	No more housing to be built in and around Retford until provision of police force upgrade in Retford. To have police on the beat in Retford town 24/7 and a manned police station of at least enough policeman to count. Retford and District correctly and safely for all who live here.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is reviewing housing distribution. The housing and will make any necessary amendments.
REF475	Resident	Amount and location of homes (ST14, ST26, ST27, ST28, ST29, ST30, ST31) – don't support Generally yes but, as stated before, the Garden Village is a poorly executed idea.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST 14 Housing	Distribution		
1195356	Resident	<p><i>Worksop will deliver.....</i> Therefore we do not require green land to be destroyed for unrequired housing and destroying the natural very old and established landscape , trees , bio diversity with wildlife some of which is protected such as the bats that exist, owls, sparrow hawks, buzzards, herons, frogs, toads , hedgehogs, hares and the insect population This proposal is monstrous and should not be allowed to proceed</p>	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Local Plan is seeking a net gain in biodiversity. Policies are proposed which seek to protect wildlife (both flora and fauna) and trees and hedgerows. The Plan is looking to deliver more trees/community woodland schemes throughout the district.
1195356	Resident	<p>Good access !!!!!!!!</p> <p>The Cannon Crossroads are always backed up and at peak times you can be waiting a good 10 minutes for any considerable movement through the traffic lights , this then extends along the A60 with a knock on effect and you want to create 1500 houses with a little link road from Blyth Road to Carlton Road with no changes to either Blyth Road / Thievesdale Road junction or the Cannon Crossroads. This will create deadlock likened to a large city and is a likely accident hot spot</p>	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council to ensure highway issues are addressed should the site be taken forward. The Bassetlaw Transport Assessment will inform decisions made on the Local Plan.
1195356	Resident	<p>Destroying green fields and heritage assets, prominent natural assets and long established woodland is not beneficial to the area and will not enhance the area. Its not sustainable or innovative its called commuterville and concrete jungle You are destroying a green agricultural environment that would be better suited to solar farms or wind farming, that would be retaining the natural landscape of the land and supporting the green climate change policies that are more important than 1500 unrequired houses ST15 HS1 Peaks Hill Farm</p>	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Local Plan is seeking a net gain in biodiversity. Policies are proposed which seek to protect wildlife (both flora and fauna) and trees and hedgerows. The Plan is looking to deliver more trees/community woodland schemes throughout the district.
1195356	Resident	<p>You cannot provide the infrastructure quoted here until all the houses are built and sold and money been received from years of council taxes because you have scrapped the community levy and are using loop to avoid implementing infrastructure.....Rippon Homes The Lodge on Thievesdale Lane.....agreement made between yourselves , the developers and Highways Agency that if you only build 42 houses at a time then you don't have to change the road junction. Madness to expect the current roads and junctions to cope with minimum of 3000 more cars. And as for health centres , schools etc what are you going to do with minimum of 1500 extra school children who will needs doctors, dentists and other associated facilities</p>	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Local Plan process is the best way to ensure infrastructure is delivered. If the Council does not have an up to date Plan in place it makes it more difficult to plan for infrastructure because development evolves piecemeal/unplanned.
1195356	Resident	<p>How can this link road improve flow in and around Worksop..... you are adding a minimum of 1500 cars to the area and expecting a link road from Blyth Road to Carlton Road to ease flow in Worksop !!!!!!! You are going to make Worksop even more difficult to access as well as the surrounding estates and access to A57 and A1... the road infrastructure cannot cope as it is and you are not doing any improvements to any other roads of junctions and this little link road is not going to improve that , it is going to add to the heavy congestion that currently exists and gets worse every day. Bikes and people walking will be an absolute minority as the roads are not safe for cyclists and walking from this area is not really an option to reach train station or and other services . How can this link road improve flow in and around Worksop..... you are adding a minimum of 1500 cars to the area and expecting a link road from Blyth Road to Carlton Road to ease flow in Worksop !!!!!!! You are going to make Worksop even more difficult to access as well as the surrounding estates and access to A57 and A1... the road infrastructure cannot cope as it is and you are not doing any improvements to any other roads of junctions and this little link road is not going to improve that , it is going to add to the heavy congestion that currently exists and gets worse every day. Bikes and people walking will be an absolute minority as the roads are not safe for cyclists and walking from this area is not really an option to reach train station or and other services .</p>	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Local Plan process is the best way to ensure infrastructure is delivered. If the Council does not have an up to date Plan in place it makes it more difficult to plan for infrastructure because development evolves piecemeal/unplanned.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST 14 Housing	Distribution		
1196000	Resident	<p>Unfortunately, I am not familiar with all of the proposed development sites, so I can only comment on the one I am familiar with. This is HS9 - Sandhills. I can see the potential advantages of using this site from a developer's point of view. There are several arguments against it from the point of view of existing local residents. Of these, I feel the most important is the impact on the local roads and the safety of road users and pedestrians. The current plan lacks detail in terms of how the development would be set up. However, a previous proposal indicated that the only point of access would be from Manvers Road which, in turn, comes off West Carr Road. The turn into Manvers Road from West Carr Road is on a bend close to the bottom of the railway bridge. The flat stretch of road going away from the bridge is congested with parked cars most of the time. In itself, this seems to be negotiated reasonably safely most of the time. However, in recent years, we have already seen an increase in housing on the old Bridon site, as well as other developments in the area, so traffic levels have already risen. Linked into this, we have an increasing number of schoolchildren making their way along this road to Retford Oaks school and the Sixth Form site. Coming out of Manvers Road on to West Carr Road, visibility isn't terrible, but we have the bridge on one side (with sometimes unseen traffic coming up the other side), and a virtually blind bend only 50-100 metres away on the other side. In principle, this is hazard enough. My concern is that, with most households having 2 cars, the proposed minimum of 75 houses in the period up to 2037 (and that could rise afterwards) means there are likely to be around 150 additional vehicles using that junction on a regular basis. (And this ignores the increased use of heavy vehicles while any building work is taking place.) If the railway line didn't border the other side of West Carr Road, it might be possible to do something to widen the road or put in other traffic safety measures. However, the presence of the railway pretty much rules any measures being taken. I do recognise that it has been noted that the proximity to the town and other facilities means road use could be minimised, but there would have to be significant incentives used to stop people using their cars to the degree they do at present.</p>	<p>This is a very early stage in the Local Plan process. More detail will be added as the plan progresses.</p>
REF255	Sheffield City Region	<p>In terms of housing, the Draft Plan seeks to deliver 478 new homes per year between 2018 and 2037 - above and beyond the Local Housing Need calculation and a reflection of the economic growth planned for Bassetlaw. This is a positive expression of the growth ambitions held by the SCR LEP who have consistently emphasised the important role that housing plays in creating the right conditions for economic growth. As such, the LEP and the MCA will continue to support an increase in housing delivery across South Yorkshire, complementing similar ambitions in Bassetlaw's Local Plan.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
1177570	Resident	<p>I think that this is too big and in an attractive area of countryside that should be preserved. Despite the vague references to green gaps, which seem to have no actual legal basis (the plan admits that development IS allowed in these areas), this will lead to the joining up of Worksop and Carlton, in a way that we are already seeing to the west of the town between Worksop and Shireoaks.</p>	<p>The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained.</p>
1180212	Resident	<p>I strongly object to the plans to build on the field alongside the A60 at Peaks Hill Farm. This is a beautiful piece of countryside, part of the view across woodland and farmland as you travel from Worksop towards Carlton. The field is surrounded by woodland which follows the relief of the land. The view when travelling from Carlton towards Worksop is equally stunning, with the houses at the edge of Worksop only visible as you top the brow of the hill. I would urge the planning department and relevant councillors to walk/cycle/drive along this stretch of road and contemplate the impact their plans would have on the character of the area, on the amenity value, on the present community and on future generations. This field and woodland is a crucial part of the green buffer between Carlton and Worksop. Once this is breached, development is likely to continue to encroach on this beautiful green space. The woods to either side of the A60 have muntjac and roe deer and buzzards. Building near the woods at Peaks Hill would inevitably disturb the wildlife. I question the safety of building a link road onto the A60 at Peaks Hill. There have been fatal accidents on this stretch of road. Visibility is affected due to the gradient and cars accelerate as they descend from the brow of the hill.</p>	<p>The field adjacent to the A60 will be protected as green infrastructure so will remain open. However the road is considered to be necessary to manage traffic flow in Worksop so will remain part of the scheme.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
1180445	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>Overall, the draft Bassetlaw Local Plan (BLP) has much to commend it – there are innovative ideas, such as the garden villages, green energy site and welcome references to the need for cycling and walking connectivity and green infrastructure. Serious concerns about the inclusion of a special area of countryside on the western fringe of the large proposed Peaks Hill Farm housing development site. If you travel north from Worksop towards Carlton on the A60, on the edge of the town, you pass the G4S offices on the right in woodland. This mature wood on the right covers a hill and ridge that curves round to Peaks Hill farm enclosing a sloping, triangular shaped field on the right/front, bordered by the A60 (circled blue on the map below). This field is included in the plans for residential development. As you carry on north you pass Freshfields house on the left and down the hill, extensive and beautiful views of the rural landscape open out across the horizon towards Carlton direction. This landscape, the views, the mature woods and fields to the right and front, is one of the most beautiful I know. Often, as I travel back from Worksop this view will lift my spirits. It is unique and precious landscape. Once it's built on, it will be spoilt and lost for ever. It is current and future generations that will lose the enjoyment of this landscape (or 'amenity value' really it is priceless). I was shocked when I saw the plans to build on this field (just a few days before it went public). It is out of sight from Worksop, on land sloping down to Carlton and enclosed by woods. This would be building in pristine countryside clearly separated from the town envelope. The plan states the need for a green belt or buffer between Worksop and Carlton. I would argue that this field and its surrounding trees and ridge must be included in that green belt or buffer zone (it's visible from the Carlton direction but not from Worksop). To build on it would set a dangerous precedent and surely other fields and woods will be built over until Worksop merges with Carlton. I would urge all councillors and relevant officers to visit the site to see with their own eyes.</p> <p>Note on p.59 of BDC's commissioned Site Allocations: Landscape Study, below is their conclusion on the Peaks Hill Farm (site 12H in the report) site: 'A combination of topography, the landscape value of existing woodlands and the extent to which the site extends north into open countryside, suggest that only a limited development in the middle and southern sections of the site could be achieved without an overall adverse landscape impact.' https://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/media/5295/bassetlaw-draft-landscape-study-2019.pdf That means, it is the western, A60 side of the site that will be most adversely affected. I do not feel as strongly about the other parts of the proposed Peaks Hill development, as the largest part is to the East of the Peaks Hill Woods, stretching over to Blyth Rd – backing on to Thievesdale, on a slope facing south to the town and joined on to Worksop. Another aspect of the development is a relief road running through the site from Blyth road and coming out on the A60 near the Peaks Hill farm (though this is not confirmed). Highway matters are clearly for the County to consider but I have serious concerns as it a dangerous stretch of fast road, on a bend and a hill, that has had several fatalities due to the poor visibility. I also believe the consultation period should be extended. I have yet to meet a member of the public who is aware of the Draft Local Plan, let alone that this piece of land is affected. Such an important plan with huge changes for Bassetlaw needs extensive publicity and consultation. In conclusion, I recognise the pressures on the council to find space for more housing to allow Worksop to grow and prosper but I believe the particular field, woods and views described above are precious to local people, to wildlife (deer and buzzards are regularly seen here) and to future generations, and therefore, the boundary of Green 'belt' or buffer zone should be redrawn to include and protect this relatively small but special piece of land near the A60 (and remove the residential designation).</p>	The field adjacent to the A60 will be protected as green infrastructure so will remain open. However the road is considered to be necessary to manage traffic flow in Worksop so will remain part of the scheme.
1183048	Resident	I object to homes being built on the land as again we are destroying valuable habitat and it is again one step closer to merging the rural village of Carlton in Lindrick with Worksop , when the town is already struggling to maintain any decent shops as people are not shopping local , adding a further 750 homes and 750 more in the phase 2 will not regenerate the town but just add to congestion .	As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet housing needs and jobs growth. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits including a net gain in biodiversity which is a national policy requirement and retention of existing woodland. Additional homes will provide additional footfall to support the town centre.
1188066	Resident	a) The proposed area includes a considerable area of woodland. When the UK government is committed to increasing the area of woodland, I would oppose the felling of any trees in the ST15 development. b) I would oppose any new roads which connect with any existing roads in the Hemmingfield housing area which subsequently connect to Thievesdale Lane.	The majority of trees and woodland will be protected. Any lost will be required to be re-provided on site. No roads to Thievesdale.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
1189740	Resident	<p>For many years I have travelled from Carlton to Worksop. As you head into Worksop the open fields at Peaks Hill give you a more positive view to the day. No sign of houses or stress just that bit of relaxation before you hit the chaos of Worksop and the queue at the Canon traffic lights and everyone rushing around. The road has had many accidents over the years including fatalities and even if you reduce the speed to 30 you cannot see over the hill to the right towards Carlton plus the bridleway comes out on the top of the hill and it is used by many walkers and horses. The relaxing view of Peaks Hill is seen for many miles including from the bridleway in front of Walkers Farm on Owday Lane. Building at Peaks Hill would have a huge impact on a large area and make the daily commute to work for many more stressful. This seems to be the only green field site to be developed in the local plan. Why should it be developed? There would also be an impact on the wildlife in the area and a lot of the trees would be cut down. The woodland has been there for many years and is not somewhere you would ever expect to be developed. A number of deer have been seen in the area. Carlton in Lindrick is already joined onto Costhorpe via the development on the A60 opposite the Co-Op and I am sure in a few years Langold will also be joined up. Do you not think enough green fields have already been developed along the A60. There must be far more suitable sites than Peaks Hill Farm and a connecting road between Blyth Road and the A60 is madness.</p>	<p>As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet housing needs and jobs growth. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits including a net gain in biodiversity which is a national policy requirement and retention of existing woodland. Highways safety is a prerequisite of development so any new roads/junctions will be required to meet appropriate standards.</p>
REF019	Resident	<p>I am compelled to put forward my objections regarding the proposed Peaks Hill Farm Development in Worksop as it will directly affect our home, our enjoyment of life in the area, the surrounding homes and people and the existing wild life, some of which is protected.</p> <p>I understand that the development is for 750 new dwellings from the year 2026, with a further proposal of an additional 750 new dwelling after the year 2037.</p> <p>I do not feel that this massive development will be of benefit to our community because the area is already overcrowded and the infrastructure is not in place.</p> <p>Worksop currently has multiple property developments in progress at the moment, for example; the Gatefold estate is still not fully complete and houses remain unsold. The Shireoaks area has 3 building developments in progress, Carlton in Lindrick has another and the St Anne's estate development is set to start soon. There is a mass of development in progress and this proposal will add to many difficulties of the existing communities.</p> <p>Worksop does not have the capability to safely and adequately offer full Health Care and schooling to accommodate the massive number of extra people coming into the area.</p> <p>This proposal will also destroy habitat for the local wildlife living around us, such as foxes and hedgehogs (statistics show that they could be extinct in 10 years if their habitat is not protected), multiple species for bats (many of which are protected) would be driven out and deer would be prevented from using the wood as they do at present.</p> <p>Could you please respond with your comments and detailed confirmation how you intend to address all of the above points and fears, which I have raised, for the benefit and protection of all existing dwellers in the area and the existing natural habitat.</p>	<p>As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
REF023	Water Management Consortium	'This site is outside of the Board's district'.	Comments noted

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF025	Resident	<p>As residents of Westerdale we have strong concerns about the draft plan for Peaks Hill Farm.</p> <p>Firstly residents have been given very little information about this plan which will have a major negative impact. We were notified for the first time that this plan existed only a week ago via tiny pieces of paper attached to lamp posts. The consultation meeting at Thievesdale Community Centre has been arranged at a time when most residents will be at work hence we are unable to raise concerns and ask for information and the deadline for concerns is very short, February 26. Secondly there are already several major new housing estates under construction around Worksop, is there any concrete evidence that there is a market for these houses? The housing websites such as Rightmove, are flooded with new houses that no-one seems to want, many have been up for sale for several months even after reducing their price.</p> <p>Are there any plans to increase the size or number of schools, doctors' surgeries and hospital services in the area in line with these increased number of houses? Residents currently struggle to book doctors' appointments and the wait for hospital appointments is already a huge problem as the current facilities are struggling to cope with current demands.</p> <p>The plan includes shops at a time when there is clear evidence that there is no support for small shops. Shops in the town centre are closing as they cannot compete with the increasing number of supermarkets in Worksop and online shopping. Shops next to the Celtic Fields development have struggled to be economically viable with many shops closing after a short time, even Tesco Express failed.</p> <p>The plan also fails to consider the important national and global issue of climate change. The destruction of the natural environment coupled with the building work and the eventual existence of another huge housing estate will no doubt add to the problem of global warming. Doesn't the council have any social conscience and awareness of its responsibility towards this issue and our children's futures?</p> <p>Finally the ongoing building work will seriously effect the value of residents' houses. As we are about to have our tranquillity ruined by the building work lasting for years we cannot move elsewhere as no-one would be willing to buy our properties. Surely there are grounds to reconsider this proposal? Or at the very least wait until there is concrete proof that there is a market for the current homes already under construction. We look forward to a response to our concerns.</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>
REF027	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	The main points raised with me are, urban sprawl towards Carlton and the building on green fields and the secondary school places with the traffic/ accidents coming in fourth place.	<p>The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. A financial contribution will be secured to provide for secondary education and traffic management and road safety will be addressed through the Transport Assessment for the scheme. The Council has allocated sites on brownfield land but there isn't enough suitable and available sites to meet needs. So greenfield land is required.</p>
REF028	Resident	<p>We have received the leaflet informing of the proposed build on Peaks Hill Farm and we would like to strongly object to this application based on the points below:</p> <p>There has been recent building activity on the farmland off the bottom of thievesdale lane and we have already witnessed wildlife displacement due to this. Before this build foxes very rarely entered the populated area around Airedale, however we are having regular visits where they are in search of food which is causing distress to our dog and small animals housed in our garden shed. Reducing the natural habit of wildlife by building on the proposed land is only going to aggravate the matter further and force wildlife into populated areas. What gives us the right to take away more land that is occupied by our fragile wildlife? Worksop is full of new build sites at the minute, Gateford and Thievesdale just to name a couple, so where is the justification of a further development on a green field site rather than brown field?</p> <p>Developments of this size will increase traffic congestion in the area and make it unsafe for the local children and elderly. You also have to consider the increase of children to our local schools, that are already at capacity. Finally, you will be removing old and established oak trees, which are just off of Carlton road, again where is the justification for this?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF033	Resident	I object in the strongest possible terms to the development from Peaks Hill Farm to Blyth Road, I think it has been dealt with very underhanded, 1 notice on 1 streetlight at the bottom of Colsterdale the day before the meeting in town & the time of the meeting on thievesdale lane, absolutely disgusting, people still at work & fetching their children from school, furthermore the people from the council were very imcompetent, no idea what they were doing, would not answer any questions properly, senior people should have been there to answer questions put to them, but I guess its a case of it bring N. I. M. B. Y, well it's in mine, my late husband & I worked hard to buy our own property & all you have done is devalue it, who wants to look out on industrial units & a main road??, also I want to know about the wildlife, whats going to happen to them, we have deers, pheasants, rabbits & numerous wild birds to view at present, don't they count for anything, obviously not in your eyes, with 750 houses you are talking roughly 1500 cars, the pollution will be awful, no mention of schools, doctors, its impossible to get a doctors appointment now & Bassetlaw Hospital isn't big enough to deal with the demand that would be put on it, I truly hope this planning doesn't get passed, build on the brown field sites, countryside is precious.	The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultation events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.
REF036	Resident	I was shocked to see the size and scale of this plan, it will essentially join Gateford with Thievesdale and Carlton in Lindrick, this will change Worksop beyond recognition. I was speaking with someone who moved from Sheffield to Gateford for a more rural lifestyle and they too were appalled at the plans. ANOTHER main road is a huge concern and this will link both Carlton Road and Blyth Road together - both very busy roads with 50 and 60 mph speed limits, increase in the traffic to these areas is an incredibly troubling thought, likely to lead to even more accidents. More roads and housing / shops means more traffic which means an increase to both noise and light pollution. What greatly concerns me is yet more loss of wildlife and their habitat, the world is currently in a climate emergency and the government / councils still destroy the few precious green spaces / fields/ trees/ hedgerows that are left to build even more new housing. After the worst flooding Worksop has ever seen, how does ripping up fields and trees and hedgerows (the very things that are needed to counteract and mop up the flood water) and concrete over it all make any sense?! No matter what "green plan " you have in place it will NEVER make up for the loss of all of this established habitat. Period. Our UK wildlife is in dire straits and species are struggling to survive due to council plans just like this up and down the country, please do not push ever more closer to making these species extinct. The "State of Nature Report" statistics for the flora and fauna facing extinction - one quarter of mammals - one in five plants- 15% of fungi and lichens- 40% of vertebrates- 12 % of invertebrates There has been a 60% decline in priority species since 1970. This is unforgivable. PLEASE do not add to these sobering statistics, do not let greed have the upper hand. I prefer MY tax money being put towards regenerating run down buildings and areas, not leaving them to rot and just building a load of new builds. Any more shops away from the town centre will only kill it off completely. These plans at best show no consideration to local residents and at worst utter contempt.	Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF037	Resident	<p>Should the suggested access road be adopted, then major alterations would have to be made both on Blyth Road and Carlton Road since both of these roads are major roads out of and into Worksop, carrying large volumes of traffic without additional traffic. Speed restrictions do not work, traffic lights or roundabouts would need to be constructed. Blyth Road already has commercial units, within close proximity to the proposed road, you have a transport unit where heavy goods vehicles enter and leave the storage area, then within a short distance a livery unit and stables for horses, there again slow moving vehicles entering and leaving the site. Should this suggested access road be adopted then all internal roads will have to be returned to the main access road, since roads on the Hemmingfield and Ambleside roads are not suitable for heavy vehicles in particular service and emergency vehicles, since the width of the roads and bends cause problems for already existing residents.</p> <p>Regarding the existing properties on Hemmingfield Rise, all the properties overlooking this site are bungalows, therefore the building of high storey houses would not be in the best of interests to residents, further along this boundary the houses are built very close to the boundary and again would invade residents privacy. Should this site be given planning permission then I fail to see any benefit to Bassetlaw since you are only providing housing for residents mainly working in nearby cities, who can purchase properties at a lower rate than in cities, no benefit could be enjoyed by Worksop and its facilities. Regarding a medical service, we have only two General Practices in Worksop, both of which are already under extreme pressure, building a new practice would only be a building, where does one expect to find the doctors and staff, I appreciate this is not a problem being felt only in Bassetlaw but nationwide, the same applies to our hospital where departments are being closed due to lack of funding and staff. I ask that consideration be given to my comments along with all the others which you may receive, It is my opinion that greater benefit could be gained for all Bassetlaw if attention was given to the town centre.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
REF039	Resident	<p>I find it hard to believe that you are using valuable Farm land to build housing when we import more food than we can produce. Does Worksop really need 1500 houses it's not like we need attract workers to fill jobs that have long since gone along with what once was a nice little town. If we are not going to use the land to produce food then why not put solar panels there and produce green energy which will benefit everyone and help to reduce carbon emissions. So planners and councilors is a fist full of dollars or a giant leap for mankind to help save our planet.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF040	Resident	<p>I would like to object to the proposed plan re the above policy at Peaks Hill Farm.</p> <p>1. There are considerable types of wildlife in the woodland area - buzzards, owls, bats, foxes and hedgehogs, which we all know are becoming extinct. Removing any part of the woodland would affect their longevity.</p> <p>2. The field behind the houses on Westerdale drops about 5 feet which could cause issues with drainage and future flooding. Any houses built on the field would be lower than the current houses which would cause issues with privacy.</p> <p>3. Infrastructure on surrounding roads - the two road junctions (off old Thievesdale onto Blyth Road and out onto main Thievesdale Road) are already busy with traffic throughput from cars, lorries and buses and will not be able to support more traffic to the point where it will become dangerous for the drivers and considerably affect commute time.</p> <p>4. Broadband issues - broadband is sporadic in this area - increased population in this area can only decrease the speed per household unless there are plans to spend government funds on this - ref the government policy on Building Digital UK.</p> <p>5. Worksop town centre had declined rapidly over the past 15 years - shops closed due to rent increases, and increased drug use and crime. The proposed new houses will only bring people into Bassetlaw who want to buy affordable homes and continue to commute to their workplace which will not help Bassetlaw's economy.</p> <p>The factories and employment mentioned in your plan don't offer the wages and hours to support people buying these houses - whatever 'affordable' means to the individual! Typically, Wilkinsons and B&Q offer zero hours contract at either living/or minimum wage which is not attractive to people with degree education or above, which seems to be the type of people you're trying to bring into the Bassetlaw area.</p> <p>6. On visiting the hospital for an emergency through A&E, we were informed that the hospital had been reduced from 140+ beds to 90 beds hospital - staff were working round the clock as there was such a shortage, machines were having to be plugged in rather than have batteries due to costs/budget restrictions. The children's ward is closed at night and discussions re closing the A&E department and moving it to Doncaster are on-going. The hospital cannot support the current population in Bassetlaw let alone support additional homes.</p> <p>7. The doctors and dentist are at capacity in the town. You have to wait 2-3 weeks currently for a doctors appointment, and longer for a dental appointment. Doctors are encouraging social prescribing and referral through pharmacies and their own reception team.</p> <p>Elderly people are not able to get the support they need through the social system for home visits and support. The situation is at breaking point - why would you stretch this further to the point that existing people within the town will leave and move to other areas where provision to look after their family is much better and safer!</p> <p>8. Schooling - The primary schools in Worksop are full with some having to teach in porter cabins. The secondary schools don't have enough places to support all the children currently coming through the school system, let alone with increased population - with many having to travel outside of Worksop to get school places.</p> <p>9. The process of notification about the Bassetlaw Plan falls out of your policy with only 2 flyers on lampposts on Westerdale and one tweet on twitter. According to your policy each home affected such have been notified by letter to give them the opportunity to attend the consultation sessions - this hasn't happened. We were informed at the consultation meeting that notice of these meetings was on Social media. This is not inclusive to all residents and doesn't meet the government policy for assisted digital.</p> <p>10. The 'consultation' meeting at Thievesdale was unhelpful with staff not having the answers to the many questions raised by the residents in this area. This consultation event would have been much better if Bassetlaw staff would have chaired the meeting with seating for people to be given the opportunity to ask questions and everyone to hear the answers. Similarly, it would have been helpful if all staff were fully informed about the plans and dates, as a number of us were told different dates by different staff members! It was chaos and I don't think anyone who attended came away with any answers. It clearly wasn't a consultation meeting - as no one was consulted on the day! Also, why have a meeting when people are working and can't attend!</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF041	Resident	<p>I would like to object to the proposed plan re the above policy at Peaks Hill Farm.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are considerable types of wildlife in the woodland area - buzzards, owls, bats, foxes and hedgehogs, which we all know are becoming extinct. Removing any part of the woodland would affect their longevity. 2. The field behind the houses on Westerdale drops about 5 feet which could cause issues with drainage and future flooding. Any houses built on the field would be lower than the current houses which would cause issues with privacy. 3. Infrastructure on surrounding roads - the two road junctions (off old Thievesdale onto Blyth Road and out onto main Thievesdale Road) are already busy with traffic throughput from cars, lorries and buses and will not be able to support more traffic to the point where it will become dangerous for the drivers and considerably affect commute time. 4. Broadband issues - broadband is sporadic in this area - increased population in this area can only decrease the speed per household unless there are plans to spend government funds on this - ref the government policy on Building Digital UK. 5. Worksop town centre had declined rapidly over the past 15 years - shops closed due to rent increases, and increased drug use and crime. The proposed new houses will only bring people into Bassetlaw who want to buy affordable homes and continue to commute to their workplace which will not help Bassetlaw's economy. The factories and employment mentioned in your plan don't offer the wages and hours to support people buying these houses - whatever 'affordable' means to the individual! Typically, Wilkinsons and B&Q offer zero hours contract at either living/or minimum wage which is not attractive to people with degree education or above, which seems to be the type of people you're trying to bring into the Bassetlaw area. 6. On visiting the hospital for an emergency through A&E, we were informed that the hospital had been reduced from 140 + beds to 90 beds hospital - staff were working round the clock as there was such a shortage, machines were having to be plugged in rather than have batteries due to costs/budget restrictions. The children's ward is closed at night and discussions re closing the A&E department and moving it to Doncaster are on-going. The hospital cannot support the current population in Bassetlaw let alone support additional homes. 7. The doctors and dentist are at capacity in the town. You have to wait 2-3 weeks currently for a doctors appointment, and longer for a dental appointment. Doctors are encouraging social prescribing and referral through pharmacies and their own reception team. Elderly people are not able to get the support they need through the social system for home visits and support. The situation is at breaking point - why would you stretch this further to the point that existing people within the town will leave and move to other areas where provision to look after their family is much better and safer! 8. Schooling - The primary schools in Worksop are full with some having to teach in porter cabins. The secondary schools don't have enough places to support all the children currently coming through the school system, let alone with increased population - with many having to travel outside of Worksop to get school places. 9. The process of notification about the Bassetlaw Plan falls out of your policy with only 2 flyers on lampposts on Westerdale and one tweet on twitter. According to your policy each home affected such have been notified by letter to give them the opportunity to attend the consultation sessions - this hasn't happened. We were informed at the consultation meeting that notice of these meetings was on Social media. This is not inclusive to all residents and doesn't meet the government policy for assisted digital. 10. The 'consultation' meeting at Thievesdale was unhelpful with staff not having the answers to the many questions raised by the residents in this area. This consultation event would have been much better if Bassetlaw staff would have chaired the meeting with seating for people to be given the opportunity to ask questions and everyone to hear the answers. Similarly, it would have been helpful if all staff were fully informed about the plans and dates, as a number of us were told different dates by different staff members! It was chaos and I don't think anyone who attended came away with any answers. It clearly wasn't a consultation meeting - as no one was consulted on the day! Also, why have a meeting when people are working and can't attend! 	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF044	Resident	<p>I would like to object to the proposed plan re the above policy at Peaks Hill Farm.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I have seen many types of wildlife in the woodland area - buzzards, owls, bats, foxes and hedgehogs. By building close to the woodland area, it would disturb the wildlife's habitat. Consequently, decreasing numbers of our British wildlife. 2. The field behind the houses on Westerdale drops about 5 feet. This could cause issues with drainage and future flooding. Rainfall in Nottinghamshire in Autumn 2019 was the wettest since record began, with nearly twice as much rainfall than average. 3. Houses built on the field would be lower than the current houses which would cause issues with privacy. 4. The two road junctions (off old Thievesdale onto Blyth Road and out onto main Thievesdale Road) are very busy with traffic throughout from cars, lorries and buses and will not be able to support more traffic to the point where it will become dangerous for the drivers and considerably affect commute time. 5. Broadband issues - broadband is very sporadic. I work as a teacher, and have had to use my parent's internet in order to work from home. An increase in population can only decrease the speed per household. 6. Worksop town centre is poor. Shops have closed due to rent increases, and increased drug use and crime. The factories and employment mentioned in your plan do not offer the wages and hours to support people buying these houses. Wilkinsons and B&Q offer zero hours contract at either living/or minimum wage which is not attractive to people with a degree education. 7. The hospital has been reduced from 140 + beds to 90 beds. The children's ward is closed at night and discussions of closing the A&E department and moving it to Doncaster are on-going. This is a huge cause of concern when thinking of starting a family. It has encouraged me to think about moving out of Worksop. 8. There is a wait of 3 weeks currently for a doctors appointment and longer for a dental appointment. 9. Elderly people are not able to get the support they need through the social system for home visits and support. This is encouraging people to move their loved ones out of the area. 10. I have heard about children being taught in porter cabins. Once again, this discourages me to want to start a family in Worksop. 11. The process of notification about the Bassetlaw Plan falls out of your policy with only 2 flyers on lampposts on Westerdale and one tweet on twitter. I heard that at the consultation meeting, notice of these meetings was on Social media. This is not inclusive to all residents and doesn't meet the government policy for assisted digital. 12. I was unable to attend the 'consultation' meeting at Thievesdale. Due to the timing, I was at work. I heard how unhelpful it was. Staff did not have the answers to many questions – it sounded pointless. Numerous people have been given different start dates from the staff! 	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
REF052	Resident	<p>I object to plans to build the Peaks Hill Farm development and the plans that include the Thievesdale Lane changes I believe this is not needed we have many empty properties in Worksop the land should be left as it is and let wildlife live on it will cause to much interference with peoples homes.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
REF053	Resident	<p>Please don't build on Peaks Hill Farm land, there is a lovely wood where buzzards nest and we need some green land. It would be better to build on Gateford site towards Carlton where they are already building hundreds of houses. They will need a lot more things in place. Busses, doc's schools they have been cut my bus it is a job to get a doc's app as well.</p>	<p>The development will make sure that necessary infrastructure is in place and that wildlife is protected through an ecological assessment for the site.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF055	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>Specifically I object to the inclusion of a triangular field to the east of the A60, between G4S and Peaks Hill Farm. The view, the aspect of this field, surrounded by mature trees on a woodland ridge is really beautiful. It is also separated from Worksop, and from the rest of development by this woodland ridge. To build in this field would be urban intrusion into pristine countryside. It will set a precedent – moving Worksop down the hill towards Worksop. (rest of the development, east of the ridge is on the Worksop side of the ridge and adjoining thievesdale and therefore less damaging. The quality of life (and wildlife) will be damaged for everyone who walks, cycles or drives along this route – losing such a wonderful vista/aspect. Damage to woods and its wildlife – deer, buzzards etc... will be considerable. In conclusion, any buffer zone between Carlton and Worksop should follow the topography – follow the wooded ridge line from G4S to Peaks Hill Farm and the field in question should be removed from the residential designation. I am also concerned at the safety implications of a link road joining the A60 near Peaks Hill. It is a fast, busy road and there have been several fatal accidents on the hill/bend at Peaks Hill – visibility is very poor.</p>	<p>The field adjacent to the A60 will be protected as green infrastructure so will remain open. However the road is considered to be necessary to manage traffic flow in Worksop so will remain part of the scheme. The woodland will be mostly protected and wildlife protected through an Ecological Impact Assessment for the site. The green gap between Carlton and Worksop starts at the site boundary to maintain separation between the two settlements. Road safety is vital and will be factored in to the transport assessment for the site.</p>
1191664	Resident	<p>In my opinion there is a conservation issue with all the houses now being built in and near Worksop. I do not support this as I live in a small estate near Peaks Hill Farm and I am worried about the council giving access from this small estate to the new development. As I live on a small estate near the Peaks Hill Farm development, I am worried about the council contracting a through road to the new development from our estate. The roads on this estate are not good as it is and are not wide enough I do have photos of the state of the roads, if required there is a small T junction at the top of Ambleside Grange and it would be impossible for the residents to back out of there drives if there was through traffic, This would cause problems and may result in accidents There is also the issue of conservation and the wildlife in the area, we have Owls, Pheasants, Foxes, Bats and Dear these all come down into our gardens from the Peaks Hill Farm Proposed developement</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
1192641	Resident	<p>Peaks hill farm. I have lived on westerdale for the past 18 years and on ribblesdale before that. I used to walk my dogs on westerdale before it was built,it was wasteland but had a lot of wildlife which has now gone. The area which you are planning on building has the same wildlife. From deers to owls,buzzards and every other bird we have in our area. This morning on a visit to clumber, it was so nice to hear all the birds and spot buzzards and deer. And I thought when you start to build all this will be gone.And for what? People making more money. People meaning council. There is houses being built in our area at the moment. Too many, 3 sites in shireoaks,Carlton Rhodesia Gateford and soon in langold. Where are all the people coming from to purchase these and where is all the money coming from for people to buy them. There was planning to build on Kilton golf course for years. Has this been put to one side now and passed onto westerdale. We have 4 golf courses in Worksop and Kilton is the one least used. It is council owned already so it wouldn't cost to buy the land and wildlife wouldn't be an issue. There is also a field on Blyth road which stands empty nearly all year round. The odd football match and Bassetlaw show is all what takes part on this ground. There has been bad flooding in Worksop recently. Wouldn't it be a good idea to spend more money on flood defences and better drainage. Think of how much water will be added to our drains from surface water drainage when more concrete replaces fields. I hope someone reads this and puts it on the no pile and hopefully you will decide not to go ahead with this build and move your plans to else where. Do the finance people ever look at the budget on these plans.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF081	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>My opinion as a member for the Carlton ward is that the piece of land aside the A60 should not be built on and the existing tree lines be retained. I feel that this would maintain the current green buffer along the A60 and shield the rest of the development from view. I also feel that the proposed road should be as close as possible to the G4s site, again to maintain a boundary. Finally the planting of new trees I feel should be primarily along the northern side to again give a fixed boundary when viewed from the hundred acres lane area. If these points are adopted I will support the plan.</p>	<p>The field adjacent to the A60 will be protected as green infrastructure so will remain open. However the road is considered to be necessary to manage traffic flow in Worksop so will remain part of the scheme. A robust woodland belt along the northern boundary will be a requirement.</p>
REF083	Resident	<p>I am against the building of anything on this rural landscape. I live on an estate adjacent to the eastern side of this proposed development, which has a high density of woodland before it meets Carlton Road. We see various wildlife around the estate, which comes from these wooded areas. We get squirrels and hedgehogs frequently, and are often lucky enough to see an owl and other birds of prey just sitting on the garden fences. By building across the open areas surrounding the trees these animals will no longer have places to feed and will be forced out, or perish. The proposed land is at a higher level to where we are and I have a concern about flooding. Currently, the open fields and woodland can soak up the water and it causes us no problems. Once the ground is covered with houses and roads, will the water take its natural route downhill and find its way onto our estate roads, potentially causing a flood risk. The boundary of this development has many places where access could be put through to link up with current development. My particular concern is Winster Grove, which has nothing more than a wooden fence separating the road end from the development land. I am aware that the original builders in 1996, retained ownership of this thin strip of land and clearly had the intentions of one day continuing the road through. Winster Grove is a cul de sac of predominantly OAP bungalows who currently do not have passing traffic. If this were to be opened up as an estate road then it would become the most direct route for anyone leaving the new development intending to head towards Worksop Town centre. Even if it were opened up as a pedestrian access, it would be abused by motorcycles taking a shortcut. Our estate has a virtually 0% crime rate currently, and many people do not even know it's here, but opening it up to pedestrian and cycle/motorcycle access is almost certainly going to cause an increase in crime rates. The increase in traffic along Carlton Road concerns me. Currently, when trying to get out of Ambleside Grange onto Carlton Road in the morning, traffic from The Cannon traffic lights is backed up past Ambleside Grange and sometimes out of sight around the corner past Ashes Park Avenue. By adding 750 houses (initially) you potentially add 1000+ cars since most homes have two or more cars. These cars can only use two ways into Worksop and I would suspect those on the western side of the development will use Blyth Road, whilst those on the Eastern side use Carlton Road. Realistically, you could add 250 more cars to this traffic queue in the morning. When I came to Worksop in 1987 there were two doctors' surgeries for the whole town. Today, there are still two doctors' surgeries in the town, but the housing stock has increased by many thousands. When Gateford was developed and thousands of houses were (and still are) built we were promised new amenities. Gateford Park school was built and was oversubscribed before it opened its doors. The Secondary schools are full. Here we have again promises of new amenities and a new school, but not before 2037. The town is full of supermarkets and more are coming, so buying a pint of milk will never be a problem, but getting to see a doctor or dentist in person and in reasonable time, is now impossible. These are a dense line of mature trees that run parallel with Carlton Road and would prevent any road access through from that side. The plans obviously include removing some, or all of these trees in order to make an access road, yet trees of a similar age and size that stand within homeowner's gardens are protected. Several local residents have applied for permission to reduce or remove their trees and have been refused. Why are these trees any different?</p> <p>I suspect that, regardless of what anyone says, this development will get pushed through and these houses will be built and we will have to live with the subsequent consequences. I have been told that a large number of trees are to be planted around the site and would like to see some kind of green buffer between the current developments and the new one, and the linking of the two, by footpaths and roads, kept to a minimum.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF101	Resident	<p>I would like to begin this letter by giving you a small profile of me. I have lived at this address for 37 years and was born in Worksop. I am now retired but worked as a teacher for forty years, for the most part as a class teacher but also as a senior manager. To me Worksop is a pretty, historical market town, the centre of the town has suffered and become tired and drab. With that in mind, I am interested in, and in favour of any development which will benefit the local community and economy. Thank you for organising the meeting at Thievesdale CC on 4th Feb. Regrettably I came home embarrassed and appalled by the behaviour of some of the people from the local area. Some were rude, boorish and offensive. My apologies on their behalf. My thanks go particularly to the young planner stood by the plan. Understandably she, I think, was rather upset by the lack of respect she was shown and the rudeness of some of the public. I am not critical of Bassetlaw Council with what I write next, but I thought the meeting would have been easier to control and manage if it had been more formal. Perhaps a senior officer giving a presentation and then opening the floor and asking the audience to raise hands if they had any questions would have been more successful for the council and public. As it was, very few people got to ask questions or hear the answers of others. Finally, thank you for taking the time to read the enclosed. Comments re Peaks Hill:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positives: • Boost for Worksop town's economy • Housing offering a range of prices • Extra medical facilities • My perception of the dispersion road is that the junctions where it joins Blyth Road/Carlton Road will slow down the traffic on those roads. The effect of the 30MPH limit on Blyth Road has been positive but still a lot of drivers exceed that limit. • Provision of employment • Possible increased footfall into the town centre • Negatives: • There are deer in the woods • If an access road were to be joined to Westerdale, concerns about volume and speed of traffic • Medical facilities i.e. more pressure on Bassetlaw Hospital • Doctor's Surgery, positive if this happens but it was promised for the Ashes Park Road development 38 years ago when I saw the plans but it didn't happen, so potentially a negative as the existing doctors' surgeries are struggling with demand • Loss of farm land • Loss of views for the householders who bought their properties adjacent to fields • Increased pollution in the area 	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
REF109	Resident	<p>As a resident of Wharfedale I oppose the scale of this plan. The Development site is too large and will have a great impact on residents. I have lived in this house for 29 years I don't want to lose my privacy and be over looked. Also the traffic and noise pollution this massive build will bring will be immense. What about our quality of life to green spaces and clean air? The effect it will have on our local wildlife and green environment will be such a loss. The amount of Dwellings planned is far too many.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
1194059	Resident	<p>We totally oppose the proposed development of land for housing on the Thievesdale site. The vast increase in volume of traffic, the risk of increased pollution, the loss of natural habitats for wildlife, the immense increase in demand for local services, the vague promises of increased employment opportunities - none of these issues appear to have been addressed. In 2018 there were just under 700 empty homes in the Worksop area, there are new homes on the Gateford estate that have never been occupied, possibly others on the various developments taking place in the area. None of these plans are justified, it is just a scheme to bolster the construction industry and stimulate the financial sector by way of increased mortgage borrowing - local government and central government are reverting to the tried and failed policy of building our way out of a recession/sluggish economy. It hasn't worked in the past and it won't work in the future. Our countryside deserves better treatment and care than the plans BDC are putting forward.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
REF110	Resident	<p>With regards to the above proposal I wish to make my comments known to all concerned. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm policy , within the Bassetlaw Local Plan. This development is too large a project and will be of great inconvenience to local residents. Because of the amount of dwellings proposed, this would cause great disruption and pollution to residents for at least 15 years, many of these residents are now or will be elderly, resulting in the rest of their lives being spent on a noisy building site. Current climate change has resulted in heavier rainfall. In the past year Thievesdale has had regular flooding due to drains being unable to cope with heavier downfalls of rain. This has resulted in burst drains under Thievesdale Road (where the road has actually fractured and had to be repaired). At the moment rainfall soaks in to the fields. With extra dwellings in the area, this would put more rainfall into the system which eventually ends up in rivers producing more flooding in Worksop. The fields currently support a vast amount of wildlife. They are a regular valuable hunting ground for Buzzards and falcons as well as in the nearby trees, important nesting locality for owls, Buzzards and Woodpeckers whose young feed at feeding stations in residents gardens. My own Bungalow which overlooks the fields is built on a higher elevation than the fields, I accept that I have no rights to a view, but even if construction does go ahead and a six foot fence is erected, I will spend the next 15 years with absolutely no privacy from construction work in my kitchen, bedroom or garden. Building the type of houses in the price range that developers will be proposing will not have any effect on housing shortages, Worksop is full of new homes which cannot be sold already.it will just result in more commuters moving into area and clogging up unsustainable roads, GP surgeries, Hospitals and Dentists. Thank you for listening my comments I hope they go towards you re-considering this proposal.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
1194203	Resident	I would not wish to see construction on the peaks farm proposal to build on the a 60 highway out side calton in lindrick towards worksop.this should be left as farm land.	The field adjacent to the A60 will be protected as green infrastructure so will remain open. However the road is

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF121	Resident	<p>I am totally opposed to these plans on the following grounds:-1. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm, Policy 15, within the Bassetlaw Local Plan2. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents of Worksop. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime3. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction4. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable5. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems6. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster7. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change8. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character9. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:10. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife11. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor12. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline13. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)14. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution15. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses16. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport17. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook18. Build enough housing that local people can actually afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings19. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>considered to be necessary to manage traffic flow in Worksop so will remain part of the scheme. A robust woodland belt along the northern boundary will be a requirement.</p> <p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF128	Resident	<p>I am totally opposed to these plans on the following grounds:-1. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm, Policy 15, within the Bassetlaw Local Plan2. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents of Worksop. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime3. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction4. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable5. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems6. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster7. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change8. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character9. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see10. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife11. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor12. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline13. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)14. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution15. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses16. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport17. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook18. Build enough housing that local people can actually afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings19. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings!' (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
1194849	Resident	<p>For me, the beautiful uplifting view from the A60 Carlton Road (hedgerow in front of field with undulating mature wood land to the rear) should be protected. It is a huge community asset (visually, environmentally, ecologically), particularly so in a largely post-industrial landscape where much natural beauty has been lost. I feel that all the woodland on the proposed site should be protected and the public given access via new footpaths. I don't believe that we should be driving a new road from the A60 through these woods. If there have to be two access points to the new development then let both be from the B6045 Blyth Road. If any trees are lost they should be replaced by at least twice as many - provision should be made to regularly water and protect new trees for at least a year after planting to ensure that they establish.</p>	<p>The field adjacent to the A60 will be protected as green infrastructure so will remain open. However a through road is considered to be necessary to manage traffic flow in Worksop so will remain part of the scheme. A robust woodland belt along the northern boundary will be a requirement.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
1194878	Resident	I am against Peaks Hill Farm Policy 15. I am against the use of prime farmland and green spaces to build the project. The development site is too big and will have a huge impact on the local residents of Worksop. The demand for such housing is low, just look at the Gateford estate which is still not complete 22 years on. It will lower existing house prices and make it more difficult to sell our existing properties. An initial 750 properties + 174 being built by Rippon homes, will create approximately 2750 new residents (based at an occupancy of 3 per dwelling) and approximately 1850 extra vehicles on our roads, (Based on 2 cars per property). This will subject the area to extra noise, pollution and disruption for years to come. Our roads will not cope with the extra traffic. Our schools have no spaces to take the extra 750 children. Our doctors surgeries and our hospital are at breaking point and will not find places for 2700 extra residents. The building of the 750 properties (174 Rippon homes) will be built BEFORE any supporting infrastructure such as Doctors, Schools, Hospital improvements and dentists. Yet you want to add approximately 2750 extra residents to the area. There is already great pressure on these services and great amount of inconvenience and dissatisfaction for Worksop's residents. Police, Ambulance and Fire services will also need to cover a greater occupancy. Commuting is going to become a bigger problem as many house buyers will have come in from Sheffield, Doncaster and Nottingham. Their travel to work will impact A1 A57 A60 and M1 routes and our poor and unreliable train services.	Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced, accessible green infrastructure network (including retained woodland), new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The site is privately owned and currently there is no public right of way. Development will enable green infrastructure routes to become accessible to local residents. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council and other infrastructure partners to ensure any necessary infrastructure is delivered.
1194878	Resident	How will our local roads improve ? The Plan says, Its putting a new distributor road linking Blyth Road and Carlton Road. This will NOT ease congestion on our local roads. The Plan will be Adding an extra 1850 vehicles in Phase 1 (based on 2 cars per property) The cannon cross roads is a nightmare at times. As is Kilton Road. Sandy Lane and many other well known bottlenecks. The distributor road will NOT improve these problematic roads, it will simply soak up some of the extra 1850 vehicles. Adding hundreds of extra vehicles to problem roads every day. This is not a solution its a 'tick-box'. The amount of housing development proposed exceeds our Local need for a population of just 40,000. Gateford estate has already reached saturation, with planned building areas left unwanted. Planning permissions have already been agreed by the council in numerous other areas of Worksop. Why are we looking at proposing a further 750 (+750) extra properties with NO extra supporting infrastructure for the area. ? Why are we using our Farm Land to buildupon?.This is a loss of prime local crop growing land. This invaluable "Climate Friendly" green space is necessary for wildlife birds insects and importantly the town and its people of Worksop. In a time of Climate change we should look at recycling used land and preserving green and farm land. If the farmer wants to sell, it should be for Green energy purposes rather than unnecessary buildings. Once lost this land and its wildlife will be lost forever. Known for its established trees, Goss hawks, buzzards, sparrow hawks, a heron, owls, bats, hedgehogs, rabbits and hares. Gone forever. Adding new tree siblings which may not establish, may die or residents may remove, will not encourage the wildlife or greenery back . Its gone forever. The way the council has conducted itself regarding this matter so far has been poor. Failure to alert home owners especially elderly about the proposals within the Plan, have been poor. Notifications and ability to object has been poor. Trust in the council within this process has been low.	Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced, accessible green infrastructure network (including retained woodland), new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The site is privately owned and currently there is no public right of way. Development will enable green infrastructure routes to become accessible to local residents. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council and other infrastructure partners to ensure any necessary infrastructure is delivered.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
1194921	Resident	<p>I am against the Peaks Hill Farm Building Project. I object to it because</p> <p>1) It is terrible for our Climate. Why build on beautiful green farm land when there are so many other sites available.</p> <p>2) It is awful for the wildlife. My bungalow is next to the fields and woodlands and the wildlife, birds, hawks, squirrels and butterflies, they are beautiful. Why are you taking away my pleasures. This is exactly why I bought my bungalow.</p> <p>3) The disruption and inconvenience will run through the rest of my life, with no benefits to me. I will have to suffer Noise and pollution and lose my privacy to be overlooked by strangers.</p> <p>4) It will impact me personally with Health services. Already difficult to get Doctors and Hospital Appointments. I understand there are no plans to build more Doctors surgeries for the extra population, until 750 houses are built. That's not acceptable in my opinion.</p> <p>5) We don't need more housing in Worksop. We need to improve a lot of town centre housing for people at entry level. Knock down and replace some old buildings and rebuild.</p> <p>6) The increase in traffic will affect me. Ability to get a taxi. 750 new houses means a lot of extra vehicles. More road chaos and queues.</p> <p>7) Building is happening all over Worksop. We do not need anymore . Stop It !! We don't need 750 extra houses. We need farm land and green areas. Build on brown land and leave these fields alone. It is bad for me personally and its bad for Worksop. No one in Worksop will benefit. This will bring people in from Sheffield and overload our resources and services.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced, accessible green infrastructure network (including retained woodland), new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The site is privately owned and currently there is no public right of way. Development will enable green infrastructure routes to become accessible to local residents. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council and other infrastructure partners to ensure any necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
REF134	Resident	<p>Having visited the consultation presentation re the Bassetlaw plan I was shocked and disappointed to see you had included a huge swathe of Carlton in Lindrick land into this plan. Less than two years ago Carlton approved their building plan with a referendum and we were assured the result would protect the parish boundaries from further major development for the next fifteen years. This was stated clearly in the village plan and we were told the District Council would support us in this!!</p> <p>Simply by calling it North Worksop doesn't change the fact it is the parish of Carlton look where the sign for Worksop is on the A60 if you haven't got a map ! The open aspect down the A60 should be protected as a rural view.</p>	<p>The field adjacent to the A60 will be protected as green infrastructure so will remain open. However a through road is considered to be necessary to manage traffic flow in Worksop so will remain part of the scheme. A robust woodland belt along the northern boundary will be a requirement. Although sitting in Carlton parish the site is adjacent to Worksop and relates better to its urban form. Its is also reasonable to expect residents to use the facilities of Worksop rather than Carlton.</p>
REF135	Resident	<p>I visited the consultation presentation regarding the Bassetlaw plan and was surprised and disappointed to see you had included a huge swathe of land belonging to Carlton in Lindrick parish in it. Less than two years ago Carlton in Lindrick approved a building plan with a referendum and we were assured the result would protect the parish boundaries from any further major development for the next fifteen years. We were also told that the District Council would support us in this. I object to the fact that the piece of land is identified as North Worksop in the draft plan. In reality I can see if it was identified correctly I could support a much smaller development area behind Westerdale and Hemmingfield Rise that connected to the new development that is taking place in the corner of Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road. The open farmland below Peaks Hill Farm and the woodland behind, along the A60, I think should be protected. Once these rural aspects have gone they cannot be replaced and have gone forever. If this open farmland beside the A60 is built on the credibility of the Parish Council and the District Council will be called into question by all those people who voted in the referendum to support the Carlton in Lindrick Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>The field adjacent to the A60 will be protected as green infrastructure so will remain open. However a through road is considered to be necessary to manage traffic flow in Worksop so will remain part of the scheme. A robust woodland belt along the northern boundary will be a requirement. Although sitting in Carlton parish the site is adjacent to Worksop and relates better to its urban form. Its is also reasonable to expect residents to use the facilities of Worksop rather than Carlton.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF138	Resident	<p>I am totally opposed to these plans on the following grounds:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm, Policy 15, within the Bassetlaw Local Plan 2. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents of Worksop. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime 3. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction 4. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable 5. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems 6. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster 7. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change 8. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character 9. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. <p>If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife 11. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor 12. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline 13. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change) 14. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution 15. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses 16. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport 17. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook 18. Build enough housing that local people can actually afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings 19. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan) 	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced, accessible green infrastructure network (including retained woodland), new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The site is privately owned and currently there is no public right of way. Development will enable green infrastructure routes to become accessible to local residents. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council and other infrastructure partners to ensure any necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF143	Resident	<p>I would like to object to the proposed plan re the above policy at Peaks Hill Farm.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I have seen many types of wildlife in the woodland area - buzzards, owls, bats, foxes and hedgehogs. By building close to the woodland area, it would disturb the wildlife's habitat. Consequently, decreasing numbers of our British wildlife. 2. The field behind the houses on Westerdale drops about 5 feet. This could cause issues with drainage and future flooding. Rainfall in Nottinghamshire in Autumn 2019 was the wettest since record began, with nearly twice as much rainfall than average. 3. Houses built on the field would be lower than the current houses which would cause issues with privacy. 4. The two road junctions (off old Thievesdale onto Blyth Road and out onto main Thievesdale Road) are very busy with traffic throughout from cars, lorries and buses and will not be able to support more traffic to the point where it will become dangerous for the drivers and considerably affect commute time. 5. Broadband issues - broadband is very sporadic. I work as a teacher, and have had to use my parent's internet in order to work from home. An increase in population can only decrease the speed per household. 6. Worksop town centre is poor. Shops have closed due to rent increases, and increased drug use and crime. The factories and employment mentioned in your plan do not offer the wages and hours to support people buying these houses. Wilkinsons and B&Q offer zero hours contract at either living/or minimum wage which is not attractive to people with a degree education. 7. The hospital has been reduced from 140 + beds to 90 beds. The children's ward is closed at night and discussions of closing the A&E department and moving it to Doncaster are on-going. This is a huge cause of concern when thinking of starting a family. It has encouraged me to think about moving out of Worksop. 8. There is a wait of 3 weeks currently for a doctors appointment and longer for a dental appointment. 9. Elderly people are not able to get the support they need through the social system for home visits and support. This is encouraging people to move their loved ones out of the area. 10. I have heard about children being taught in porter cabins. Once again, this discourages me to want to start a family in Worksop. 11. The process of notification about the Bassetlaw Plan falls out of your policy with only 2 flyers on lampposts on Westerdale and one tweet on twitter. I heard that at the consultation meeting, notice of these meetings was on Social media. This is not inclusive to all residents and doesn't meet the government policy for assisted digital. 12. I was unable to attend the 'consultation' meeting at Thievesdale. Due to the timing, I was at work. I heard how unhelpful it was. Staff did not have the answers to many questions – it sounded pointless. Numerous people have been given different start dates from the staff! 	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced, accessible green infrastructure network (including retained woodland), new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The site is privately owned and currently there is no public right of way. Development will enable green infrastructure routes to become accessible to local residents. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council and other infrastructure partners to ensure any necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF144	Resident	<p>• I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm, Policy 15: HS1 within the Bassetlaw Local Plan1. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents in Worksop. 750 dwellings,(Plus the 750 to be built after 2035) in addition to business/ employment and the current 150+ homes being built at the end of Thievesdale Lane will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subjected to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their life time.2. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings- such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction.3. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the long wait,some as long as 6 weeks,at the medical centres to see any GP. Getting in and out of Town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country- style roads. The villages on these routes get congested too and their air quality must already be poor. The train station car park is often full and the train services poor and unreliable.4. The amount of housing development locally needed exceeds local needs; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of around 42,000. this 'saturation' policy will increase the number of commuters in and out of Worksop on an already unsustainable road and rail systems.5. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster.6. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change.7. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character.8. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and Green environment- birds(including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs, roe deer and insect population. 9. To build a road connecting B6045 to the A60 will mean cutting down mature trees at the A60 side of the proposed development. We should be protecting them not cutting them down. 10. The land at the moment is a natural 'soak away', if it is turned into dwellings etc and roads there is the potential for flooding. Because of the problem with 'Global warming' extremes of weather will be the norm including the high rainfalls and flooding we are currently having.11. The drains in the area don't cope with this now, more roads and houses will only add to the problem. If my concerns are over-ruled, I would like to see: 1. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. A minimum of 15 metres to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife. 2. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new homes to extend the green corridor. 3. Any communal areas, eg youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the tree line. 4. New dwellings to have minimum car parking to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution(linked to climate change).5. Minimal street lighting to minimise light pollution. 6. Low level housing near existing homes, such as bungalows, not high- rise town houses.7. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport.8. Maximise tree/ shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook.9. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings.10. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to ' at least 750 dwellings!' (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced, accessible green infrastructure network (including retained woodland), new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The site is privately owned and currently there is no public right of way. Development will enable green infrastructure routes to become accessible to local residents. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council and other infrastructure partners to ensure any necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
1195232	Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * The community consultation was not done correctly. The process was not followed correctly by the council, as outlined in the 2020. * The consultation process should be re-run correctly and the end date should be extended by a month. * The Council is working against its own strategic objective in almost every way. * The plan is not sustainable. * The volume of housing far exceeds the councils own target figure. * No extra school places will be made available. The Plan misleads us to believe it will. * No extra Doctors surgery's will be created. The Plan misleads us to believe it will. * Such infrastructure is only planned AFTER the completion of Phase 1 * It will be subject to the councils collection of council Tax's from new properties. * NO guarantees of required infrastructure can be made by the council . They are all subject to the completion of the plan and building the funds Afterwards to provide them. It is all Lies to deceive the people of Worksop. 	<p>The community consultation was undertaken in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. The community consultation process referred to in the representation relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the housing needs. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced, accessible green infrastructure network (including retained woodland), new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
1195233	Resident	<p>* The community consultation was not done correctly. The process was not followed correctly by the council, as outlined in the 2020.* The consultation process should be re-run correctly and the end date should be extended by a month.* The Council is working against its own strategic objective in almost every way.* The plan is not sustainable.* The volume of housing far exceeds the councils own target figure.* No extra school places will be made available. The Plan misleads us to believe it will.* No extra Doctors surgery's will be created. The Plan misleads us to believe it will.* Such infrastructure is only planned AFTER the completion of Phase 1* It will be subject to the councils collection of council Tax's from new properties.* NO guarantees of required infrastructure can be made by the council . They are all subject to the completion of the plan and building the funds Afterwards to provide them. It is all Lies to deceive the people of Worksop.</p>	<p>and other infrastructure partners to ensure any necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p> <p>The community consultation was undertaken in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. The community consultation process referred to in the representation relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the housing needs . The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced, accessible green infrastructure network (including retained woodland), new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council and other infrastructure partners to ensure any necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF145	Resident	<p>I strongly object to the above development on the following grounds. My points are in no particular order.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 There is going to be a severely detrimental effect on the local wildlife due to the destruction of habitat 2 Loss of an overly large area of green space, space that gives Worksop its rural feel and is fundamental to its character 3 With the emphasis very much on the issues with the climate, this development will destroy local food producing land that could be used to feed the local community hence reducing food miles 4 Worksop doesn't currently have a good network infrastructure in place and the addition of the traffic these new houses will generate will cause chaos to local community 5 I fail to see why we need such a large number of new houses based on the fact that we currently only have circa 42,000 population. The increase will not be able to be supported by the transport infrastructure which is already poor 6 Local health centres are already working to a five-week waiting list for appointments which in itself is not acceptable. This development will severely exacerbate this problem. 7 The local train station car-park is often full and the service unreliable to say the least. This will only get worse. 8 My understanding is that no doctors' surgeries, dental practices and schools will be built until after the houses have been completed. This is surely not acceptable. 9 The size of the development means the hat the area is going to become one big building site for many, many years. This again is not acceptable. <p>Whilst my house backs on my on the fields in question I understand that I cannot hold the magnificent views I currently have forever. However the sheer size of development proposed is, in my opinion, totally out of proportion with the local requirements. I trust you will consider my objection seriously.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced, accessible green infrastructure network (including retained woodland), new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The site is privately owned and currently there is no public right of way. Development will enable green infrastructure routes to become accessible to local residents. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council and other infrastructure partners to ensure any necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF146	Resident	<p>I strongly object to the above development on the following grounds. My points are in no particular order.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 There is going to be a severely detrimental effect on the local wildlife due to the destruction of habitat 2 Loss of an overly large area of green space, space that gives Worksop its rural feel and is fundamental to its character 3 With the emphasis very much on the issues with the climate, this development will destroy local food producing land that could be used to feed the local community hence reducing food miles 4 Worksop doesn't currently have a good network infrastructure in place and the addition of the traffic these new houses will generate will cause chaos to the local community 5 I fail to see why we need such a large number of new houses based on the fact that we currently only have circa 42,000 population. The increase will not be able to be supported by the transport infrastructure which is already poor 6 Local health centres are already working to a five-week waiting list for appointments which in itself is not acceptable. This development will severely exacerbate this problem. 7 The local train station car-park is often full and the service unreliable to say the least. This will only get worse. 8 My understanding is that no doctors' surgeries, dental practices and schools will be built until after the houses have been completed. This is surely not acceptable. 9 The size of the development means that the area is going to become one big building site for many, many years. As I am now 94 years old I can only predict that once development begins, I will never again experience the peace and tranquility I currently enjoy and is so important at my time of life. Whilst my house backs on to the fields in question I understand that I cannot hold the magnificent views I currently have forever. However the sheer size of development proposed is, in my opinion, totally out of proportion with the local requirements. I trust you will consider my objection seriously. 	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced, accessible green infrastructure network (including retained woodland), new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The site is privately owned and currently there is no public right of way. Development will enable green infrastructure routes to become accessible to local residents. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council and other infrastructure partners to ensure any necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF147	Resident	<p>I strongly object to the above development on the following grounds. My points are in no particular order.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 There is going to be a severely detrimental effect on the local wildlife due to the destruction of habitat 2 Loss of an overly large area of green space, space that gives Worksop its rural feel and is fundamental to its character 3 With the emphasis very much on the issues with the climate, this development will destroy local food producing land that could be used to feed the local community hence reducing food miles 4 Worksop doesn't currently have a good network infrastructure in place and the addition of the traffic these new houses will generate will cause chaos to local community 5 I fail to see why we need such a large number of new houses based on the fact that we currently only have circa 42,000 population. The increase will not be able to be supported by the transport infrastructure which is already poor 6 Local health centres are already working to a five-week waiting list for appointments which in itself is not acceptable. This development will severely exacerbate this problem. 7 The local train station car-park is often full and the service unreliable to say the least. This will only get worse. 8 My understanding is that no doctors' surgeries, dental practices and schools will be built until after the houses have been completed. This is surely not acceptable. 9 The size of the development means that the area is going to become one big building site for many, many years. This again is not acceptable. Whilst my house backs on to the fields in question I understand that I cannot hold the magnificent views I currently have forever. However the sheer size of development proposed is, in my opinion, totally out of proportion with the local requirements. I trust you will consider my objection seriously. 	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced, accessible green infrastructure network (including retained woodland), new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The site is privately owned and currently there is no public right of way. Development will enable green infrastructure routes to become accessible to local residents. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council and other infrastructure partners to ensure any necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF148	Resident	<p>The destruction of prime farmland, the construction of so many unnecessary dwellings and associated buildings. The impact on local residents with noise dirt will make their lives miserable plus have an effect on their health. The extra volume of traffic on all surrounding roads will cause havoc accidents minor and major including Fatal.</p> <p>The added strain on our now over stretched services Roads with a major amount of Pot Holes, 1 small fire station, Railway station congested car park, Rail transport and time tables abysmal. The general road infrastructure is very poor mostly single lane carriage ways trying to cope with 30plus tonne wagons trying to negotiate our narrow roads including some local established company's, Lorry park and storage park on Blyth road causes a few problems already. All these points need sorting out prior to any building work.</p> <p>Medical appointments are near to impossible to get with the amount of residents that are here. A hospital that can only be described now as a Cottage Hospital frequently on a Red.</p> <p>Farm land being lost good agriculture being lost we need food, it may cause the farmers to reduce their work force. We will lose a lot of wildlife which live and breed in the surrounding woods, once their habitats are gone they may not return.</p> <p>Education Worksop schools are almost full, build new ones where the staff to run and operate them come from, nationally teachers are in short supply.</p> <p>The loss of any green land is a crime against humanity, we all need to be able to enjoy the open spaces and benefit from it for our health. Will you be stopping the local shooters from using the woods around Peaks Hill Farm and standing guns in hand in the fields. Just a question.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced, accessible green infrastructure network (including retained woodland), new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The site is privately owned and currently there is no public right of way. Development will enable green infrastructure routes to become accessible to local residents. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council and other infrastructure partners to ensure any necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
1195290	Resident	<p>The housing projects seem to have been passed regardless of the plan where permission is granted without proper consultation with the residents and putting up thousands of homes on green belt land, which is also a conservation area. But the public seem to don't matter. It would be great to see the money trail.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced, accessible green infrastructure network (including retained woodland), new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The site is privately owned and currently there is no public right of way. Development will enable green infrastructure routes to become accessible to local residents. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council and other infrastructure partners to ensure any necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF151	Resident	<p>I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm, Policy 15: HS1, within the Bassetlaw Local Plan.</p> <p>1. The development is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents of Worksop. 750 dwellings (plus the 750 planned for after 2035) and business/employment land in addition to the 150+ dwellings currently being built at the end of Thievesdale Lane, will mean that local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 years building site. For many elderly residents, that is the rest of their lifetime.</p> <p>2. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings- such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction.</p> <p>3. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the long wait to see a GP at the medical centres, some as long as 6 weeks. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. These pass through small villages which already get congested and their air quality must already be poor! The train station car park is often full and the train services poor and unreliable.</p> <p>4. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of around 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems.</p> <p>5. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster.</p> <p>6. Loss of prime food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change.</p> <p>7. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character.</p> <p>8. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment- birds(including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs, roe deer and insect population. 9. To build a link road from the B6045 to the A60 will mean cutting down mature trees on the A60 side of the development. We should be protecting trees, not cutting them down. 10. The land is a natural soak away but if vast numbers of dwellings and roads are built there is the potential for flooding. We are living at a time when extreme weather conditions are going to be expected so heavy rain will be something we have to accept. The drains don't cope at the moment so more buildings and roads will only add to the problem. If my concerns are overruled, we want to see</p> <p>1. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife.</p> <p>2. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and to extend the green corridor.</p> <p>3. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the trees. 4. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution.(linked to climate change)</p> <p>5. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution.</p> <p>6. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses.</p> <p>7. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport.</p> <p>8. Maximise tree/ shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook.</p> <p>9. Build enough housing that local people can actually afford and cater for an increasing elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings.</p> <p>10. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'!(as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced, accessible green infrastructure network (including retained woodland), new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The site is privately owned and currently there is no public right of way. Development will enable green infrastructure routes to become accessible to local residents. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council and other infrastructure partners to ensure any necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF152	Resident	<p>Further to the above proposed plan, we would like to make the following concerns and comments: A supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools is needed before the building, or at the commencement of building, as there is already pressure on existing resources which currently creates problems particularly getting an appointment with the Doctor. The increased volume of traffic trying to get in/out of Worksop will make life very frustrating and unhealthy for commuters as long queues already exist at rush hour and when children finish schools in and around Worksop. This will increase the levels of pollution in the area with the knock on adverse effect on health and wellbeing. If it goes ahead, green space should be made available with tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment. Developers should be made to provide decent size gardens and not allowed to cram as many dwellings as they can onto a space to maximise their profits.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced, accessible green infrastructure network (including retained woodland), new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The site is privately owned and currently there is no public right of way. Development will enable green infrastructure routes to become accessible to local residents. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council and other infrastructure partners to ensure any necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF153	Resident	<p>We have been residents of Westerdale, Worksop for over 18 years. We were horrified to see building works taking place by Rippon Homes off Blyth Road. We received notification from neighbours of the proposed development at the rear of our property at Peaks Hill Farm. No notification was received from the Council. Therefore, it is with heavy hearts that we are having to contact you to explain our upset at the Council's plans to develop a site in such a large way. This will have obvious monetary consequence for all our properties. There was a significant premium to pay in the purchase of our house, which was in no doubt due to the beautiful scenic view. We are against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peak Hill Farm, Policy 15, within the Bassetlaw Local Plan.</p> <p>When we attended two consolation meetings, the information was unclear and limited to say the least. No plans or specifications as to the layout of the properties and the amenities were available for inspection. The representatives did their best but to be honest they had been given no sufficient information to answer our many questions. They didn't know themselves how the development was going to look. Why wasn't a senior Planning Officer available at these consultations? We have noticed from other residents' comments that this plan was not made public until after building works had begun. We have also noticed that some people on Westerdale purchased their properties within the last few years and had been given no prior warning as to the new development plans for the rural land to the rear of their properties.</p> <p>We have many concerns about what impact this development will have, for the land, the community and us as homeowners of Westerdale.</p> <p>These fields are filled with wildlife; since moving in, we have seen birds, frogs, toads, newts, hares, hedgehogs, pheasants, mice and insects. If this development is to be implemented this wildlife will be dramatically reduced/eradicated. There is a huge concern globally for the impact of climate change and this development will be contributing massively to our local environment. The introduction of more traffic, building works and construction will further add to issues contributing to climate change such as air pollution, noise pollution and increased traffic. Furthermore, we will not only lose the invaluable green space that has always been there but we will lose a prime local food-growing land. In light of recently leaving the EU, we would urge the Council's aims should be to preserve crop growing space, as we will no longer be importing vital food-sources from EU countries? The prospect of a link road running behind our house is also a major concern. This will turn our tranquil back garden into a heavily congested roadway filled with pollution, noise and traffic. We insist that this link road needs to be positioned at least 1 mile away from the houses to protect residents and wildlife, including pets such as cats, that have been accustomed to roaming on these fields freely for years. We have seen people walking their dogs on this land every day and would be interested to see if this is indeed a public right of way. Furthermore, one of the reasons we purchased this property was for the privacy the location provided. If you are going to build 750 dwellings, a link road plus businesses (in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon Homes) our privacy will be compromised by builders for at least 15 years during the construction works. For many elderly residents, that could well be their lifetime. The disruption this will cause will be catastrophic and how do you ensure we as residents will not be victims of this? How far back from our houses on Westerdale will these houses be built? With new buildings, more people will move to Worksop and this will consequently put further strain on the already unreliable rail services. People will no doubt be choosing to commute to surrounding cities such as Sheffield and Doncaster as Worksop does not have many job opportunities or prospects. We would urge the Council to consider different ways to improve the town centre and put focus into that rather than creating cheaper housing for those working in cities to benefit from.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced, accessible green infrastructure network (including retained woodland), new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The site is privately owned and currently there is no public right of way. Development will enable green infrastructure routes to become accessible to local residents. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council and other infrastructure partners to ensure any necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF153	Resident	<p>Our town centre has been neglected for several years, local businesses are forced to leave as the rent is so high and as a result many shops are vacant. If our concerns are overruled, we want to see something that will respect us as long-term residents. We want to see a 50 meter green buffer-zone between the existing homes and any new development to maintain privacy and protect our wildlife. Please confirm that Long Plantation will remain in situ. The new dwellings should also have gardens backing onto the buffer-zone to increase distance between existing homes and new houses. Following on, communal areas such as youth facilities, playgrounds, car parks and sports pitches should be located away from any existing homes behind the tree line to ensure our privacy and peace is respected. To promote wildlife and the regrowth of eco-systems this development will have destroyed, the development needs to have an extensive plan to plant new trees, shrubs, bushes and green areas. Green pathways and corridors across all the development need to connect existing woodlands and walking paths to enable easy access to public transport. These new houses also need to have decent sized gardens so people can enjoy the benefits of outdoor space. We feel the residents of our community have been treated very badly in this proposal. Have the Council any plans to compensate residents, such as ourselves, for the loss of value for our properties? We would be grateful for your detailed comments on all the points listed in this letter. We will finish by saying, this development will have a significant impact on the mental health of residents of Westerdale and beyond. This has already caused significant stress for family, my fellow residents and ourselves. The Council needs to take our concerns seriously.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced, accessible green infrastructure network (including retained woodland), new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The site is privately owned and currently there is no public right of way. Development will enable green infrastructure routes to become accessible to local residents. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council and other infrastructure partners to ensure any necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF154	Resident	<p>I am compelled to put forward my objections regarding the proposed Peaks Hill Farm Development in Worksop as it will directly affect our home, our enjoyment of life in the area, the surrounding homes and people and the existing wild life, some of which is protected.</p> <p>I understand that the development is for 750 new dwellings from the year 2026, with a further proposal of an additional 750 new dwelling after the year 2037.</p> <p>I do not feel that this massive development will be of benefit to our community because the area is already overcrowded and the infrastructure is not in place prior to these being built. Worksop currently has multiple property developments in progress at the moment, for example; the Gatefold estate is still not fully complete and houses remain unsold. The Shireoaks area has 3 building developments in progress, Carlton in Lindrick has another and the St Anne's estate development is set to start soon. There is a mass of development in progress and this proposal will add to many difficulties of the existing communities.</p> <p>Worksop does not have the capability to safely and adequately offer full Health Care and schooling to accommodate the massive number of extra people coming into the area. This proposal will also destroy habitat for the local wildlife living around us, such as foxes and hedgehogs (statistics show that they could be extinct in 10 years if their habitat is not protected), multiple species for bats (many of which are protected) would be driven out and deer would be prevented from using the wood as they do at present. This would be a loss of invaluable green space that has always been parts of Worksop's local character.</p> <p>Loss off prime local food growing land when councils should be investing in British grown produce now we are no longer in the European Union and helping to mitigate climate change. The increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster.</p> <p>The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission thith thousands more in the plan. for a population of 42,000. This saturation policy will increase the numbers in and out of worksop on already unsustainable road, and rail systems.</p> <p>Could you please respond with your comments and detailed confirmation how you intend to address all of the above points and fears, which I have raised, for the benefit and protection of all existing dwellers in the area and the existing natural habitat.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced, accessible green infrastructure network (including retained woodland), new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The site is privately owned and currently there is no public right of way. Development will enable green infrastructure routes to become accessible to local residents. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council and other infrastructure partners to ensure any necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF155	Resident	<p>1. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm, Policy 15 within the Bassetlaw Local Plan. 2. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on residents of Worksop. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime. 3. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings- such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction so this is not guaranteed. 4. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the waiting times at medical centres to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are congested single lane, country-style roads. also, the train services are poor and unreliable. Finally, the Town Centre is poorly maintained with little incentive to attract shoppers to visit. 5. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the number of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsuitable road and rail systems. It's also unclear how the housing requirement in the plan has been determined i.e. has it considered the number of existing properties that naturally become available to purchase e.g. residents leaving Bassetlaw, going into permanent care, passing away etc... 6. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster. 7. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change. 8. There will be a loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character. The primary focus should be on locating brownfield sites to develop on in Bassetlaw. 9. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment - birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. 10. The proposal to build a road across this site to connect Blyth Road and Carlton Road will cause pollution from noise and fumes in this area, in addition to the increased pollution created by the huge number of houses that are planned to be built on this site. Councils are supposed to be helping to reduce the impact on Climate Change (e.g. Clean Air Zones) and this is not in accordance with the approach. 11. Page 78 states "at least 750 houses in phase 1". Please confirm what the maximum number of houses that can be built on this site in phase 1 will be. 12. Para 7.2.8. This is very vague and requires further clarification i.e. what exactly is being proposed and where on the site will this development be located. If this is located near existing housing it will increase the level of pollution (e.g. from noise, traffic and fumes etc). 13. Strategic Objectives Para 4.2. Point 1 states... Building at least 1,500 homes plus other development on agricultural land at High Peaks Farm is not in accordance with the vision outlined in the Strategic Objectives of the draft Local Plan. 14. There has been insufficient communication (or in some instances no communication) to the residents of Bassetlaw regarding the draft Bassetlaw Plan. In relation to Peaks Hill Farm this initially consisted of one notice attached to a lamp post on Westerdale which gave only a very short timescale to respond. It is highly likely that some residents who will be affected by this plan will still be unaware of the full ramifications of this proposal. There will also be a significant number of residents who haven't had time to thoroughly review the huge volume of information in this plan. I therefore request 1 month extension to the consultation period to enable residents to review this plan in more detail to help them make a more informed response to this.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced, accessible green infrastructure network (including retained woodland), new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The site is privately owned and currently there is no public right of way. Development will enable green infrastructure routes to become accessible to local residents. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council and other infrastructure partners to ensure any necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF155	Resident	<p>If my concerns are over-ruled, I would like to see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife 11. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor 12. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline 13. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change) 14. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution 15. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses 16. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport 17. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook 18. Build enough properties to cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings 19. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan) 20. If a road is built to link Blyth Road and Carlton Road through Peaks Hill Harm it needs to be located well away from existing homes behind the treeline. 21. Any green technology that is developed needs to be located well away from existing homes behind the treeline. 	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, including new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF156	Resident	<p>1. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm, Policy 15 within the Bassetlaw Local Plan. 2. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on residents of Worksop. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime. 3. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings- such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction so this is not guaranteed. 4. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the waiting times at medical centres to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are congested single lane, country-style roads. also, the train services are poor and unreliable. Finally, the Town Centre is poorly maintained with little incentive to attract shoppers to visit. 5. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the number of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsuitable road and rail systems. It's also unclear how the housing requirement in the plan has been determined i.e. has it considered the number of existing properties that naturally become available to purchase e.g. residents leaving Bassetlaw, going into permanent care, passing away etc... 6. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster. 7. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change. 8. There will be a loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character. The primary focus should be on locating brownfield sites to develop on in Bassetlaw. 9. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment - birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. 10. The proposal to build a road across this site to connect Blyth Road and Carlton Road will cause pollution from noise and fumes in this area, in addition to the increased pollution created by the huge number of houses that are planned to be built on this site. Councils are supposed to be helping to reduce the impact on Climate change (e.g. Clean Air Zones) and this is not in accordance with the approach. 11. Page 78 states "at least 750 houses in phase 1". Please confirm what the maximum number of houses that can be built on this site in phase 1 will be. 12. Para 7.2.8. This is very vague and requires further clarification i.e. what exactly is being proposed and where on the site will this development be located. If this is located near existing housing it will increase the level of pollution (e.g. from noise, traffic and fumes etc). 13. Strategic Objectives Para 4.2. Point 1 states... Building at least 1,500 homes plus other development on agricultural land at High Peaks Farm is not in accordance with the vision outlined in the Strategic Objectives of the draft Local Plan. 14. There has been insufficient communication (or in some instances no communication) to the residents of Bassetlaw regarding the draft Bassetlaw Plan. In relation to Peaks Hill Farm this initially consisted of one notice attached to a lamp post on Westerdale which gave only a very short timescale to respond. It is highly likely that some residents who will be affected by this plan will still be unaware of the full ramifications of this proposal. There will also be a significant number of residents who haven't had time to thoroughly review the huge volume of information in this plan. I therefore request 1 month extension to the consultation period to enable residents to review this plan in more detail to help them make a more informed response to this.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, including new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF157	Resident	<p>1. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm, Policy 15 within the Bassetlaw Local Plan. 2. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on residents of Worksop. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime. 3. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings- such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction so this is not guaranteed. 4. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the waiting times at medical centres to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are congested single lane, country-style roads. also, the train services are poor and unreliable. Finally, the Town Centre is poorly maintained with little incentive to attract shoppers to visit. 5. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the number of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsuitable road and rail systems. It's also unclear how the housing requirement in the plan has been determined i.e. has it considered the number of existing properties that naturally become available to purchase e.g. residents leaving Bassetlaw, going into permanent care, passing away etc... 6. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster. 7. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change. 8. There will be a loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character. The primary focus should be on locating brownfield sites to develop on in Bassetlaw. 9. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment - birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. 10. The proposal to build a road across this site to connect Blyth Road and Carlton Road will cause pollution from noise and fumes in this area, in addition to the increased pollution created by the huge number of houses that are planned to be built on this site. Councils are supposed to be helping to reduce the impact on Climate change (e.g. Clean Air Zones) and this is not in accordance with the approach. 11. Page 78 states "at least 750 houses in phase 1". Please confirm what the maximum number of houses that can be built on this site in phase 1 will be. 12. Para 7.2.8. This is very vague and requires further clarification i.e. what exactly is being proposed and where on the site will this development be located. If this is located near existing housing it will increase the level of pollution (e.g. from noise, traffic and fumes etc). 13. Strategic Objectives Para 4.2. Point 1 states... Building at least 1,500 homes plus other development on agricultural land at High Peaks Farm is not in accordance with the vision outlined in the Strategic Objectives of the draft Local Plan. 14. There has been insufficient communication (or in some instances no communication) to the residents of Bassetlaw regarding the draft Bassetlaw Plan. In relation to Peaks Hill Farm this initially consisted of one notice attached to a lamp post on Westerdale which gave only a very short timescale to respond. It is highly likely that some residents who will be affected by this plan will still be unaware of the full ramifications of this proposal. There will also be a significant number of residents who haven't had time to thoroughly review the huge volume of information in this plan. I therefore request 1 month extension to the consultation period to enable residents to review this plan in more detail to help them make a more informed response to this.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, including new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF158	Resident	<p>1. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm, Policy 15 within the Bassetlaw Local Plan. 2. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on residents of Worksop. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime. 3. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings- such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction so this is not guaranteed. 4. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the waiting times at medical centres to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are congested single lane, country-style roads. also, the train services are poor and unreliable. Finally, the Town Centre is poorly maintained with little incentive to attract shoppers to visit. 5. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the number of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsuitable road and rail systems. It's also unclear how the housing requirement in the plan has been determined i.e. has it considered the number of existing properties that naturally become available to purchase e.g. residents leaving Bassetlaw, going into permanent care, passing away etc... 6. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster. 7. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change. 8. There will be a loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character. The primary focus should be on locating brownfield sites to develop on in Bassetlaw. 9. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment - birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. 10. The proposal to build a road across this site to connect Blyth Road and Carlton Road will cause pollution from noise and fumes in this area, in addition to the increased pollution created by the huge number of houses that are planned to be built on this site. Councils are supposed to be helping to reduce the impact on Climate change (e.g. Clean Air Zones) and this is not in accordance with the approach. 11. Page 78 states "at least 750 houses in phase 1". Please confirm what the maximum number of houses that can be built on this site in phase 1 will be. 12. Para 7.2.8. This is very vague and requires further clarification i.e. what exactly is being proposed and where on the site will this development be located. If this is located near existing housing it will increase the level of pollution (e.g. from noise, traffic and fumes etc). 13. Strategic Objectives Para 4.2. Point 1 states... Building at least 1,500 homes plus other development on agricultural land at High Peaks Farm is not in accordance with the vision outlined in the Strategic Objectives of the draft Local Plan. 14. There has been insufficient communication (or in some instances no communication) to the residents of Bassetlaw regarding the draft Bassetlaw Plan. In relation to Peaks Hill Farm this initially consisted of one notice attached to a lamp post on Westerdale which gave only a very short timescale to respond. It is highly likely that some residents who will be affected by this plan will still be unaware of the full ramifications of this proposal. There will also be a significant number of residents who haven't had time to thoroughly review the huge volume of information in this plan. I therefore request 1 month extension to the consultation period to enable residents to review this plan in more detail to help them make a more informed response to this.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, including new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF161	Resident	<p>We would first like to say that we are opposed to the plan to build 750+ (initial) houses on the fields around Peak Hill Farm, as we feel the size of the development is inappropriate for the housing needs of local people. A development of this scale would have a massive negative effect on the environment in a time when we need to be preserving the natural world, not destroy it. Any suggestion that building 750+ houses on one site, could be classed as 'green' by planting a few trees, is quite clearly ludicrous, not to mention the increase in air pollution from the 1000 + cars and home boilers a development of this scale would generate. Worksop is a small town with limited services, that are probably at breaking point, and any substantial increase in population would send these services into crisis. At the moment, it's practically impossible to get an appointment at the Larwood Surgery, given another 750+ houses, then who knows how long it would take to get an appointment. Worksop has two secondary schools both of which are at full capacity. Would a third school be built, or would we expect to cram in the extra pupils, thus lowering the standard of education received by our children. The only thing going for Worksop is the quality of education our children receive, building these extra unnecassay houses, put's that at risk for generations to come. The road and rail network is currently inadequate for the current population; with the addition of 750+ houses, road and rail will need considerable investment to keep Worksop 'moving'. These are just a few examples of why we are opposed to this development. However, if the council over-rules our concerns and the development goes ahead, then we would like to see the following. Running along the existing border between the fields and the houses on Westerdale etc. a green buffer of at lease 15 meters. This should contain a mixture of deciduous and ever-green trees and shrubs to a) reduce the amount of noise pollution, and b) to stop the existing residents from being over-looked by any new development, and c) to give the wild-life some refuge. It should also be designed not to encourage any form of criminal or anti-social behaviour. We would also expect that no properties be built that exceed 2 stories, preferably 1 along the boudary. Any 'community' developments, i.e. sports fields, community halls etc be built away from the existing border, preferably behind the line of trees in the middle of the fields. Street lighting be kept to a minimum, with anti-light pollution designs. Any builders to be kept in check about what they destroy, for example, bats (a protected species) are found all the way along Westerdale. Make sure that the builders respect the natural inhabitants, and make sure that punitive fines for any breaches are substantial. We would also want any walkways be enhancing to the environment, not a place where crime can thrive.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced in green infrastructure network, including new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF162	Resident	<p>I am totally opposed to these plans on the following grounds:-1. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm, Policy 15, within the Bassetlaw Local Plan2. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents of Worksop. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime3. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction4. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable5. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems6. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster7. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change8. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character9. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see10. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife11. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor12. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline13. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)14. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution15. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses16. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport17. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook18. Build enough housing that local people can actually afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings19. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced in green infrastructure network, including new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
1195356	Resident	<p>I am against Peaks Hill Farm development Policy 15 due to prime farmland and green spaces been destroyed for housing which is not in demand , over 600 empty homes in Worksop alone which then exceeds the required amount you have previously quoted as been needed for growth. The area will be subject to excess noise , pollution and disruption for years to come and the impact environmentally is immense which is a horrific thought in these days of climate change and eco friendly environments which you are going to destroy with this huge development . There is already great pressure on the services and amenities which current Worksop residents are unhappy with . Commuting is going to become a bigger problem as many house buyers will be from out of the area and this will have a major negative impact on the local roads and also the A1, A57, A60 and M1 routes. The train services are minimal and unreliable and not conducive to commuters. The proposed link road will not ease congestion on our local roads , it will add to it considering you are looking at appox 3000 additional cars . This is not a solution road , this is a tick box . The amount of housing exceeds the government requirement by over 20% and by over 10% at local policy level . Gateford estate is left with undeveloped areas as the builders are finding they cant sell them so why propose a further 1500 with no supporting infrastructure and over saturated residential areas. Why use farm land to build upon.....this is loss of local crop growing land with exit from the EU this is going to become a real need in the UK and this area. In this time of climate change we should look at regenerating existing land areas and preserving green land if the farmer wants to sell then it should be used for green energy - solar panel and wind farms and the like. Once destroyed you will never recreate the established eco structure and natural habitats, wildlife , established trees needed for climate control will all be lost and gone forever . Adding new tress will not replace the existing established natural environment .</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced in green infrastructure network, including new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
1195356	Resident	<p>The council has conducted itself very poorly in this matter.... You have not followed the correct Community Consultation procedure. You are working against your own Strategic Objectives There has been a complete lack of transparency The staff at the local consultation events were unhelpful and arrogant and one member actually quoted "that's the way it is" when questioned about the Peaks Hill Proposal. The Plan consistently uses the term sustainable development . This is absolute greenwash.... how can by its very nature the irrevocable loss of farmland and countryside be deemed sustainable ???? All national and international agendas are for concerns of global warming , locally sourced food , light/noise/traffic pollution, urban drainage, local infrastructure capacity, health and wellbeing will be eroded if the destruction of the countryside is allowed to happen for this excessive housing. To allow destruction on this scale is of the beautiful landscape and wildlife habitat at Peaks Hill Farm would be irresponsible and wrong</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced in green infrastructure network, including new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
1195356	Resident	<p>We request and feel its only right to connect with all residents and surrounding areas to extend the deadline from the 26th February. In order to gather more information and have sufficient time to research our reading in more detail.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced in green infrastructure network, including new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF164	Resident	<p>I would like a chance to be heard about my objections against the proposed development on the land at Peaks Hill farm. I feel extremely disappointed that Bassetlaw Council has failed to inform residents of the large scale, disruptive plans to build on the farming land associated with Peaks Hill Farm.</p> <p>If it wasn't for one resident who by chance noticed the single leaflet pinned to the lamppost and then photocopied and distributed a copy to every house hold on Westerdale , then none of us would have even been aware of these plans that will cause so much disruption, pollution and destruction of acres of greenbelt land.</p> <p>Not only that, these plans will put a huge strain on our health services, schools and roads which are already struggling to support the already growing population of Worksop. As most residents have lived here for over 20 years, I feel that it would have been only fair to inform us of these plans that were made back in 2018. We could then have had the opportunity to object to the plans. Instead the plans were kept very quiet until it was almost too late to oppose them.</p> <p>It doesn't seem right or fair that the countryside behind our gardens is going to be destroyed in order to allow 1450 house to be built over the next 15 years. This estate is full of families with young children and elderly residents who love to spend time in the privacy and safety of their gardens. These plans are not only going to affect our privacy, but the pollutants and toxins that come with the upcoming building site may jeopardise the health of residents. This will put even more strain on our health services that are already struggling.</p> <p>As a young woman interested in sustaining Britain's endangered wildlife and woodland areas, it saddens me to hear that as my local council you're planning to destroy a large woodland area, close to where I live. This is an area that contains an array of trees, plants and local wildlife. I've researched some of the core environmental values that you claim to support in a document entitled 'A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Our 25 Year Environment Plan sets out our comprehensive and long-term approach to protect and enhance Britain's natural landscapes and habitats. 2. Its goals are simple: cleaner air and water; protect plants and animals. 3. Create new habitats for wildlife. 4. When the United Kingdom leaves the European Union, we will use this opportunity to strengthen, enhance and protect our countryside and wildlife habitats. 5. It is this Government's ambition to leave our environment in a better state than we found it. 6. The places dear to us we wish to protect and preserve. We value those landscapes 7. For this reason, we safeguard cherished landscapes from economic exploitation, protect the welfare of sentient animals and strive to preserve endangered woodland and plant life. 8. So, protecting and enhancing the environment, as this Plan lays out, is about more than respecting nature. It is critical if the next generation is to flourish. <p>From reading this document I'm left puzzled to why such a plan has been put into place as it seems to contradict so many of your core beliefs and values about the environment.</p> <p>Would it not make more sense to either abandon these plans or wait until the existing new houses in Worksop have been sold? Or perhaps find land that isn't going to disrupt residents' lives, destroy greenbelt land, endanger woodlands and endanger wildlife at a time when climate change is a serious issue.</p> <p>In conclusion I feel it would be sensible to extend the consultation process beyond the original date of February 26 to allow a full consultation of such a major project to take place</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, including new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF165	Resident	<p>I would like to request an extension to the consultation process for the draft Bassetlaw Plan that affects plans for the development of land known as Peaks Hill Farm. My request for this extension is on the basis of lack of appropriate consultation with local residents. Residents were 'informed' via a single A4 leaflet fastened to a lamp post at the end of our road prior to the consultation meeting on 4-2-20. Surely each individual household should have been informed of the plans and the meeting well in advance of the meeting date? Also the meeting was scheduled to be held at a time when most residents were at work and therefore unable to attend. I have already emailed my initial objections to such a huge development on the Peaks Hill site but I have since read the draft plan and now have further objections. Whilst I support the need for local regeneration plans, I fail to see the need to build such a huge housing estate on greenfield farming land. It's clear to see that the developers of the recently built houses on Gateford are struggling to sell them, hence they are now being offered at reduced prices. Therefore there is no guarantee that developers will be able to sell over 1,500 houses on Peaks Hill Farm. The building of such a huge estate clearly contravenes Bassetlaw District Council's strategic objectives to preserve greenfield and farm land. It will lead to the destruction of acres of natural countryside and wildlife, it will increase pollution and contribute to the devastating impact of global warming. The negative implications of such massive scale house building for the infrastructure in Worksop is worrying as it will negatively affect all Bassetlaw residents. It appears that there is insufficient provision in the draft plan to increase school places, health services and road links to the level needed until these houses are built and sold. I would like to see a more realistic number of houses proposed to be built on Peaks Hill Farm which would not cause such devastation to the environment and infrastructure and would not exceed the market demand for new houses.</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultation events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF167	Resident	<p>I am totally opposed to these plans on the following grounds:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I do not believe that the consultation process for the Bassetlaw Local Plan has not been carried out adequately. It has been badly communicated and rushed 2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm, Policy 15, within the Bassetlaw Local Plan 3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents of Worksop. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime 4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction 5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable 6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems 7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster 8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change 9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character 10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population.If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see: 11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife 12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor 13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline 14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change) 15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution 16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses 17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport 18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook 19. Build enough housing that local people can actually afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings 20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan) <p>Please keep me appraised of the outcome of the opposition to these proposals by myself and the local community</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, including new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF168	Resident	<p>I am totally opposed to these plans on the following grounds:-1. I do not believe that the consultation process for the Bassetlaw Local Plan has not been carried out adequately. It has been badly communicated and rushed.2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm, Policy 15, within the Bassetlaw Local Plan3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents of Worksop. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can actually afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)Please keep me appraised of the outcome of the opposition to these proposals by myself and the local community</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced in green infrastructure network, including new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
1195520	Resident	<p>The plan as outlined removes substantial green areas and promotes an 'outer' ring road with potential significant traffic flow. Access to the new plan from the adjacent existing housing stock is unclear, potentially increasing traffic in the already congested roads.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced in green infrastructure network, including new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF173	Resident	<p>I would like to request an extension to the consultation process for the draft Bassetlaw Plan that affects plans for the development of land known as Peaks Hill Farm. This request is due to the lack of appropriate consultation with local residents. Residents were 'informed' by means of a single A4 leaflet fastened to a lamp post at the end of our road prior to the consultation meeting on 4th February 2020. Surely, as a matter of courtesy and transparency, each individual household should have been informed of the plans and the meeting date well in advance? Also, the meeting was scheduled to be held at a time when most residents were at work and therefore unable to attend. There are currently several major new housing estates under construction around Worksop which seem to be saturating the market. The supply already seems to exceed demand and these estates are attracting residents from outside Bassetlaw, primarily Sheffield who are looking for more house for their money. The few people I know on the Gateford estate commute to Sheffield or the motorway, and they are also attracted back for social and leisure activities. Almost all are derogatory towards Worksop and most do not go anywhere near the Town Centre. The only businesses to benefit are the multi-national supermarket chains. The plan does not seem to recognise serious national and global issue of climate change. Worksop has only recently been devastated by serious flooding and the road out to Barlborough was blocked for some time after the water had receded in the town centre, with a lake forming under the bridge at Darfoulds. The destruction of the natural environment coupled with the building work and the eventual existence of another huge housing estate, with hundreds if not thousands of extra commuters will no doubt add to the problem of global warming. It appears that the council is lacking any social conscience and awareness of its responsibility towards this issue and the future of our children. It is obvious that the current infrastructure will not support such a large estate. It appears from the plan that improvements to roads and junctions will not take place until after the houses are built. What you will be creating is a traffic jam from Worksop to the M1 along the A57 and the A1 along Blyth Road. In essence this is therefore hardly a sustainable development. Finally, are there any plans to increase the size or number of schools, doctors' surgeries and hospital services in the area in line with these increased number of houses? Residents currently struggle to book doctors' appointments and the wait for hospital appointments is already a huge problem as the current facilities are struggling to cope with current demands.</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultation events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>
1195661	Resident	<p>I understand the need for housing development & as such am not opposed to the development of Peaks Hill Farm. However, I do strongly oppose any connecting road infrastructure with Winster Grove. This would be unnecessary for the build and in, addition, due to the flow of Winster Grove and Ambleside Grange would lend itself to becoming a "rat run" and as such would not only disturb the peace for the residents, but would be very dangerous for drivers and residents.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, including new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
1195688	Resident	Housing developments in area remain unsold. Worksop has nothing to offer in the town centre so new residents will be commuters who will spend their money elsewhere. The roads and current infrastructures are buckling under the current demand. Drs , dentists, Hospitals can't meet current needs so how can they meet the demand for at least 2,000 more populous. Schools are full also .	Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, including new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.
REF178	Resident	I write to raise my objections to the proposed inclusion of the development of Peaks Hill Farm (PHF) site in the above document. Also, to the inclusion of such a large amount of green-space in The Plan. I also wish to express my objections regarding the manner and process of the Plans 'consultation'. Whilst I appreciate that local authorities have had to endure many austerity measures, I do not accept that "lack of resources" as quoted on a number of occasions at public meetings regarding the above, is a reason to hold these meetings in winter, half-term, during dark evenings and inclement weather, with at best, minimal publicity and more importantly, almost upon the feedback deadline of the 26th February. Retford, Carlton, Misterton and Ranby's meetings, for example, range from the 18th to 25th February. Ranby's meeting is the day before the deadline. The Plan has been heavily consulted upon with developers and other 'relevant' parties since 2018, without due consideration of local citizens and, therefore, it feels that we have been presented with a fait accompli. It is not inclusive or good enough to use the excuse that it has been on the Councils website or social media. How can people know what they don't know? Bassetlaw District Council (BDC) needed to have operated a high profile, robust and transparent district consultation programme from 2018, the date of the Plan, in order to give local people time to understand its impact. The Plan is almost 200 pages long, with over 70 additional accompanying documents further listed and most residents throughout the District are totally unaware of it and the magnitude of change that the proposals suggest (many areas having an increase in housing stock of 20%) and have been given scant time to read, absorb and comment on its contents. Irrespective of how little finance BDC has, the failure to adequately and proportionately resource timely and appropriate consultation for such, in many cases, life-changing proposals of this size, at best demonstrates a lack of operation under Best Practice and at worst, suggests that BDC have cynically kept the publicity and consultation to such a minimum and within such a short deadline in order to push through what would otherwise be a controversial document. Many residents are only now beginning to send in responses, proof that word has only just got around. There were many elderly residents at the second meeting in Worksop that I attended and which attracted many attendees - who would not have known about the meeting if we as residents, had not publicised it with a leaflet having discovered 1 small notice on a lamp-post, interestingly, we were told by an officer that we were "lucky to get that". Many have been simply bewildered and distressed by the Plan and many do not have access to the internet in order to see it and understand the content and formulate their own opinions. Indeed, many of us present, of all ages, had not previously known about this Plan, and I am on the Planning department's mailing list and had only received a letter the same time as the notice went up on the lamp-post. BDC Leader, Cllr Simon Greaves, was presumably asked by reporters at the Worksop Guardian 7th February 2020, for a reaction to the article by residents on the same day and information came too late for residents who did not know that meetings were taking place. Indeed, by the articles date of 7th February, many such meetings had already taken place. Cllr Greaves' article was, therefore, reactive; it would have been considered timely and proactive if it had been months ago whilst giving residents a list of meeting dates and basic information	The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultation events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm	<p>well in advance. The quotes of 'like it or not, as a district, Bassetlaw needs to create more opportunities for employment and more houses for people to live in" is absolutely justified and acceptable; that is not the issue. What is, is the enormity of the proposals and their impact. It is not helpful to further read 'I am happy to report that both Worksop events were well attended' when the first meeting had 10 attendees who complained about the lack of publicity (presumably prompting the same Cllrs to then leaflet the area a few days before the next meeting) which was publicised by residents, as above. The feedback forms that were handed out at meetings were highly inadequate and complex with a seeming need to equate comments to particular sections in the Plan. On contacting Planning, I was told that we could simply email or write to Planning with comments, as long as we included our contact details and made reference to the particular policy numbers, PHF being Policy 15. Why were we not told this collectively at meetings or in some appropriate BDC publicity? There is no suggestion that any forms are available, for example, in large print or different languages. It feels that the process for giving feedback/comments has been made as complex and un-inclusive as possible. I am incredulous that a district plan of this enormity and duration, did not have a reasonable, timely, well publicised, inclusive communications strategy allowing residents to make genuinely appropriate and timely contributions. That is proper consultation. Collecting comments at short notice meetings where for most people it was the first time they had any information about the Plan, can form part of a communications strategy. However, surely under the Councils legal obligations to operate under the Equality Act, Best Practice alone would require that citizens should have been given appropriate time to understand and respond to the proposals, given the range of capability, mobility, age, access to information etc that people have. For a document of this size, magnitude and impact, I feel that BDC has failed in its operation of Best Practice and in reasonably considering its residents and has even failed in the delivery of the wholly inadequate consultation process as outlined in Appendix 4 of the Plan below. None of us in the immediate vicinity have received a letter. Appendix 4: Community consultation In these cases all of the following must be met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a) An A4 laminated site notice should be displayed on the site's road/street frontage(s) for a minimum of 21 9hivThe notice should identify the site, provide a description of the proposal and where comments should be sent; • b) A letter should be sent to all properties notifying them of the proposal which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • adjoin the site boundary; • on the street(s) the site is located on; • face the site I ask BDC to remedy this unreasonable, untimely and unjust approach and to extend the deadline from this Wednesday, 26th February, for a minimum of 1 month and operate a proactive publicity campaign, through a range of media, about the Plan in order to allow all citizens throughout the District an opportunity to respond. <p>My comments on the Plan are listed below, though I have had inadequate time to respond in further detail due to the reasons stated above:Strategic Objectives4.2.1 This vision will be achieved by meeting the following objectives:Page 21. OBJECTIVE 1.'To locate new development in sustainable locations and through new settlements that respect the environmental capacity of the District, support a balanced pattern of growth across urban and rural areas, makes best use of previously developed land and buildings and minimises the loss of the District's highest quality agricultural land'.Page 265.1.17 'Worksop will deliver a minimum of 2180 new dwellings over the plan period (2018 to 2037). Since the start of the plan period Worksop has seen 230 housing completions and currently has 1404 commitments (at 30/11/2019). Combined, this equates to a supply of 1634 dwellings. Consequently, there is a requirement to allocate land for a minimum of 546 dwellings in Worksop'. 5.1.18 'However, the level of housing identified by Policy ST1 in Worksop is broadly comparable with the promotion of successful economic growth and regeneration and to facilitate the infrastructure required in support'. Response to Strategic Objective 1 and sections 5 on page 26 as above:The proposed inclusion of farmland and countryside at PHF for a development of such disproportionate enormity, causing such a loss of green-space and with a lack of infrastructure, goes against every principle in this objective.According to the Office of National Statistics data, the populations of Worksop and Bassetlaw have increased by around 10% over the last 20 years. The proportion of development in the Plan throughout the district, however, is around 20% with a huge proportion of that on green-field sites at PHF and Bassetlaw Garden Village. The huge development at Gateford is already offering discounts on unsold plots and stamp duty paid. I am interested to know where the thousands of households for Bassetlaw, 9,087 homes, will come from, given the lack of facilities and supporting infrastructure. Commuters need good levels of connectivity, not currently evident in Worksop and surrounding villages.BDC Spatial Strategy quotes 'a minimum of 9,087 homes need to be built in Bassetlaw by 2037' yet 5.1.17 above, states that only 546 further dwellings are needed in Worksop in total. Yet Peaks Hill farm on its own, is to include at least 750 houses in phase 1 alone. If this much lower number, based on population projections for the District, is what is actually needed, say allowing for a continued population increase over 20 years again of 10%, why is</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm	<p>the Plan to include so much destruction of green-space and with a 20% increase in housing stock? The developments on brown field sites would probably provide the level of housing affordability that local people can sustain in Worksop, with additional insistence on affordable homes being built at, for example, Gateford and the old Tesco site. I am a member of the RSPB, WWF Fund For Nature and the National Trust. My concerns are not simply NIMBY, but national and global. My belief is that we are part of nature, not separate from it and we all, therefore, have a moral duty to protect what we are all currently custodians of. I am particularly horrified at the extent of destruction of local green-field sites especially that proposed for Peaks Hill Farm (PHF) Policy 15. An urban sprawl of this size would have a catastrophic impact on wildlife habitats including for buzzards, owls, sparrow hawks, invertebrates, mammals (including bats) and pollinators, all of which inhabit the site. There are already 174 houses being built adjacent to this site (The Lodge at The Edge) with the Plan adding 'at least 750' more in phase 1on 54 hectares and '750' in phase 2, doubling the size. The impact on Worksop will be immense. The roads surrounding the site are single lane, country-style roads. The impact on the already stretched infrastructure, including local roads, the A57 to Sheffield, GP surgeries (the waiting time for appointments at Newgate Medical Group for example, is already 6 weeks) dentists, the hospital, schools etc will be more intolerable when added to the huge sprawling developments currently in progress at Gateford and near Shireoaks and all the other sites around the Town. The size of the PHF site means its development will be spread over decades. For many members of the local community, this will mean the anxiety of continued disruption, inconvenience, noise, heavy plant, dust and other pollution, and in the case of the elderly, literally for the rest of their lives. The proposal at PHF has very little, if any, concrete evidence of appropriate, new infrastructure support compared particularly to the proposed Bassetlaw Garden Village ST1 ST3 ST35 and ST36, which is to have a nursery and primary school, healthcare facilities, parks, enhanced transport networks, flood risk management and a new railway station etc demonstrating what is deemed necessary for a development of 750 homes. However, there is nothing specific for PHF, a development of the same size, other than for example, a road across the estate and a local bus service. The Plan clearly implies minimal infrastructure investment on and around this site and waives the Community Infrastructure Levy other than for that required to enable the development to take place. Connectivity in and out of Worksop is already inadequate and under stress. I now commute to Sheffield by train. It is a poor service:- often dirty, overcrowded, unreliable, infrequent and increasingly difficult to park at the station. I used to commute by car, a journey that used to take 35 minutes to the centre and now takes about an hour. According to the Planning section, income will need to be raised from the building of these huge developments - presumably via Council Tax and some developer contributions if evidence can be deemed to support need - in order to raise the income needed to build infrastructure, section 5.1.18 in the Plan. The level of Council Tax needed will not be raised until all properties are built and sold, this may take decades and how can we simply extend already land-locked facilities (the train station, schools and surgeries) to accommodate increases in population? Will this in turn, create the constant chicken and egg situation of increasing the destruction of further green-space? I accept the need for additional housing but not of this magnitude, especially on prime farming land that should provide locally produced food, and the surrounding green-space which has been countryside since time immemorial. National evidence shows that local authorities have limited power to enforce the provision of affordable housing on development sites and developers, who are interested in maximising their profits, do not appear to be voluntarily providing them. Worksop has a population of 42,000+. The housing currently being built and also proposed is largely 3, 4 and 5 bedroom detached. The average house price in Worksop is £139,000. New developments - see Rippon Homes development off Blyth Road - are 'luxury homes' being marketed to commuters. Gateford site is selling their 'luxury homes' homes starting at £300,000. These are not what many local people can afford to buy and I cannot find evidence to support the concept that by building lots of houses - sustainable, local and professional (with salaries sufficient to fund large houses) employment will follow - in less affluent locations. It is more feasible, that the purchasers of large homes in less well off areas will be commuters who will be unlikely to work within and spend large amounts in the local economy, preferring other locations such as Meadowhall, Sheffield, Lincoln and Nottingham. The recent tragic flooding of Worksop Town Centre is unlikely to increase investor confidence to that location. One of Worksop's Unique Selling Points is it's rural location which is what attracted us to move here from Sheffield 23 years go. It is now being turned into a sprawling commuter belt. The Plan consistently uses the term 'sustainable development'. This is absolute 'greenwash'. How can, by it's very nature, the irrevocable loss of farmland and countryside be deemed sustainable? All the national and international agendas and concerns of, for example, global warming, locally-sourced food, light/noise/traffic pollution, urban drainage, local infrastructure capacity,</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
		<p>health and wellbeing etc will continue to be eroded if destruction of the countryside is allowed at this housing saturation level. As our elected members, and as members of the public, it is our collective responsibility to protect and enhance our natural environment for current and future generations to appreciate, enjoy and benefit from. To allow destruction on this scale of this beautiful landscape and wildlife habitat at PHF, would simply be irresponsible and wrong. Please do not allow this to happen. If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife • New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor • Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline • New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change) • Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution • Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses • Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport • Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook • Build enough housing that local people can actually afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings • Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do no allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings. 	
1195884	Resident	The proposed link between the A60 and Blyth Road, to me is going to produce a more dangerous road on A60 because of the hills and dips and bends on the hills. There have been many fatalities on that road including one at the Peak Hill farm Junction between a tractor and trailer and a motor cycle. Most people from Carlton who work towards Sheffield use Owdney Lane to get to the A57 and others going for the A1 use Hundred Acre Lane or Blyth Road through Oldcotes. I think a link road would be very dangerous with people impatient to join the main carriageways from such a link road	Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced in green infrastructure network, including new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered. This includes improvements to the public highway informed by a transport assessment and liaison with Notts County Council Highways.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF184	Resident	<p>We have grave concerns regarding the above plan just off Thievesdale. It will have severe impact on the road along Blyth Road and this is bad enough as it is, being on a bend. There is already lots of traffic on this road including lorries and slow moving farm traffic. As there is no infrastructure there will be an impact on the local services like schools and surgeries. Larwood surgery is already struggling to meet the needs of the local people and therefore adding over a 1000 more patients will be devastating. Newgate Street surgery also has the same problem. We feel that the development site will be too big and we will be losing valuable growing land. We need to ensure there is enough farm land to produce food for the area not take away from it. Also the wildlife will be severely disrupted. We have hedgehogs, squirrels, hares and rabbits, sparrow hawks, owls and other birds which we will lose at a time when this wildlife should be protected. If this plan must go ahead then the least the Council can do is create a green zone for at least some of our wildlife, at least 15 metres wide and this may protect our privacy especially if the gardens back onto our gardens. We do not want houses on top of each other, rather more open space. We do not want to be overlooking new properties nor have our gardens overlooked by new residents. Bungalows would be better to protect privacy also. These properties should be made so people can afford to buy them so they do not stay empty for long periods as this would end in squatting and criminal damage or places where drugs etc can be used. There should be lots of trees and shrubbery replanted to help the environment to survive and at least create a more attractive environment. Finally please create a proper infrastructure to support all these properties before the existing infrastructure collapses under the weight of demand. GP surgeries, dentists and schools are already overrun and staff leaving due to the stress of this.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, including new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered. This includes improvements to the public highway informed by a transport assessment and liaison with Notts County Council Highways.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF185	Resident	<p>I am compelled to put forward my objections regarding the proposed Peaks Hill Farm Development in Worksop as it will directly affect our home, our enjoyment of life in the area, the surrounding homes and people and the existing wild life, some of which is protected. I understand that the development is for 750 new dwellings from the year 2026, with a further proposal of an additional 750 new dwelling after the year 2037. I do not feel that this massive development will be of benefit to our community because the area is already overcrowded and the infrastructure is not in place prior to these being built Worksop currently has multiple property developments in progress at the moment, for example; the Gatefold estate is still not fully complete and houses remain unsold. The Shireoaks area has 3 building developments in progress, Carlton in Lindrick has another and the St Anne's estate development is set to start soon. There is a mass of development in progress and this proposal will add to many difficulties of the existing communities. Worksop does not have the capability to safely and adequately offer full Health Care and schooling to accommodate the massive number of extra people coming into the area. This proposal will also destroy habitat for the local wildlife living around us, such as foxes and hedgehogs (statistics show that they could be extinct in 10 years if their habitat is not protected), multiple species for bats (many of which are protected) would be driven out and deer would be prevented from using the wood as they do at present. This would be a loss of invaluable green space that has always been parts of Worksop's local character.</p> <p>Loss off prime local food growing land when councils should be investing in British grown produce now we are no longer in the European Union and helping to mitigate climate change. The increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission thith thousands more in the plan. for a population of 42,000. This saturation policy will increase the numbers in and out of worksop on already unsustainable road, and rail systems.</p> <p>Could you please respond with your comments and detailed confirmation how you intend to address all of the above points and fears, which I have raised, for the benefit and protection of all existing dwellers in the area and the existing natural habitat.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
REF186	Resident	<p>I am compelled to put forward my objections regarding the proposed Peaks Hill Farm Development in Worksop as it will directly affect our home, our enjoyment of life in the area, the surrounding homes and people and the existing wild life, some of which is protected.I understand that the development is for 750 new dwellings from the year 2026, with a further proposal of an additional 750 new dwelling after the year 2037.I do not feel that this massive development will be of benefit to our community because the area is already overcrowded and the infrastructure is not in place prior to these being built Worksop currently has multiple property developments in progress at the moment, for example; the Gatefold estate is still not fully complete and houses remain unsold. The Shireoaks area has 3 building developments in progress, Carlton in Lindrick has another and the St Anne's estate development is set to start soon. There is a mass of development in progress and this proposal will add to many difficulties of the existing communities. Worksop does not have the capability to safely and adequately offer full Health Care and schooling to accommodate the massive number of extra people coming into the area. This proposal will also destroy habitat for the local wildlife living around us, such as foxes and hedgehogs (statistics show that they could be extinct in 10 years if their habitat is not protected), multiple species for bats (many of which are protected) would be driven out and deer would be prevented from using the wood as they do at present. This would be a loss of invaluable green space that has always been parts of Worksop's local character. Loss off prime local food growing land when councils should be investing in British grown produce now we are no longer in the European Union and helping to mitigate climate change. The increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm	employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan. for a population of 42,000. This saturation policy will increase the numbers in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road, and rail systems. Could you please respond with your comments and detailed confirmation how you intend to address all of the above points and fears, which I have raised, for the benefit and protection of all existing dwellers in the area and the existing natural habitat.	
REF188	Resident	Current infrastructure doesn't support, more children not enough school places and Bassetlaw Hospital unable to cope with the rising population Threat to wildlife Loss of green land, Increased traffic and pollution	Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.
REF189	Resident	Comments against the above plan Current infrastructure doesn't support, more children not enough school places and Bassetlaw Hospital unable to cope with the ever increasing population as an experienced sister in a very busy ED Threat to wildlifeLoss of green land, Increased traffic and pollution	Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF190	Resident	<p>Comments against the above plan</p> <p>Current infrastructure doesn't support, more children not enough school places and Bassetlaw Hospital unable to cope with the ever increasing population as an experienced sister in a very busy ED</p> <p>Threat to wildlife</p> <p>Loss of green land,</p> <p>Increased traffic and pollution</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
REF191	Resident	<p>Comments against the above plan</p> <p>Current infrastructure doesn't support, more children not enough school places and Bassetlaw Hospital unable to cope with the ever increasing population as an experienced sister in a very busy ED</p> <p>Threat to wildlife</p> <p>Loss of green land,</p> <p>Increased traffic and pollution</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF192	Resident	<p>Please find below my comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF195	Resident	<p>Please find below my comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>
1196001	Resident	I object as it will spoil the countryside and wildlife and I do not see the need for 750 houses. It will spoil the countryside and destroy the wildlife in the local area. I also do not see the need for 750 houses.	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF196	Resident	<p>Please find below my comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan).</p>	<p>continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p> <p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF197	Resident	<p>Please find below my comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation).2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm.3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan). I am asking for you to stop this development from my view as the future generation. Worksop is overcrowded with too many people as it is without hundreds more. Stop this money making scheme now and think of our little town and the residents already living here. Please.</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
1196005	Resident	<p>I wish to offer my strong support. Recognising that Worksop is relatively constrained in terms of deliverable land, notwithstanding the fact that this site falls within the parish are of Carlton-in- Lindrick, it represents the most logical option for a sustainable urban extension. With this in mind therefore, in spite of the proposal to exempt the site from CIL contributions, I would consider it prudent to amend the parish boundary to accurately portray this as an extension to Worksop.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the need for a comprehensive masterplan for the site, the proposed infrastructure provision, including a distributor road to link Carlton Road and Blyth Road is very much welcomed in an effort to enhance connectivity in the north of Worksop and alleviate the pressure that is already evident upon Cannon Crossroads. In addition to this, however, I would encourage a strong emphasis on connectivity in to and through the neighbouring estates. Current road connectivity within the Hemmingfields/ Wensleydale estates is poor, therefore consideration should be given to strategic linkages for north-south connection. One such example would be at the northern end of Hemmingfield Rise where I believe that the small portion of land originally put forward in the Land Availability Assessment was to be made accessible by the optioned-developer purchasing an existing dwelling that would 'make way' for an access point. This and numerous other points, such as Westerdale, Bransdale and Colsterdale should also be considered as vehicular links as part of the masterplan, in the interests of a truly 'connected' development. Similarly, at the design stage, a strong emphasis should be given to internal roads that connect people with destinations. Other infrastructure and community and recreation facilities provision is also welcomed. While I recognise that a good deal of this will be delivered later in the plan period or even beyond this plan period, I would advocate an 'infrastructure first' approach to development (i.e. as exemplified by other LPAs such as Blaby District Council in their Lubbesthorpe SUE). Prioritising delivery of key pieces of infrastructure (such as road links) early on in the development process can be critical in achieving a positive response from the existing local community. Although the need for affordable housing is recognised and, based on recent delivery rates, is always a challenge in Bassetlaw, consideration should be given to back-loading affordable housing in the phasing process to allow infrastructure delivery. With regard to the proposal for developer contributions towards extending the new Gateford Park Primary School, this is not the appropriate location for this investment relative to this site. As a local resident with children of primary school age, I can assure you that Gateford Park is NOT a realistic geographic option either on foot or by car/public transport. This option would not encourage sustainable forms of transport. Priority should be given to further expansion of Prospect Infant & Junior, along with St John's C of E Academy. Although, as a 'faith school' St John's does not necessarily have a catchment in the same way as others may, the east/west sides of this site are largely equidistant to these schools. Taking a crude 'as the crow flies' measurement indicates that the Gateford Park site would be three times as far to each of these schools. While there is an inevitable environmental impact associated with large scale greenfield development, I do not believe that this site is particularly high grade agricultural land (although the national dataset does not appear to give detailed information for this precise location). Nonetheless, the proposed measures for enhanced green infrastructure are considered extremely positive, in conjunction with the policy shift towards biodiversity net gains.</p>	Support noted and welcome
1196006	Resident	<p>This is ridiculous you cannot just keep building houses on all the green land there a plenty of area that need to be tidied up without building on all the fields you are not thinking about the wildlife in these areas. The schools, doctors and town centre need investment before increasing the population in the area and as for the hospital this needs to be fully functional again. Please stop building on the open fields we have issues with flooding this is only going to increase by keep building on the fields. Please see the response previous we currently have two development sites in Carlton this is more than enough 1500 house on the farm land is total unacceptable the doctors schools and hospital will not cope with the demand that are already stretched the traffic becomes worse making it impossible to get in and out of the village Before we know it there will be no fields left the wildlife needs to be protected. The town centre needs investment we need to support the local businesses and make the town centre worth visiting again.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF201	Severn Trent	<p>As with the other policies within the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan, we are supportive of the inclusion of statements regarding an integrated approach to surface water drainage and multifunctional green space. However we feel it is important that specific points regarding the Drainage Hierarchy, SuDS, retention of open Watercourses for outfall continuity are included. We would also advise that a statement regarding Water efficiency and the promotion of the 110l/p/d are included. Some example wording that we feel would assist with this is provided under the Bassetlaw Garden village comments above.</p> <p>The Peaks Hill Farm site is located within a within Source Protection Zone (SPZ), please refer to Protection of Groundwater sources section of our response.</p>	<p>continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p> <p>Thank you for your comments. The Council will ensure these points are taken into consideration in the evolution of the Bassetlaw Plan.</p>
REF204		<p>Have you learnt nothing from all the floods in worksop or is money more important. You are allowing them to build on all these green belts that provide soak aways for heavy rain and at this rate it wont be long before estates up theivesdale are flooding. Not only are they building without any thought or provisions for schools doctors and roads but they give these houses brick and concrete gardens so the water has no where to go. Stop this greed and start thinking of the future and if we must build more houses then the developers should be made to provide the facilities for these extra people . I doubt you will take note of anyones concerns but we have to try</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF208	Resident	<p>I wish to make it known that we are totally against the SIGNIFICANT proposed development which is planned on the land at the rear of my property/land.</p> <p>My main objections are:-</p> <p>1) the development is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents, traffic infrastructure and wildlife. 2) the amount of housing proposed exceeds local needs. It will inevitably attract people from the likes of Sheffield and Doncaster who will commute to third place of work outside Worksop. With the roads already congested this will cause traffic jams, added pollution and noise. Because of the location being accessible from the A1 and M1, currently if there is an accident on either of these extremely busy roads traffic naturally diverts along the A57 or Blyth Road and along Thievesdale Lane to get to the other (from M1 to the A1 and visa versa). This is already heavy traffic and with added volume there is a significant risk of accidents and god forbid injury or loss of life. 3) loss of prime arable farming land which is needed now but certainly will be needed in the future as populations increase. 4) loss of wildlife. In my back garden I get hedgehogs, sparrow hawks, there are buzzards nests in the woods a look onto and that's not to mention the insects, butterflies and a whole range of smaller birds. At night there are BATS flying around my garden. The development will have a detrimental affect on all of these and more. 5) the actual building work and length of time it will take will cause noise, dust etc and will not only impact on my health but there are many elderly people living alongside the planned development site - their health, breathing conditions etc needs to be considered.</p> <p>Should my objections be considered insignificant and the building work gets the green light then I would like to make the following comments/suggestions:-</p> <p>1) there has to be a buffer zone between the current homes of say a minimum of 15 metres to maintain privacy and wildlife. The zone should include a raised bank and or trees/shrubs to block out noise/dust/view from the construction and properties. This needs to be created BEFORE actual building work starts. 2) no direct onlookers between the current properties and the new (back gardens backing onto the buffer zone and the positioning and height of such new properties to be considered). My property as others on Westerdale stand proud and looks down onto the field. 3) minimal street lighting to minimise light pollution. 4) maximise tree and shrub planting to encourage wildlife. 5) build affordable low level properties for local people/ bungalows for the elderly and properties for first time buyers. 6) decent sized garden space for dwellings again to encourage outdoor activities and wildlife (do not allow developers to maximise profits and cram the maximum number of properties on the site).</p> <p>I would welcome anyone, involved in the decision making, to visit my property so they could gain a useful insight as to the impact this would have on me personally and my neighbours.</p> <p>I do hope mine and my local friends and neighbours comments are read and seriously considered PLEASE.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF209	Resident	<p>1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF210	Resident	<p>I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Ripponhomes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. If my concerns are overruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultation events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF211 (Map Included)	Carlton in Lindrick Parish Council	<p>Firstly it is disappointing to note that the site in question is identified as "Northern Worksop" and its location within the Parish of Carlton in Lindrick seems to have been "overlooked". This inevitably has led to residents concluding that the proposed development site must be outside the boundary which is applicable to the Parish Neighbourhood Plan which is not the case. It is suggested therefore that whilst the site could be defined as being North of Worksop it should also include reference to its location which is within the Carlton in Lindrick Parish. Secondly, the Parish Council wishes to make representations on the site development plan included on page 76 and identified as "figure 14" Peaks Hill Farm. The site proposed for development comprises an area edged in red and located between Blyth Road and the "committed" housing development on the eastern boundary and the A60 highway on the western boundary. The Parish Council and community comment made to the Parish Council strongly represents the view that the open agricultural area opposite the property known as "Freshfields" and bordered on its eastern and southern edge by mature woodland and on its western edge by the A60 Highway be retained, protected and excluded from any form of development for the duration of the current local plan. It is felt that this measure would protect the existing natural boundary inbetween the Worksop "Urban" Environment and the "Rural" Environment of Carlton in Lindrick. The natural boundary is recognised through the existence of the woodland and the high ridge of land on the southern side of the agricultural area defined earlier in this paragraph. (see references 1 and 2 on enclosed map) This requested amendment is consistent with Policy 10 of the approved Neighbourhood Plan in that it protects the rural environment on the eastern side of the A60 Highway. Reference is also made to the northern red line site boundary of the proposed development area. The trees and woodland extending northwards from Peaks Hill Farm also define the rural environment within the Parish and will serve to define the rural landscape from the proposed development which extends the "urban" environment of Worksop. It is therefore requested that this woodland area which is outside the red development site boundary be preserved and protected. (see reference 3 on enclosed map). The proposals put forward by the Parish Council would effectively create a new western boundary for site development shown at 4 on the attached plan. Thirdly, the Parish Council wishes to make observations and representations on the proposed new "link" road inbetween Blyth Road and the A60 Highway. Whilst the exact "line" of the new road is not yet defined in the current draft plan the Parish Council requests that the following implications be considered:-a) land bordering the new road which is likely to be located north of the proposed housing development should remain "undeveloped" with existing woodland and agricultural landscapes being preserved. This measure once again would comply with existing policies in the Neighbourhood Plan applicable to the eastern side of the A60 Highway. b) the detailed location of the link road should be carefully considered not only for its links to the road network bordering the Gateford Area and accessing the new A57 roundabout but for the potential additional effects on highways within the Carlton in Lindrick Parish. At the current time increasing volumes of vehicular traffic travelling north on Blyth Road from Worksop uses Hundred Acre Lane for access to the village and for access to the A60 Highway at the junction of Greenway. The traffic volume will further increase when employment capacity is applied to the commercial aspects of "Peppers Site" on Blyth Road. The access to the A60 Highway from Greenway is becoming increasingly unsuitable and has an adverse effect on queuing traffic trying to gain access to the A60 from Long Lane. In addition the narrow roads and inadequate footways prevalent from where Hundred Acre Lane joins Tinkers Hill and Greenway are totally unsuitable for "through" traffic to the A60. The narrow roads and narrow footways also are located in the Conservation Area. It is therefore suggested that the proposed "link" road could provide a recommended route to the A60 for vehicular traffic travelling from Blyth Road to the village or travelling north on the A60. Such measures could give opportunity for appropriate highway restrictions to be applied on Hundred Acre Lane to allow access to businesses and residential premises in the conservation area and reduce the environmental and safety hazards created by traffic currently gaining access to the A60 Highway. In addition the draft plan does make reference to the practicalities of providing cycle routes on highway schemes. The Parish Council would support these measures for cyclists particularly in the light of environmental protection and the safety of increasing numbers on cyclists following routes in the Rural District of BassetlawFinally, I would make the point that articulating in writing some of the above representations can at times need aspects of clarification and understanding. Please do not hesitate to contact me if this applies to any of the above content.</p>	<p>The Plan will be amended to clarify that the site sits with Carlton Parish. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF212	Resident	<p>I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. If my concerns are overruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
1196338	Resident	<p>1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. Currently Outwood Academy Valley is oversubscribed and for the last 3 years some children have not been able to attend and this will be the closest secondary school to the development. The Post 16 centre is almost at maximum capacity and is the only place in Worksop to study A levels. This means residents of these new homes will have to be bussed out for both secondary school and further education thus adding to traffic and pollution. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction 5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. If my concerns are overruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan) 21. No access including pedestrian onto existing streets such as Worcester Grove which back onto the development.</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultation events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
1196339	Resident	<p>1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. Currently Outwood Academy Valley is oversubscribed and for the last 3 years some children have not been able to attend and this will be the closest secondary school to the development. The Post 16 centre is almost at maximum capacity and is the only place in Worksop to study A levels. This means residents of these new homes will have to be bussed out for both secondary school and further education thus adding to traffic and pollution. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction 5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. If my concerns are overruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan) 21. No access including pedestrian onto existing streets such as Wonster Grove which back onto the development.</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultation events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF216	Resident	<p>Please find below my comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site.4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population11. No vehicle access through existing estates adjacent to the proposed if my concerns are overruled, I would like to see:-12. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development13. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to extend the green corridor14. Any communal areas, to be located away from any existing homes and behind the treeline15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Housing that local people can afford and cater for an elderly population with bungalows etc20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultation events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF219	Resident	<p>Please find below my comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF220	Resident	<p>I wish to formally raise concerns regarding the proposed Bassetlaw Plan for the Peaks Hill Farm (Policy 15), page 78 onwards. I do not believe that the Council has met their obligation in ensuring that locally affected residents have been properly consulted in relation to the planning process as per appendix 4 of the Local Plan. I am against the inclusion of the prime farmland and current green space land at Peaks Hill Farm within the Bassetlaw Plan. The proposed development site is extremely large and will have a significant impact on local residents. Currently there are over 150 houses being developed already on existing green fields adjacent to this proposed use of land. The Bassetlaw Plan is proposing an additional 1500 homes. This will result in all existing local residents being exposed to significant levels of noise, pollution, transport disruption and inconvenience over at least 15 years. A large proportion of the bordering homes are resided in by older adults. This will have a significant impact on them. The dwellings are being built before any supporting infrastructure is in place (such as schools, GPs etc). There is already significant pressure on the existing infrastructure such as long waits for GP appointments. The railway station at Worksop is very small and already overcrowded, so new commuters are likely to travel by car and not use public transport. This proposed area will in essence be a commuter belt for neighbouring towns and cities. The current roads and infrastructure are already extremely busy and are small, single carriageway country style roads. The three main roads (A57, Carlton Road and Blyth Road) will see significant increased amounts of both construction traffic and commuting traffic. This will increase danger and pollution to all in the local area. The current roads systems are ill-equipped to deal with this increase of population. The town centre is in dire need of regeneration and I feel that this should be the priority for the town before trying to attract new residents. Although the council have stated a commitment to regeneration and rejuvenation to the town centre, this is not mirrored in the fact that new development of supermarkets / fast food areas are already being constructed out of the town centre which will not encourage residents into the centre. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems. Bassetlaw is a District that has multiple green space and is rich with wildlife, flora and fauna. I have personally seen multiple species in the fields, such as deer, hare, foxes and buzzards to name a few. This development will have a devastating impact on the existing habits and ecology in this area. I remain perplexed as to why brownfield sites are not being utilised and that the Council are proposing to destroy the local greenfield site in favour of increasing the local human population. The Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) champions brownfield development over building on greenbelt areas. Also, that using existing sites helps to regenerate towns and cities and provides new homes in areas of high demand. As report 25/3/2019 – research found that England has enough derelict or vacant land to build more than 1 million new homes – two thirds of which are ready to start immediately. If my concerns are over-ruled, then I would expect to see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife 2. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor 3. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline 4. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change) 5. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution 6. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses 7. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport 8. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook 9. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings 10. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan) 	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF221	Resident	<p>1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF222	Notts CC	<p>Strategic Highways Part 4, a) it should state distributor road standard.</p> <p>Part 4, a), (iv)- should include reference to pedestrian and cycle links through the site linking the A60 and B6045.</p> <p>Minerals and Waste</p> <p>The Peaks Hill Farm allocation for mixed use development is adjacent to the mineral and waste site of Carlton Forest where previously sand and gravel was extracted, with the land restored through landfill. Importation of waste has now ceased, and the landfill area restored though a gas compound remains on site, which the County Council has an interest in. Mineral extraction has also now ceased at Carlton Forest however part of the site is still to be restored as per the conditions attached to the permission granted by the County Council. The operator is currently working with the County Council on a new restoration scheme for this area and so the site remains of interest to the County Council who will also monitor the aftercare progress. Considering the proposed allocation and the above, providing any proposed scheme at the allocation site does not conflict with the restoration or aftercare process or the gas compound, the County Council does not wish to raise any concern with development at this proposed allocation site in terms of minerals and waste.</p>	The policy will be amended to reflect the comments made.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF223	Resident	<p>I wish to formally raise concerns regarding the proposed Bassetlaw Plan for the Peaks Hill Farm (Policy 15), page 78 onwards. I do not believe that the Council has met their obligation in ensuring that locally affected residents have been properly consulted in relation to the planning process as per appendix 4 of the Local Plan. I am against the inclusion of the prime farmland and current green space land at Peaks Hill Farm within the Bassetlaw Plan. The proposed development site is extremely large and will have a significant impact on local residents. Currently there are over 150 houses being developed already on existing green fields adjacent to this proposed use of land. The Bassetlaw Plan is proposing an additional 1500 homes. This will result in all existing local residents being exposed to significant levels of noise, pollution, transport disruption and inconvenience over at least 15 years. A large proportion of the bordering homes are resided in by older adults. This will have a significant impact on them. The dwellings are being built before any supporting infrastructure is in place (such as schools, GPs etc). There is already significant pressure on the existing infrastructure such as long waits for GP appointments. The railway station at Worksop is very small and already overcrowded, so new commuters are likely to travel by car and not use public transport. This proposed area will in essence be a commuter belt for neighbouring towns and cities. The current roads and infrastructure are already extremely busy and are small, single carriageway country style roads. The three main roads (A57, Carlton Road and Blyth Road) will see significant increased amounts of both construction traffic and commuting traffic. This will increase danger and pollution to all in the local area. The current roads systems are ill-equipped to deal with this increase of population. The town centre is in dire need of regeneration and I feel that this should be the priority for the town before trying to attract new residents. Although the council have stated a commitment to regeneration and rejuvenation to the town centre, this is not mirrored in the fact that new development of supermarkets / fast food areas are already being constructed out of the town centre which will not encourage residents into the centre. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems. Bassetlaw is a District that has multiple green space and is rich with wildlife, flora and fauna. I have personally seen multiple species in the fields, such as deer, hare, foxes and buzzards to name a few. This development will have a devastating impact on the existing habits and ecology in this area. I remain perplexed as to why brownfield sites are not being utilised and that the Council are proposing to destroy the local greenfield site in favour of increasing the local human population. The Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) champions brownfield development over building on greenbelt areas. Also, that using existing sites helps to regenerate towns and cities and provides new homes in areas of high demand. As report 25/3/2019 – research found that England has enough derelict or vacant land to build more than 1 million new homes – two thirds of which are ready to start immediately. If my concerns are over-ruled, then I would expect to see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife 2. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor 3. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline 4. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change) 5. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution 6. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses 7. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport 8. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook 9. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings 10. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan) 	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF225	Resident	<p>• Please find below my comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. ‘At least 750 dwellings’ plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop’s infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This ‘saturation’ policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop’s local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the ‘buffer zone’ to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to ‘at least 750 dwellings’! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF226	Resident	<p>• Please find below my comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. ‘At least 750 dwellings’ plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop’s infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This ‘saturation’ policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop’s local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the ‘buffer zone’ to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to ‘at least 750 dwellings’! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF227	Resident	<p>• Please find below my comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. ‘At least 750 dwellings’ plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop’s infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This ‘saturation’ policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop’s local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the ‘buffer zone’ to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to ‘at least 750 dwellings’! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
1196652	Resident	<p>I AM TOTALLY AGAINST THE ST15 HS1 DEVELOPMENT..... AS A FUTURE GENERATION OF THE AREA I AM HORRIFIED THAT YOU ARE EVEN CONSIDERING THE DESTRUCTION AND ALLOWING THE DECLINE OF RURAL AND AGRICULTURAL LAND BY ALLOWING UNNECESSARY HOUSING TO BE BUILT ON THIS LAND WHICH IS TIME IMMEMORIAL AND ESTABLISHED AS GREEN LAND WHICH CAN ONLY SUPPORT CLIMATE CHANGE WITH ITS BIO DIVERSITY OF TREES , WILDLIFE, AND EXISITING ECO SYSTEMS . I FEEL VERY ANNOYED AND UPSET THAT AT NO TIME HAVE I EVER BEEN CONSULTED OR INFORMED ABOUT THIS PROPOSAL WHICH HAVING READ MORE ACTUALLY DATES BACK BEYOND 2016 !!!! THIS IS OUTRAGEOUS AND YOU HAVE NOT APPLIED THE COMMUNITY CONSULTATION PROCESS CORRECTLY. THE DEVELOPMENT SITE IS TO LARGE AND WILL HAVE A DETRIMENTAL AFFECT ON LOCAL RESIDENTS, THE WILDLIFE AND ECO SYSEMS THAT EXIST IN HARMONY WITH NATURE. YOU WANT TO BUILD HOMES WITH NO INFRASTRUCTURE UNTIL AFTER THEY ARE FINISHEDIT IS ALMOST IMPOSSIBLE TO OBTAIN DOCTORS AND DENTAL APPOINTMENTS WITHIN A REASONABLE TIME FRAME , FOR EXAMPLE I WANTED A DENTAL CHECK UP FOR LAST WEEK AND AM UNABLE TO GET ONE FOR 6 WEEKS WHICH TAKES US INTO APRIL WHICH IS BEYOND BELIEF. THE ROAD INFRASTRUCTURE IS STRUGGLING TO COPE AT THE PRSENT TIME AND THIEVESDALE LANE/BLYTH ROAD JUNCTION HAS HAD NUMEROUS ACCIDENTS AND NO PLANS TO IMPROVE THIS YET YOU WANT ADD A POTENTIAL 3000 CARS (AS MOST 3/4/5 BEDROOMED HOUSES WILL HAVE MORE THAN ONE CAR) TO THIS ALREADY CONGESTED SYSTEM - THIS IS NOT ACCEPTABLE. THE HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS FAR EXCEED THE NATONAL QUOTE BY 20% AND LOCAL QUOTA BY 10%THIS SATURATION WILL ONLY BRING IN COMMUTERS WHICH WONT ADD TO THE SUSTAINABILITY OF WORKSOP TOWN OR ITS ROAD OR RAIL STRUCTURE. THE LOSS OF LOCAL PRIME FOOD GROWING LAND IS OUTRAGEOUS WHEN THE COUNCIL SHOULD BE LOOKING AT LOCAL SUSTAINABILITY ESPECIALLY IN THESE DAYS OF CLIMATE CHANGE - DO YOU ACTUALLY CARE ABOUT THE FUTURE GENERATIONS OR JUST LINING YOUR POCKETS FOR NOW WITH NO REGARD TO MY OR MY FUTURE CHILDRENS LIFE. THE LOSS OF ESTABLISHED WILDLIFE SUCH AS BIRDS INCLUDING SPARROW HAWKS, BUZZARDS, OWLS, FROGS , TOADS, BATS, HARES , HEDGEHOGS, AND THE INSECT POPULATON WHICH THRIVES ON THE POLLINATION IN THIS GREEN AREA IS GOING TO BE TOTALLY DESTRUCTIVE TO THE PRESENT TIME AND EVEN MORE TO THE FUTURE AND THE FUTURE GENERATIONS . I WOULD LIKE YOU TO RECONSIDER YOUR PLANNING ACTIONS AND LOOK AT REGENERATING THE EYESORES THAT CURRENTLY EXIST AND MAKE THAT AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND BUILD ON BROWN LAND THAT IS ALREADY EMPTYAND CAN BE MADE SUSTAINABLE WHICH IS A FAR MORE PROACTIVE WAY TO GO TO PROMOTE CLIMATE CHANGE , ECO STUCTURE AND REGENERATING AREAS THAT REALLY NEED IT RATHER THAN DESTROYING GREEN LAND THAT SERVES A MASSIVE PURPOSE FOR THE CLIMATE AND FUTURE SURVIVAL OF THE AREA . I TRUST YOU WILL TAKE THESE CONSIDERATIONS VERY SERIOUSLY AND RECONSIDER THIS WHOLE PLANNING PROCESS</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated apprriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring resdients had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF229	Resident	<p>Please find below my comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population.If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>
REF230	Resident	<p>Please find below my comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population.If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
		<p>see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife 12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor 13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline 14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change) 15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution 16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses 17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport 18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook 19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings 20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan) 	<p>must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>
1196658	Resident	<p>As a Carlton resident I am dismayed by the proposal to build extensively on this beautiful site which gladdens the heart on the way home.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF232	Resident	<p>Please find below my comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF233	Resident	<p>against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at PeakHills Farm policy 15 within the Bassetlaw local planThe development is much to large and will have too much impact on ourselves and other local residents of Worksop The initial 750 dwellings plus the business and employment land as well as the 174 that areCurrently being built off Blyth road will mean all local residents in the wide vicinity will be subject toPollution, disruption and inconvenience for at least 15 years of this being a building site.For many of the elderly residents in this area this will probably be mean the rest of their lives.These dwellings will be built before any thoughts have gone into building much needed infrastructure such aSuch as Doctors surgeries, dentists and schools which are needed much more than more houseson green space We already under pressure in Bassetlaw infrastructure for the above essentials as we can no longer able to get doctors appointments without waiting weeks sometimes meaning this can be too late!Getting into town is getting more difficult by the day especially from the A57 all connecting roads to theA1are single lane country roads the trains are very unreliable and the car park for this is nowhere near big enough The planning far exceeds local need 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan.This 'saturation' policy for a population of 42,000 will seriously increase the amount of commuters.in and out of Worksop and we already have a unsustainable road and rail system this will increase pollution traffic and reliance on poor connective services to external areas of employee such as Doncaster /Sheffield.We will lose prime food growing land when what the council should be doing is encouraging climate change.Loss of our beautiful countryside very valuable green space.The sad loss of our established local wildlife including Owls Bats Sparrow Hawks & Buzzards all which frequent this area, and not forgetting the frogs toads newts hares hedgehogs and insects.I would like to see our objections upheld but in case the are overruled then :-1- A buffer zone of at least 15 metres between current homes for privacy and wildlife2- New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the buffer zone to increase distance between existing homes and new housing increasing the green corridor.3- Any communal areas such as youth facilities, playgroups/ playgrounds car parks and sports pitchesTo be located away from any existing homes in the centre of new development and behind the tree line.4- New development to have minimal car parking space to discourage multiple car ownership therefore reducing noise and pollution linked to climate change.5- Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution 6- Low level housing for example bungalows not high rise townhouses near to existing homes.7- Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connecting woodland inclusive cycle pathwalking routes to connecting public transport 8- Maximise tree and shrub planting to open spaces and verges to create a more attractive environment.and build more bungalows etc for our elderly not enormously overpriced homes that will encourage More city commuters and pollution from their vehicles.9- decent sized garden and space between homes so people can healthily benefit from the outdoors.10- do not allow developers to greedily profit from agreeing to the (At Least 750)dwellings as stated in the plan11- Do not allow the building of the recycling plant also rumoured?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF234	Resident	<p>Are against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at PeakHills Farm policy 15 within the Bassetlaw local planThe development is much to large and will have too much impact on ourselves and other local residents of Worksop The initial 750 dwellings plus the business and employment land as well as the 174 that areCurrently being built off Blyth road will mean all local residents in the wide vicinity will be subject toPollution, disruption and inconvenience for at least 15 years of this being a building site.For many of the elderly residents in this area this will probably be mean the rest of their lives.These dwellings will be built before any thoughts have gone into building much needed infrastructure such aSuch as Doctors surgeries, dentists and schools which are needed much more than more houseson green space We already under pressure in Bassetlaw infrastructure for the above essentials as we can no longer able to get doctors appointments without waiting weeks sometimes meaning this can be too late!Getting into town is getting more difficult by the day especially from the A57 all connecting roads to theA1are single lane country roads the trains are very unreliable and the car park for this is nowhere near big enough The planning far exceeds local need 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan.This 'saturation' policy for a population of 42,000 will seriously increase the amount of commuters.in and out of Worksop and we already have a unsustainable road and rail system this will increase pollution traffic and reliance on poor connective services to external areas of employee such as Doncaster /Sheffield.We will lose prime food growing land when what the council should be doing is encouraging climate change.Loss of our beautiful countryside very valuable green space.The sad loss of our established local wildlife including Owls Bats Sparrow Hawks & Buzzards all which frequent this area, and not forgetting the frogs toads newts hares hedgehogs and insects.I would like to see our objections upheld but in case the are overruled then :-1- A buffer zone of at least 15 metres between current homes for privacy and wildlife2- New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the buffer zone to increase distance between existing homes and new housing increasing the green corridor.3- Any communal areas such as youth facilities, playgroups/ playgrounds car parks and sports pitchesTo be located away from any existing homes in the centre of new development and behind the tree line.4- New development to have minimal car parking space to discourage multiple car ownership therefore reducing noise and pollution linked to climate change.5- Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution 6- Low level housing for example bungalows not high rise townhouses near to existing homes.7- Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connecting woodland inclusive cycle pathwalking routes to connecting public transport 8- Maximise tree and shrub planting to open spaces and verges to create a more attractive environment.and build more bungalows etc for our elderly not enormously overpriced homes that will encourage More city commuters and pollution from their vehicles.9- decent sized garden and space between homes so people can healthily benefit from the outdoors.10- do not allow developers to greedily profit from agreeing to the (At Least 750)dwellings as stated in the plan11- Do not allow the building of the recycling plant also rumoured?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF235	Resident	<p>After reading the proposal for Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm, could you inform me how the LPA have considered reasonable alternatives to the site? I have deep reservations about transport links, further school places and medical and social facilities for new and existing residents. If the plans go ahead then I would like you to write to me to guarantee the required infrastructure will be in place. Please find below further comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm.</p> <p>1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation).</p> <p>2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm.</p> <p>3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime.</p> <p>4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction.</p> <p>5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. This is in addition to delays in seeing medical staff at Larwood surgery. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable.</p> <p>6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems.</p> <p>7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster.</p> <p>8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change.</p> <p>9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character.</p> <p>10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population.</p> <p>If my concerns are overruled, I want to see:</p> <p>11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife.</p> <p>12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor.</p> <p>13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline.</p> <p>14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)</p> <p>15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution.</p> <p>16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses.</p> <p>17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport.</p> <p>18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook.</p> <p>19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings.</p> <p>20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings!' (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF236	Resident	<p>I am against the building of anything on this rural landscape. I live only meters away from this proposed development land. It is regarded as a quiet and well-hidden area. This would be under threat by the thousands of people that would potentially be moving in right on my door step. Traffic congestion at rush hour along Carlton Road is already at unbearable levels, often backing up past Eddison Park Avenue and almost outside of the current Worksop boundary. The potential of hundreds more cars added on to the unbearable levels of congestion at peak times would cause misery to the people who live in the area. The added potential of a through road being added on to the end of Winster Grove and in to the new development is also very troubling as it would mean that a quiet residential street would become a cut-through to potentially hundreds of vehicles. I am yet to see any sort of congestion mitigation measures to be announced by Bassetlaw District Council and this is very worrying. It is also very troubling that I am yet to see any development plans for vital services such as schools and doctors surgeries that match the scale of the number of dwellings being proposed. Waiting lists for local GP surgeries are already weeks long and there is a struggle to find places at local schools for local children. Whilst building a primary school on this proposed site would ease the pressure on school places that would come with this development, it would only add further stress to those trying to find secondary school places for their children. I am also very concerned about the effect on wildlife and the environment that this development would have. I often see an array of wildlife in my garden including squirrels, hedgehogs and a wide species of birds, many of whom come from the Gateford Hill woods. The possibility of felling dozens of trees on the Gateford Hill woods and also the Long plantation will have a worrying effect on both wildlife and the environment, something which will be made worse by the thousands of homes, cars and people moving in to the area. The current land of this proposed development currently also acts as a very useful flood plain. This development will only worsen the current climate crisis and damage local habitat for generations to come. Instead of creating homes for the people of Worksop, I fear that all this development will do is invite people from other areas to come and live in Worksop, therefore doing very little to help local people. There are already thousands upon thousands of houses being built or planned across Bassetlaw including 151 homes at Hawfinch Place in Carlton in Lindrick, 1,600 homes at Simpson Park in Harworth, 71 houses on the Lidl site on Blyth Road, thousands more houses on Gateford Park and Gateford Common in Worksop as well as Shireoaks Common. This is only a small fraction of the homes currently planned or under construction in a small area of Bassetlaw. Whilst I am not against all of these developments, I am deeply concerned about the effect many of them will have on my current way of life and standard of living as I am only 22 years of age.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF238	Resident	<p>, I would like to request an extension to the consultation process for the draft Bassetlaw Plan that affects plans for the development of land known as Peaks Hill Farm. > > My request for this extension is on the basis of lack of appropriate consultation with local residents. Residents were 'informed' via a single A4 leaflet fastened to a lamp post at the end of our road prior to the consultation meeting on 4-2-20. Surely each individual household should have been informed of the plans and the meeting well in advance of the meeting date? Also the meeting was scheduled to be held at a time when most residents were at work and therefore unable to attend.> > I have already emailed my initial objections to such a huge development on the Peaks Hill site but I have since read the draft plan and now have further objections. Whilst I support the need for local regeneration plans, I fail to see the need to build such a huge housing estate on greenfield farming land. It's clear to see that the developers of the recently built houses on Gateford are struggling to sell them, hence they are now being offered at reduced prices. Therefore there is no guarantee that developers will be able to sell over 1,500 houses on Peaks Hill Farm.> > The building of such a huge estate clearly contravenes Bassetlaw District Council's strategic objectives to preserve greenfield and farm land. It will lead to the destruction of acres of natural countryside and wildlife, it will increase pollution and contribute to the devastating impact of global warming. > > The negative implications of such massive scale house building for the infrastructure in Worksop is worrying as it will negatively effect all Bassetlaw residents. It appears that there is insufficient provision in the draft plan to increase school places, health services and road links to the level needed until these houses are built and sold. > > I would like to see a more realistic number of houses proposed to be built on Peaks Hill Farm which would not cause such devastation to the environment and infrastructure and would not exceed the market demand for new houses.</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF240	Resident	<p>Please find below my comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF241	Resident	<p>Please find below my comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF242	Resident	<p>Please find attached a form with comments regarding the peaks hill farm proposed development. These comments sum up both mine and many other people's opinions I have spoken with in the local area on the proposed development, which I feel we have not even been properly informed of at which I am extremely disappointed of. Please consider these comments and think of the impact this development would have on the current residents of Worksop, especially young adults like myself. Myself and many others would be tempted to move away from the area if projects like this go ahead, due reasons mentioned in the attached document. In addition to this, Worksop town centre to me feels like it is dying a slow painful death, which leaves myself and many people my age going to places like Doncaster and Sheffield just for something to do, as there are only so many times we can go to the pub!!! I'm all for supporting the town I have lived in all my life, but only if investment goes into actually making the town better, not just by building houses! Please find below my comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. If my concerns are overruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF243	Resident	<p>I have to say after reviewing the plans I'm a little disappointed. I understand the pressure to build the extra housing has come from the housing secretary but nowhere in the plans does is mention the fact that Bassetlaw is a ex miner's community and with this sadly in 10-15 years' time many elderly's who own miners housing will be sadly passing away and leaving them to their heirs . Presently Worksop has 1500 empty homes. I think since the average life expectancy is approximately 80 years old it would be good to consider how many people are now 65 and owning their homes and basing the figures from there. Whilst considering this, I can see that there are plans to build on many of Worksop's Greenland but no consideration for expansion of bereavement and cemeteries. I'd like this to be reviewed and considered because this effects all families. In relation to the actual plans. I'm in two minds regarding this but also a little frustrated. Myself and my fiancé bought our first home on October 2018 and specially asked our solicitor regarding the belt of land behind our home and we were advised it would be very difficult for planning permission to be obtained to build. With this we "overpaid" for our home by an extra thousand pounds and since then have invested an extra ten thousand pounds into making our house a home. The reason we had chosen ... as our forever home was because of the peace and serenity the views and the bench at the bottom of the garden gave us. My fiancé suffers badly with anxiety and depression and the idea of possibly up to 4000 people living behind us is upsetting him tremendously. I wish along with these plans of yours you could also invent a time machine so we could turn back time and have never made this mistake of purchasing this property. You state that you want to build affordable housing, but I can confirm the prices that the Gateford properties were going for (£150,000.00 for a 2 bedroom house) was never going to be affordable for a young working couple starting out in life. Living in our home has meant we have been close to family and with my Grandma Vera, being seriously ill I can be close to her supporting her as she does not have a carer and still able to commute to work. I worry with the expansion of the housing the increase this will have on traffic I need to be able to get out of Worksop quickly and be with my grandma some days in less the 30 minutes but I highly doubt with affected road closures whilst disruptions occur for the next 15 years this would happen. I also worry about the infrastructure of Worksop, in recent months there has been mass flooding. This flooding also affected Theivesdale. Luckily, I don't believe anyone's home were flooded the drains simply were over flowing and the field which you're planning to build on also flooded. If more houses and drains were added to the already strained drainage system, I think this would cause more harm then good. Another thing which also concerns me is that it has been clearly stated the houses need to be built first before any support can be given to local schools and GP's. I'd like to raise right now that I am aware of a couple of children who have had to be schooled from home as there were no placements for them. So, with further increased population how do you plan to allocate education for these children without the funding? Living so close to Sherwood Forest and Clumber Park I'm disappointed that the green spaces which form part of Worksop's charm will be taken away for more breeze blocked homes. I wouldn't class Worksop as a desirable place to live but I would say it attracts tourism from the national parks with them being so close to Worksop. Taking away Worksop's inner community and extending it and changing the road system seems like an unwise decision and I fail to see the benefits to the town centre which needs attention and funding, as its beginning to look like a ghost town. I'd also like to mention regarding the wildlife. Although this will be the last of your concerns the last summer was beautiful, we saw owls, hedgehogs, butterflies and have built a bee hotel for the creatures. Its already up there that the bees and butterflies are declining again I'm unsure why you would want to destroy more Greenland for housing where as stated in my first paragraph I don't think has been well thought out. Ultimately despite all my negatives against these new housing if you can ensure that housing will be affordable to young couples (2 bedroom house for £100,000.00, 3 for £125,000.00 ect) I think it would be great but we had no support like this when we moved into our home. And as mentioned before paid over the odds. If the plans were to go ahead despite my above concerns I'd like to request the following terms if the plans were to go ahead.-A Green tree lined buffer between our homes and the new properties. -Any communal areas to be moved away from the green tree line buffer and placed centrally or at the other side of the development away from our existing properties. -We'd like compensation for the disruption the new development will have on our lives. We already are beginning to get extremely frustrated with the existing development happening at the bottom of our road near Blyth road despite being 500 yards away from it. -We'd like for the new development to be a safe haven for the wildlife we have presently with this we want to see open spaces with wild flower seeds sown each year like near the hospital and we'd like more trees and shrubs to be planted and incorporated into the plans. -We'd like minimal lighting near our properties. Many of us have built summerhomes/glorified sheds overlooking onto the field and</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
		<p>have conservatories which to us are our relaxation rooms and we don't want blinding lights disturbing our routines. I'd like to highlight that the new plans are going to affect all of the residents in our day to day lives. I do worry what the increased traffic on A57 will mean for me commuting to work and getting to my grandma's home. But at the end of the day this decision will be decided by the council I just hope that the decision is for the greater need and to not just tick a box to say you did the thing the home secretary asked.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
1196693	Resident	<p>I AM TOTALLY AGAINST THE ST15 HS1 DEVELOPMENT..... AS A FUTURE GENERATION OF THE AREA I AM HORRIFIED THAT YOU ARE EVEN CONSIDERING THE DESTRUCTION AND ALLOWING THE DECLINE OF RURAL AND AGRICULTURAL LAND BY ALLOWING UNNECESSARY HOUSING TO BE BUILT ON THIS LAND WHICH IS TIME IMMEMORIAL AND ESTABLISHED AS GREEN LAND WHICH CAN ONLY SUPPORT CLIMATE CHANGE WITH ITS BIO DIVERSITY OF TREES , WILDLIFE, AND EXISTING ECO SYSTEMS . I FEEL VERY ANNOYED AND UPSET THAT AT NO TIME HAVE I EVER BEEN CONSULTED OR INFORMED ABOUT THIS PROPOSAL WHICH HAVING READ MORE ACTUALLY DATES BACK BEYOND 2016 !!!!! THIS IS OUTRAGEOUS AND YOU HAVE NOT APPLIED THE COMMUNITY CONSULTATION PROCESS CORRECTLY. THE DEVELOPMENT SITE IS TO LARGE AND WILL HAVE A DETRIMENTAL AFFECT ON LOCAL RESIDENTS, THE WILDLIFE AND ECO SYSTEMS THAT EXIST IN HARMONY WITH NATURE. YOU WANT TO BUILD HOMES WITH NO INFRASTRUCTURE UNTIL AFTER THEY ARE FINISHEDIT IS ALMOST IMPOSSIBLE TO OBTAIN DOCTORS AND DENTAL APPOINTMENTS WITHIN A REASONABLE TIME FRAME , FOR EXAMPLE I WANTED A DENTAL CHECK UP FOR LAST WEEK AND AM UNABLE TO GET ONE FOR 6 WEEKS WHICH TAKES US INTO APRIL WHICH IS BEYOND BELIEF. HOW CAN YOU PLAN ON BUILDING 1500 HOUSES PLUS ALL THE OTHER PROPOSED AREAS AND YET NOT PROVIDE THE SUPPORTING INFRASTRUCTURE UNTIL ITS COMPLETED AND SOLD..... 1500 3/4/5 BEDROOMED HOUSES WILL HAVE CHILDREN IN THEM SO HOW DO YOU PROPOSE TO SCHOOL THEM SEEN AS THE LOCAL ESTABLISHMENTS ARE ALREADY AT CAPACITY WITH PORTLAND ACTUALLY BEEN OVERSUBSCRIBED THIS YEAR. THE ROAD INFRASTRUCTURE IS STRUGGLING TO COPE AT THE PRESENT TIME AND THIEVESDALE LANE/BLYTH ROAD JUNCTION HAS HAD NUMEROUS ACCIDENTS AND NO PLANS TO IMPROVE THIS YET YOU WANT ADD A POTENTIAL 3000 CARS (AS MOST 3/4/5 BEDROOMED HOUSES WILL HAVE MORE THAN ONE CAR) TO THIS ALREADY CONGESTED SYSTEM - THIS IS NOT ACCEPTABLE. YOU QUOTE THAT THIS LINK ROAD WILL TAKE PRESSURE OFF WORKSOP TOWN TRAFFIC , THIS IS A COMPLETE FALSEHOOD AS IT WILL INCREASE TRAFFIC FLOW AND CREATE MORE CONGESTION ON CARLTON ROAD, BLTYH ROAD, KILTON HILL WHICH ALL LINK INTO TOWN THE HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS FAR EXCEED THE NATIONAL QUOTE BY 20% AND LOCAL QUOTA BY 10%THIS SATURATION WILL ONLY BRING IN COMMUTERS WHICH WONT ADD TO THE SUSTAINABILITY OF WORKSOP TOWN OR ITS ROAD OR RAIL STRUCTURE. THE LOSS OF LOCAL PRIME FOOD GROWING LAND IS OUTRAGEOUS WHEN THE COUNCIL SHOULD BE LOOKING AT LOCAL SUSTAINABILITY ESPECIALLY IN THESE DAYS OF CLIMATE CHANGE - DO YOU ACTUALLY CARE ABOUT THE FUTURE GENERATIONS OR JUST LINING YOUR POCKETS FOR NOW WITH NO REGARD TO MY OR MY FUTURE CHILDRENS LIFE. THE LOSS OF ESTABLISHED WILDLIFE SUCH AS BIRDS INCLUDING SPARROW HAWKS, BUZZARDS, OWLS, FROGS , TOADS, BATS, HALES , HEDGEHOGS, AND THE INSECT POPULATION WHICH THRIVES ON THE POLLINATION IN THIS GREEN AREA IS GOING TO BE TOTALLY DESTRUCTIVE TO THE PRESENT TIME AND EVEN MORE TO THE FUTURE AND THE FUTURE GENERATIONS . I WOULD LIKE YOU TO RECONSIDER YOUR PLANNING ACTIONS AND LOOK AT REGENERATING THE EYESORES THAT CURRENTLY EXIST AND MAKE THAT AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND BUILD ON BROWN LAND THAT IS ALREADY EMPTY AND CAN BE MADE SUSTAINABLE WHICH IS A FAR MORE PROACTIVE WAY TO GO TO PROMOTE CLIMATE CHANGE , ECO STRUCTURE AND REGENERATING AREAS THAT REALLY NEED IT RATHER THAN DESTROYING GREEN LAND THAT SERVES A MASSIVE PURPOSE FOR THE CLIMATE AND FUTURE SURVIVAL OF THE ITEM DETAILS AREA . I TRUST YOU WILL TAKE THESE CONSIDERATIONS VERY SERIOUSLY AND RECONSIDER THIS WHOLE PLANNING PROCESS I DO NOT WANT ST15 / HS1 TO PROCEED AND DEMAND AN EXTENSION IN ORDER TO GATHER FURTHER EVIDENCE WHICH IT APPEARS THE COUNCIL ARE CONCEALING IN THIS PLAN IN ORDER TO PURSUE THEIR OWN GOALS WHICH ARE NOT OF BENEFIT TO THE RESIDENTS OF WORKSOP</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultation events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF244	Resident	<p>Please find below my comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm1. The development site is rather large and will surely have a great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land , in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime2. All the connections to the main roads are poor - the A1 North involves travelling through the centre of Blyth, the A1 & A57 South via Manton, the M1 & A57 North for Sheffield, etc. via Gateford on a road that already has speed restricting humps and the M1 South through the centre of town ! Additionally both main roads into the town centre are constantly overloaded (plus one route also having a level crossing !). 3. Therefore I would suggest that an alternative development should be located on the piece of land bounded by the Retford Road and the railway line and the Osberton Nurseries (with access provided from the A57 via a road running between the buildings associated with Greencore and Wilko). This would remove pressure from these narrow overloaded roads – in particular providing better access to Sheffield and the M1 (plus Retford, etc.) via the A57 and likewise for Doncaster , Manton, etc. via the A1. Additionally of course if a railway station was built in that area it could provide passengers with direct access to Sheffield (and Retford for access to Doncaster and/or London).4. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop utilising already unsustainable road and rail systems (see alternative solution described above !).5. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster (see the better solution described above in entry 3 !).6. Provision of appropriately priced properties would make this alternative development very suitable to some workers who are/will be employed by those local businesses (plus those planned to occur in the new business area which has been created on the other side of the A57).</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
1196694	Resident	<p>I oppose the plan to build at Peaks Hill. This is a huge expansion to Worksop, unnecessary, it will not address the local housing need which is for small units, it will create congestion, increased traffic and increased commuting. Building 1500 houses will bring huge disruption to existing roads and neighbourhoods. This is an area of pristine countryside which should be preserved, not given over to unnecessary construction. 4.1.3 and 5.1.40 - The vision of Bassetlaw attracting highly paid work, new business and growth in business, is based on an assumption that providing more business land will achieve this. I am not aware that there is a shortage of such land at present. Bassetlaw already has the locational advantages of proximity to road links and Doncaster airport, yet these businesses are not attracted to locate here.I oppose the proposal for the major expansion of Worksop at Peaks Hill. Parag 4.2 of the CIL Draft Charging Schedule notes that of the new developments: 81% are greenfield and 19% are brownfield. This is an appalling scenario for our environment. Bassetlaw is ahead of schedule to meet its targets for housebuilding by 2037. It should not be approving plans to build on so much greenfield land. It should continue to review what brownfield sites become available in the decades to come. There will be new brownfield sites available before (and after) 2037 which can be considered for residential building. 5.1.49 refers to building more quality housing than is required – this cannot be justified: once greenfield land is built on, it is lost forever; there is nothing sustainable about this approach. Building on greenfield sites to such a level as is proposed, especially at Peaks Hill, does not meet the definition of "sustainable development". The ability of future generations to meet their own needs for enjoyment of the natural environment, clean air, space and nature will be adversely impacted by this huge development and the consequent growth in traffic. The Draft Plan ignores the benefit to health and wellbeing of existing open spaces and the proven benefit to mental health of open vistas and scenery. Building on open country reduces the space available for wildlife and plants, has an adverse effect on natural drainage and, as such, does nothing to mitigate against the effects of the climate emergency. The development which recently began at the junction of Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road has shocked many by its impact on the landscape and the views when leaving Worksop. This corner abuts the proposed development at Peaks Hill. The negative impact on the wellbeing of the local community and the negative impact on the views of Worksop approaching and leaving on Blyth Road have not, in my opinion , been given sufficient weight.Parag 4.2 of the CIL Draft Charging Schedule notes that 20% of the greenfield units and 10% of the brownfield units will be affordable, ie 80% of greenfield and 90% of brownfield units will not be affordable housing. How is this meeting the local demand identified at 3.13: the huge percentage increase in over 65s and over 80s and the percentage</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm	<p>decrease in the numbers aged 16-65? There is a need for smaller houses and for bungalows, not for large houses.7.2.3 – whatever the design of the development, this is not a sustainable development – the ability of future generations to meet their own needs for health and wellbeing, enjoyment of nature, landscape and the natural environment will be compromised.7.2.13 Why is it necessary for the site to be exempt from a CIL? If the developer contribution is to be provided through Section 106 contributions, there is no guarantee there will be any contribution given these are negotiable and can be waived (2.4 CIL Draft Charging Schedule)? "...infrastructure requirements ...can be sought through on site provision" – what does that mean? Who will pay for the infrastructure and how could that be enforced?Policy 15 refers to a mix of housing types but gives no figures for smaller units which would meet the demand from the changing and older demographic mix in the area. 4 and 5 bedroom houses will simply be bought by those currently living in more expensive areas such as Sheffield, who will then commute to work outside Bassetlaw, thus increasing traffic. The Plan cannot control who buys these houses and their travel to work distance. The Climate Emergency is obvious. The Plan should prioritise protecting the environment, not simply pay lip service to it. The council will have little control over the developers once this plan is agreed. Once building is underway, the developer will have the upper hand if they decide they do not want to adhere to whatever high standards of construction and design the council may prefer. The Plan is for 1500 houses at Peaks Hill. This should be made clear. Many reading this will only see 750 (phase 1) and not realise the extent of what is proposed. The country as a whole needs more housing, but of a type to meet local need. Housing demand in London and the South East exceeds supply. There is no shortage of property to buy in Worksop, certainly no shortage of 4 and 5 bedroom houses. There is no argument for building yet more estates of such luxury housing. I oppose the plans to build at Peaks Hill</p>	
1196694	Resident	I oppose the proposed link road between Peaks Hill and Blyth Road. This will mean increased commuting between Worksop and Sheffield, increased traffic, poorer air quality, adverse effects on health, more congestion.	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
1196694	Resident	<p>The Draft Plan ignores the benefit to health and wellbeing of existing open spaces and the proven benefit to mental health of open vistas and scenery. Building on open country reduces the space available for wildlife and plants, has an adverse effect on natural drainage and, as such, does nothing to mitigate against the effects of the climate emergency. The development which recently began at the junction of Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road has shocked many by its impact on the landscape and the views when leaving Worksop. This corner abuts the proposed development at Peaks Hill. The negative impact on the wellbeing of the local community and the negative impact on the views of Worksop approaching and leaving on Blyth Road have not, in my opinion , been given sufficient weight.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
REF245	Resident	<p>FORM Please find below my comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm 1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation) 2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm 3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime 4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction 5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable 6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems 7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster 8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change 9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character 10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population.</p> <p>If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:</p> <p>11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife 12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor 13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline 14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change) 15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution 16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses 17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport 18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook 19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings 20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF250	Resident	<p>I have been in contact regularly with Planning, including being on your mailing list regarding the Peaks Hill Farm site (Policy 15). Despite this contact, no information was given about progress on the plan to develop the site being in an advanced stage. Since attending consultation meetings, I have been informed that the Council has been working with an agent regarding the development for two years. However, Planning officers were not allowed to disclose this. The fact that the Council has withheld this information to residents in the immediate vicinity, has prevented us from making informed and timely decisions to where we now want to live. I conclude that the Council have withheld this information due to its controversial nature. I also feel I have been deliberately misled by the Council as I have consistently asked about development to the rear of our property. This and the short consultation framework for the Plan, do not engender my trust in the Council</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF264	Resident	<p>I list below my objections to the above mentioned development</p> <p>1 I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm Policy 15 within the Bassetlaw Local plan.</p> <p>2 The development is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents of Worksop The number of dwellings proposed and already under construction will cause noise pollution disruption and inconvenience for possibly the rest of my lifetime.</p> <p>3 I understand that the supporting infrastructure will only commence after the completion of the development which can only cause harm to the existing infrastructure which is struggling to provide services already. Existing transport systems are under pressure now, roads and rail links will be unable to cope with the increase this development will have on them New rail and road links must be in place prior to and development commencing if the development proceeds.</p> <p>5 The number of dwellings exceeds local needs This will only increase the number of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems</p> <p>6 Increased commuting will add to pollution Traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment such as Sheffield and Doncaster At this time of climate change we should be trying to reduce commuting not increase it. Better to place new development near to the center of employment hubs thus shortening the commute.</p> <p>7 Loss of prime local farm land is in the light of climate change is also to be deplored.</p> <p>8 The loss to the established local wildlife and green environment is also to be deplored The Council should be the Guardians for the future generations of Worksop residents and should not side step those issues by allowing developers to maximise their profits by over development of the area.</p> <p>Should my concerns be over-ruled I would like to see:-</p> <p>1 A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. A little like farmers wildlife margins around their fields</p> <p>2 Sympathetic development arrangements planning gardens that back onto the buffer zone to increase the distance between existing and new homes.</p> <p>3 Any communal area to be centrally located in the new development and away from the existing homes.</p> <p>4 Provision of Low level housing near any existing homes such as bungalows not higher-rise town houses.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF265	Resident	I am writing to make objections to the proposed planning application behind Westerdale Worksop. The plans are for 750 houses stretching from Blythe Road to Carlton Road. I believe that this is not in the public interest as the demand is not there for the proposed houses and it will have a detrimental effect on the local wildlife. The fields behind my home are a hub for wildlife, foxes, rabbits, birds and bats these animal live in the fields and adjacent woods. I also believe that the local amenities are not sufficient to take on the extra people that this proposed development will bring. In the local area there is already a lot of housing currently being built therefore I do not believe that there is a market in which to sell these houses. I am writing to object to the proposed planning application to the land behind my house on Westerdale, which will stretch from Blythe Road to Carlton Road. I believe that there is not the demand for the 750 extra houses that this development will bring and that it will have a detrimental effect on the local wildlife. The fields behind my house are home to foxes, rabbit, birds of prey and bats to name a few and this development will destroy their habitat. In the local area there are currently projects underway to provide extra housing therefore I believe this development will take away rather than add to the local economy as the amenities are already under funded and stretched to capacity.	Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.
REF266	Resident	I am writing to object to the proposed planning application to the land behind my house on Westerdale, which will stretch from Blythe Road to Carlton Road. I believe that there is not the demand for the 750 extra houses that this development will bring and that it will have a detrimental effect on the local wildlife. The fields behind my house are home to foxes, rabbit, birds of prey and bats to name a few and this development will destroy their habitat. In the local area there are currently projects underway to provide extra housing therefore I believe this development will take away rather than add to the local economy as the amenities are already under funded and stretched to capacity. I am writing to object to the proposed planning application to the land behind my house on Westerdale, which will stretch from Blythe Road to Carlton Road. I believe that there is not the demand for the 750 extra houses that this development will bring and that it will have a detrimental effect on the local wildlife. The fields behind my house are home to foxes, rabbit, birds of prey and bats to name a few and this development will destroy their habitat. In the local area there are currently projects underway to provide extra housing therefore I believe this development will take away rather than add to the local economy as the amenities are already under funded and stretched to capacity.	Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF267	Resident	I am writing to object to the proposed planning application to the land behind my house on Westerdale, which will stretch from Blythe Road to Carlton Road. I believe that there is not the demand for the 750 extra houses that this development will bring and that it will have a detrimental effect on the local wildlife. The fields behind my house are home to foxes, rabbit, birds of prey and bats to name a few and this development will destroy their habitat. In the local area there are currently projects underway to provide extra housing therefore I believe this development will take away rather than add to the local economy as the amenities are already under funded and stretched to capacity.	Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.
REF268	Resident	I am writing to object to the proposed planning application to the land behind my house on Westerdale, which will stretch from Blythe Road to Carlton Road. I believe that there is not the demand for the 750 extra houses that this development will bring and that it will have a detrimental effect on the local wildlife. The fields behind my house are home to foxes, rabbit, birds of prey and bats to name a few and this development will destroy their habitat. In the local area there are currently projects underway to provide extra housing therefore I believe this development will take away rather than add to the local economy as the amenities are already under funded and stretched to capacity.	Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
1197012	Resident	<p>1. The development site is rather large and will surely have a great impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land , in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime</p> <p>2. All the connections to the main roads are poor - the A1 North involves travelling through the centre of Blyth, the A1 & A57 South via Manton, the M1 & A57 North for Sheffield, etc. via Gateford on a road that already has speed restricting humps and the M1 South through the centre of town ! Additionally both main roads into the town centre are constantly overloaded (plus one route also having a level crossing !).</p> <p>3. Therefore I would suggest that an alternative development should be located on the piece of land bounded by the Retford Road and the railway line and the Osberton Nurseries (with access provided from the A57 via a road running between the buildings associated with Greencore and Wilko). This would remove pressure from these narrow overloaded roads – in particular providing better access to Sheffield and the M1 (plus Retford, etc.) via the A57 and likewise for Doncaster , Manton, etc. via the A1. Additionally of course if a railway station was built in that area it could provide passengers with direct access to Sheffield (and Retford for access to Doncaster and/or London).</p> <p>4. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop utilising already unsustainable road and rail systems (see alternative solution described above !).</p> <p>5. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster (see the better solution described above in entry 3 !).</p> <p>6. Provision of appropriately priced properties would make this alternative development very suitable to some workers who are/will be employed by those local businesses (plus those planned to occur in the new business area which has been created on the other side of the A57).</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
1197077	Resident	The development of land adjoining Carlton Road (known locally as the Sandhills) will remove the natural break between the settlements of Worksop & Carlton in Lindrick. This will eventually lead to there being no break in development from Worksop all the way to Oldcotes. This will damage the character of Carlton in Lindrick especially as you approach the village from the south and enter the old part of the village; as well as destroy the natural landscape. This in turn will affect wildlife, reduce the amount of farm land and increase the likelihood of flooding in the local area.	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
1197090	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>Response to draft Bassetlaw Local Plan, January 2020 (With particular concerns re Peaks Hill Farm site, ST15, p.78)</p> <p>Overall, the draft Bassetlaw Local Plan (BLP) has aspects that are commendable, including innovative ideas, such as the garden villages, green energy site and welcome references to the need for cycling and walking connectivity and green infrastructure. However, I have serious objections to the inclusion of a special area of countryside on the western fringe of the large proposed Peaks Hill Farm (PHF) housing development site. I also have concerns about the overall sustainability of this large Greenfield site. If you travel north from Worksop towards Carlton on the A60, on the edge of the town, you pass the G4S offices on the right in woodland. This mature wood on the right covers a hill and ridge that curves round north-eastwards to Peaks Hill farm enclosing a sloping, triangular shaped field on the right/front, bordered by the A60 (circled blue on the map below). This field is included in the plans for residential development. As you carry on north you pass Freshfields house on the left and down the hill, extensive and beautiful views of the rural landscape open out across the horizon towards Carlton direction. This landscape, the views, the mature woods and fields to the right and front, is one of the most beautiful I know. Often, as I travel back from Worksop this view will lift my spirits. It is unique and precious landscape. Once it's built on, it will be spoilt and lost for ever. It is current and future generations that will lose the enjoyment of this landscape. The 'public good', 'amenity value' or wildlife value of that landscape is priceless and is not reflected in the cost-benefit of commercial development decisions. I was shocked when I saw the plans to build on this field (just a few days before it went public). It is out of sight from Worksop, on land sloping down to Carlton and enclosed by woods. From this site is a beautiful and extensive view to the North West – the site is visible from Owday lane, over a mile away. This would be building in pristine countryside clearly separated from the town envelope. The plan states the need for a green buffer between Worksop and Carlton. I would argue that this field and its surrounding trees and ridge must be included in that green buffer zone (it's visible from the Carlton direction but not from Worksop). To build on it would set a precedent and surely other fields and woods will be built over until Worksop merges with Carlton. I would urge all councillors and relevant officers to visit the site to see with their own eyes. On p.59 of BDC's commissioned report Site Allocations: Landscape Study, is their conclusion on the Peaks Hill Farm (site 12H in the report) site: 'A combination of topography, the landscape value of existing woodlands and the extent to which the site extends north into open countryside, suggest that only a limited development in the middle and southern sections of the site could be achieved without an overall adverse landscape impact. However, care should be taken to respect topography, retain woodlands and if possible improving connectivity.' https://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/media/5295/bassetlaw-draftlandscape-study-2019.pdf That means, it is the western, A60 side of the site that will be most adversely affected and the boundary of the green buffer should therefore follow the line of the topography - i.e. follow the ridge that separates this field and Peaks Hill farm from the rest of the development site and from Worksop. Not only is this a beautiful landscape - between Worksop and Carlton/Blyth – but it is also a designed heritage landscape. The rolling fields and wooded ridges and copses were designed and planted by estate managers in the 18th and 19th centuries to be attractive and create an impact. Some of the older, 'veteran' trees found on this Peaks Hill site might pre-date this period. I do not object quite as strongly about the other parts of the proposed Peaks Hill development, as the largest part is to the East of the Peaks Hill woods, stretching over to Blyth Rd – backing on to Thievesdale, and joined on to Worksop. It is a concerning, serious loss of countryside - the site gives extensive views towards the Trent in the NE direction - but the development will be less visible from the roads running into Worksop from the North. Therefore, like the Landscape Study Report, I think development on the south and middle sections of the site can be managed better in terms of acceptable landscape impact than any development near the A60 on the west side of the site. However, in this, my amendment to my original submission, I have reflected on other submissions made on this site and thought through concerns of others re the sustainability of the PHF site. Although I'm most concerned about the landscape impact on the western part of the site, I now think the sustainability of the whole PHF site is questionable. The proposal for PHF is for 1500, mainly 3 or 4 bed 'executive' homes, probably to be occupied by commuters working in South Yorks (a reasonable expectation, given what's happened at similar recent developments such as Gateford). This will put more traffic on the roads and more strain on local health and education services for decades to come. There will be the irrevocable loss of a large wildlife resource. There are still areas of Brownfield sites, possibly in Bassetlaw, (more will become available in the future) certainly in South Yorks, - that could be developed for housing (but are less attractive to developers). Instead, large proposed Greenfield sites, such as PHF, in the Draft Plan are in danger of eroding the clear asset that Bassetlaw has – beautiful landscape and quiet roads. Government, at all</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm	<p>levels, should take in the wider regional and national picture of sustainability – and that needs to be factored into this District Local Plan. Developing Greenfield sites is clearly profitable for landowners, developers and builders (and car manufacturers) but is damaging the environment, quality of life (and the planet) for future generations in Bassetlaw by removing the amenity value of this attractive countryside.</p> <p>Another aspect of the proposed development is a relief road running through the site from Blyth road and coming out on the A60 near the Peaks Hill farm (though this location is not confirmed). Highway matters are clearly for the County Highways to consider but I have serious concerns as it a dangerous stretch of fast road, on a bend and a hill, and it has had several fatalities in recent years. If there has to be a new road – and I'm not convinced there is a need for one – it should be at the south end of the proposed site and come out onto the A60 closer to G4S offices. I also believe the consultation period should be extended. From talking to residents in Carlton and in Worksop, it seems few members of the public are aware of the Draft Local Plan, let alone that this piece of land is affected. Such an important plan with huge changes for Bassetlaw needs extensive publicity and consultation. Yes, consultation on the Local Plan in its various guises seems to have been going on years but there have been such drastic changes to the LP in the last few months - such as the PHF site coming forward, and abandoning the previously proposed garden village sites – changes that even many BDC Cllrs were not aware of (until just before it went public). The PHF site is within the Carlton in Lindrick Parish boundary but even ward District Cllrs were not consulted on full details of this site until early January 2020 and Parish Cllrs learned about it only when public consultation started. The village developed its own Neighbourhood Plan, finalised last year, with assistance from BDC planners and the PHF site is not mentioned because it had not been brought forward at that time. It is fair to say that the concerns I am expressing here in my submission</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF294	Resident	<p>I believe that further panning consents in the Parish of Carlton in Lindrick is in contravention of the Carlton Neighbourhood Plan which was agreed upon only last year. This plan highlighted two suitable sites that were agreed upon ... the Riddell, currently being built on by Avant Homes and the Old Firbeck Colliery site. To allow further housing development breaks this agreement between the council and the people of Carlton.¹ In support of other residents I forward the following objections and information. The Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)². I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm and anywhere else in Bassetlaw. There has simply been enough already.</p> <p>3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime⁴. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction⁵. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable⁶. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems⁷. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster⁸. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change⁹. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character¹⁰. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:¹¹ A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife¹². New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor¹³. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline¹⁴. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)¹⁵. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution¹⁶. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses¹⁷. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport¹⁸. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook¹⁹. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings²⁰. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF296	Resident	<p>I am aware that this submission will reach you by the deadline of Wednesday 26th February and unfortunately will not be the comprehensive response that I would have submitted given more time. I feel strongly that the Consultation process has been inadequate and untimely. The guidelines that appear in Appendix 4 of the Draft Plan have NOT been followed. 1. Appendix 4 (a) states 'An A4 laminated site notice should be displayed on the site's road/street frontage(s) for a minimum of 21 days...' Only one notice was displayed on Westerdale and when I asked the planners about this, I was informed that we were 'lucky' to have one notice as they were not obliged to put them up. I don't believe one was sufficient and object to the comment made by the planner.2. Appendix 4 (b) states that 'A letter should be sent to all properties notifying them of the proposal...' I did not receive a letter notifying me of the proposal. When I asked why I hadn't received a letter I was informed the Council do not have the resources. And yet the tables in the Consultation meeting were full of impressive, quality, colour printed A3 and A5 leaflets for me to take away. I was also told that if I had been on the Council's mailing list I would have been notified. One of my neighbours is on the mailing list and keeps in regular contact with the Council and still did not receive a letter.3. The consultation meetings were poorly organised. Council staff gave conflicting answers to questions and were not always polite.4. Foreword page 2: 'Following on from our successful consultation on the Bassetlaw Local Plan....this is the next stage of our conversation with local people, businesses and communities'I was completely unaware that there had been a consultation early in 2019. I only discovered this while talking to a planning officer at the Consultation meeting held on 29th January in the Ceres Suite. His response was that they had publicised this consultation and there had been '500 comments to prove it'. Looking into this the comments were predominantly made by developers so I would question the integrity of the publication process.5. One of our resident was informed at one of the Consultation meetings that the Council have been working with an agent for two years, but officers were not allowed to disclose this. I question whether that is an allowable procedure? It certainly creates a level of distrust between the Council and residents. There is a worrying lack of transparency here.6. The Draft Plan is approximately 200 pages long and there are more than 70 further documents that are referred to. This is a massive resource to digest and make sense of. It is unreasonable to expect that the few weeks we have been aware of this are sufficient to have made sense of this document and to have formulated a comprehensive response. Indeed the final Consultation at Ranby only took place on 25th February, the day before the deadline. The Council have put people in an impossible situation.7. The feedback forms that were handed out at meetings were highly inadequate and complex with a need to equate comments to particular sections in the Plan. On contacting Planning, I was told that we could simply email or write to Planning with comments, as long as we included our contact details and made reference to the particular policy numbers, PHF being Policy 15. Why were we not told this collectively at meetings or in some appropriate BDC publicity? It feels that the process for giving feedback/comments has been made as complex and un-inclusive as possible. 8. I have attended two consultation meetings. The first one (29/1/2020 Ceres Suite) was very poorly attended. There were 9 of us in attendance and we decided to work together to publicise these proposals and raise local awareness. We produced our own flyers which we delivered locally and, as I am sure you are already aware, the subsequent Consultation meeting on 4/2/2020 at Thievesdale Community Centre was extremely well attended. It was the Council's responsibility to ensure that local residents were aware. We have worked as a group tirelessly since 29th January. We have produced and delivered 2 flyers, had several group meetings and a meeting with Brendan Clarke-Smith MP. We have used social media to reach out to people and raise awareness. Apparently the planners have commented that response to this Draft Plan is 'unprecedented'. More evidence that it was imperative to inform people so they could 'have their say'. Indeed, in her Foreword on page 2 of the Draft Plan Councillor Jo White's final sentence reads "It is absolutely vital that people take a look at what is being proposed and have their say." I absolutely agree with her and it is surely the duty and responsibility of the Council to make every effort, in line with their Community Consultation policy, to facilitate this process. Sadly, the Council haven't. 9. I ask the Council to consider objectively their handling of this Consultation process and ask that you grant an extension of the deadline. I would suggest a period of at least one month in order to allow people to do the reading and research necessary and to complete their comments for submission.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Strategic Objectives4.2.1 This vision will be achieved by meeting the following objectives:</p> <p>Page 21. OBJECTIVE 1.'To locate new development in sustainable locations and through new settlements that respect the environmental capacity of the District, support a balanced pattern of growth across urban and rural areas, makes best use of previously developed land and buildings and minimises the loss of the District's highest quality</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm	<p>agricultural land'.Page 265.1.17 'Worksop will deliver a minimum of 2180 new dwellings over the plan period (2018 to 2037). Since the start of the plan period Worksop has seen 230 housing completions and currently has 1404 commitments (at 30/11/2019). Combined, this equates to a supply of 1634 dwellings. Consequently, there is a requirement to allocate land for a minimum of 546 dwellings in Worksop'. 5.1.18 'However, the level of housing identified by Policy ST1 in Worksop is broadly comparable with the promotion of successful economic growth and regeneration and to facilitate the infrastructure required in support'. Response to Strategic Objective 1 and sections 5 on page 26 as above:The proposed inclusion of farmland and countryside at PHF for a development of such disproportionate enormity, causing such a loss of green-space and with a lack of infrastructure, goes against every principle in this objective.According to the Office of National Statistics data, the populations of Worksop and Bassetlaw have increased by around 10% over the last 20 years. The proportion of development in the Plan throughout the district, however, is around 20% with a huge proportion of that on green-field sites at PHF and Bassetlaw Garden Village. The huge development at Gateford is already offering discounts on unsold plots and stamp duty paid. I am interested to know where the thousands of households for Bassetlaw, 9,087 homes, will come from, given the lack of facilities and supporting infrastructure. Commuters need good levels of connectivity, not currently evident in Worksop and surrounding villages.BDC Spatial Strategy quotes 'a minimum of 9,087 homes need to be built in Bassetlaw by 2037' yet 5.1.17 above, states that only 546 further dwellings are needed in Worksop in total. Yet Peaks Hill farm on its own, is to include at least 750 houses in phase 1 alone. If this much lower number, based on population projections for the District, is what is actually needed, say allowing for a continued population increase over 20 years again of 10%, why is the Plan to include so much destruction of green-space and with a 20% increase in housing stock? The developments on brown field sites would probably provide the level of housing affordability that local people can sustain in Worksop, with additional insistence on affordable homes being built at, for example, Gateford and the old Tesco site. I am particularly horrified at the extent of destruction of local green-field sites especially that proposed for Peaks Hill Farm (PHF) Policy 15. An urban sprawl of this size would have a catastrophic impact on wildlife habitats including for buzzards, owls, sparrow hawks, invertebrates, mammals (including bats) and pollinators, all of which inhabit the site. There are already 174 houses being built adjacent to this site (The Lodge At The Edge) with the Plan adding 'at least 750' more in phase 1on 54 hectares and '750' in phase 2, doubling the size. The impact on Worksop will be immense. The roads surrounding the site are single lane, country-style roads. The impact on the already stretched infrastructure, including local roads, the A57 to Sheffield, GP surgeries (the waiting time for appointments at Newgate Medical Group for example, is already 6 weeks) dentists, the hospital, schools etc will be more intolerable when added to the huge sprawling developments currently in progress at Gateford and near Shireoaks and all the other sites around the Town. The size of the PHF site means its development will be spread over decades. For many members of the local community, this will mean the anxiety of continued disruption, inconvenience, noise, heavy plant, dust and other pollution, and in the case of the elderly, literally for the rest of their lives. The proposal at PHF has very little, if any, concrete evidence of appropriate, new infrastructure support compared particularly to the proposed Bassetlaw Garden Village ST1 ST3 ST35 and ST36, which is to have a nursery and primary school, healthcare facilities, parks, enhanced transport networks, flood risk management and a new railway station etc demonstrating what is deemed necessary for a development of 750 homes. However, there is nothing specific for PHF, a development of the same size, other than for example, a road across the estate and a local bus service. The Plan clearly implies minimal infrastructure investment on and around this site and waives the Community Infrastructure Levy other than for that required to enable the development to take place.Connectivity in and out of Worksop is already inadequate and under stress. I now commute to Sheffield by train. It is a poor service:- often dirty, overcrowded, unreliable, infrequent and increasingly difficult to park at the station. I used to commute by car, a journey that used to take 35 minutes to the centre and now takes about an hour. According to the Planning section, income will need to be raised from the building of these huge developments - presumably via Council Tax and some developer contributions if evidence can be deemed to support need - in order to raise the income needed to build infrastructure, section 5.1.18 in the Plan. The level of Council Tax needed will not be raised until all properties are built and sold, this may take decades and how can we simply extend already land-locked facilities (the train station, schools and surgeries) to accommodate increases in population? Will this in turn, create the constant chicken and egg situation of increasing the destruction of further green-space?I accept the need for additional housing but not of this magnitude, especially on prime farming land that should provide locally produced food, and the surrounding green-space which has been countryside since time immemorial.National evidence shows that local authorities have limited power to enforce the provision of affordable housing on development sites and developers, who are interested in maximising their profits, do not appear to be voluntarily providing them.Worksop has a population of 42,000+. The housing currently being built and also proposed is</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm	<p>largely 3, 4 and 5 bedroom detached. The average house price in Worksop is £139,000. New developments - see Rippon Homes development off Blyth Road - are 'luxury homes' being marketed to commuters. Gateford site is selling their 'luxury homes' homes starting at £300,000. These are not what many local people can afford to buy and I cannot find evidence to support the concept that by building lots of houses - sustainable, local and professional (with salaries sufficient to fund large houses) employment will follow - in less affluent locations. It is more feasible, that the purchasers of large homes in less well off areas will be commuters who will be unlikely to work within and spend large amounts in the local economy, preferring other locations such as Meadowhall, Sheffield, Lincoln and Nottingham. The recent tragic flooding of Worksop Town Centre is unlikely to increase investor confidence to that location. The Plan consistently uses the term 'sustainable development'. This is absolute 'greenwash'. How can, by it's very nature, the irrevocable loss of farmland and countryside be deemed sustainable? All the national and international agendas and concerns of, for example, global warming, locally-sourced food, light/noise/traffic pollution, urban drainage, local infrastructure capacity, health and wellbeing etc will continue to be eroded if destruction of the countryside is allowed at this housing saturation level. As our elected members, and as members of the public, it is our collective responsibility to protect and enhance our natural environment for current and future generations to appreciate, enjoy and benefit from. To allow destruction on this scale of this beautiful landscape and wildlife habitat at PHF, would simply be irresponsible and wrong. I implore this Council to reconsider their plans. We live in a changing world but let's work together and change it for the better. If my concerns are overruled, I want to see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife • New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor • Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline • New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change) • Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution • Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses • Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport • Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook • Build enough housing that local people can actually afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings • Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings. 	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF297	Resident	<p>I am aware that this submission will reach you by the deadline of Wednesday 26th February and unfortunately will not be the comprehensive response that I would have submitted given more time. I feel strongly that the Consultation process has been inadequate and untimely. The guidelines that appear in Appendix 4 of the Draft Plan have NOT been followed. 1. Appendix 4 (a) states 'An A4 laminated site notice should be displayed on the site's road/street frontage(s) for a minimum of 21 days...' Only one notice was displayed on Westerdale and when I asked the planners about this, I was informed that we were 'lucky' to have one notice as they were not obliged to put them up. I don't believe one was sufficient and object to the comment made by the planner.2. Appendix 4 (b) states that 'A letter should be sent to all properties notifying them of the proposal...' I did not receive a letter notifying me of the proposal. When I asked why I hadn't received a letter I was informed the Council do not have the resources. And yet the tables in the Consultation meeting were full of impressive, quality, colour printed A3 and A5 leaflets for me to take away. I was also told that if I had been on the Council's mailing list I would have been notified. One of my neighbours is on the mailing list and keeps in regular contact with the Council and still did not receive a letter.3. The consultation meetings were poorly organised. Council staff gave conflicting answers to questions and were not always polite.4. Foreword page 2: 'Following on from our successful consultation on the Bassetlaw Local Plan....this is the next stage of our conversation with local people, businesses and communities'I was completely unaware that there had been a consultation early in 2019. I only discovered this while talking to a planning officer at the Consultation meeting held on 29th January in the Ceres Suite. His response was that they had publicised this consultation and there had been '500 comments to prove it'. Looking into this the comments were predominantly made by developers so I would question the integrity of the publication process.5. One of our resident was informed at one of the Consultation meetings that the Council have been working with an agent for two years, but officers were not allowed to disclose this. I question whether that is an allowable procedure? It certainly creates a level of distrust between the Council and residents. There is a worrying lack of transparency here.6. The Draft Plan is approximately 200 pages long and there are more than 70 further documents that are referred to. This is a massive resource to digest and make sense of. It is unreasonable to expect that the few weeks we have been aware of this are sufficient to have made sense of this document and to have formulated a comprehensive response. Indeed the final Consultation at Ranby only took place on 25th February, the day before the deadline. The Council have put people in an impossible situation.7. The feedback forms that were handed out at meetings were highly inadequate and complex with a need to equate comments to particular sections in the Plan. On contacting Planning, I was told that we could simply email or write to Planning with comments, as long as we included our contact details and made reference to the particular policy numbers, PHF being Policy 15. Why were we not told this collectively at meetings or in some appropriate BDC publicity? It feels that the process for giving feedback/comments has been made as complex and un-inclusive as possible. 8. I have attended two consultation meetings. The first one (29/1/2020 Ceres Suite) was very poorly attended. There were 9 of us in attendance and we decided to work together to publicise these proposals and raise local awareness. We produced our own flyers which we delivered locally and, as I am sure you are already aware, the subsequent Consultation meeting on 4/2/2020 at Thievesdale Community Centre was extremely well attended. It was the Council's responsibility to ensure that local residents were aware. We have worked as a group tirelessly since 29th January. We have produced and delivered 2 flyers, had several group meetings and a meeting with Brendan Clarke-Smith MP. We have used social media to reach out to people and raise awareness. Apparently the planners have commented that response to this Draft Plan is 'unprecedented'. More evidence that it was imperative to inform people so they could 'have their say'. Indeed, in her Foreword on page 2 of the Draft Plan Councillor Jo White's final sentence reads "It is absolutely vital that people take a look at what is being proposed and have their say." I absolutely agree with her and it is surely the duty and responsibility of the Council to make every effort, in line with their Community Consultation policy, to facilitate this process. Sadly, the Council haven't. 9. I ask the Council to consider objectively their handling of this Consultation process and ask that you grant an extension of the deadline. I would suggest a period of at least one month in order to allow people to do the reading and research necessary and to complete their comments for submission.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Strategic Objectives4.2.1 This vision will be achieved by meeting the following objectives:</p> <p>Page 21. OBJECTIVE 1.'To locate new development in sustainable locations and through new settlements that respect the environmental capacity of the District, support a balanced pattern of growth across urban and rural areas, makes best use of previously developed land and buildings and minimises the loss of the District's highest quality</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm	<p>agricultural land'.Page 265.1.17 'Worksop will deliver a minimum of 2180 new dwellings over the plan period (2018 to 2037). Since the start of the plan period Worksop has seen 230 housing completions and currently has 1404 commitments (at 30/11/2019). Combined, this equates to a supply of 1634 dwellings. Consequently, there is a requirement to allocate land for a minimum of 546 dwellings in Worksop'. 5.1.18 'However, the level of housing identified by Policy ST1 in Worksop is broadly comparable with the promotion of successful economic growth and regeneration and to facilitate the infrastructure required in support'. Response to Strategic Objective 1 and sections 5 on page 26 as above:The proposed inclusion of farmland and countryside at PHF for a development of such disproportionate enormity, causing such a loss of green-space and with a lack of infrastructure, goes against every principle in this objective.According to the Office of National Statistics data, the populations of Worksop and Bassetlaw have increased by around 10% over the last 20 years. The proportion of development in the Plan throughout the district, however, is around 20% with a huge proportion of that on green-field sites at PHF and Bassetlaw Garden Village. The huge development at Gateford is already offering discounts on unsold plots and stamp duty paid. I am interested to know where the thousands of households for Bassetlaw, 9,087 homes, will come from, given the lack of facilities and supporting infrastructure. Commuters need good levels of connectivity, not currently evident in Worksop and surrounding villages.BDC Spatial Strategy quotes 'a minimum of 9,087 homes need to be built in Bassetlaw by 2037' yet 5.1.17 above, states that only 546 further dwellings are needed in Worksop in total. Yet Peaks Hill farm on its own, is to include at least 750 houses in phase 1 alone. If this much lower number, based on population projections for the District, is what is actually needed, say allowing for a continued population increase over 20 years again of 10%, why is the Plan to include so much destruction of green-space and with a 20% increase in housing stock? The developments on brown field sites would probably provide the level of housing affordability that local people can sustain in Worksop, with additional insistence on affordable homes being built at, for example, Gateford and the old Tesco site. I am particularly horrified at the extent of destruction of local green-field sites especially that proposed for Peaks Hill Farm (PHF) Policy 15. An urban sprawl of this size would have a catastrophic impact on wildlife habitats including for buzzards, owls, sparrow hawks, invertebrates, mammals (including bats) and pollinators, all of which inhabit the site. There are already 174 houses being built adjacent to this site (The Lodge At The Edge) with the Plan adding 'at least 750' more in phase 1on 54 hectares and '750' in phase 2, doubling the size. The impact on Worksop will be immense. The roads surrounding the site are single lane, country-style roads. The impact on the already stretched infrastructure, including local roads, the A57 to Sheffield, GP surgeries (the waiting time for appointments at Newgate Medical Group for example, is already 6 weeks) dentists, the hospital, schools etc will be more intolerable when added to the huge sprawling developments currently in progress at Gateford and near Shireoaks and all the other sites around the Town. The size of the PHF site means its development will be spread over decades. For many members of the local community, this will mean the anxiety of continued disruption, inconvenience, noise, heavy plant, dust and other pollution, and in the case of the elderly, literally for the rest of their lives. The proposal at PHF has very little, if any, concrete evidence of appropriate, new infrastructure support compared particularly to the proposed Bassetlaw Garden Village ST1 ST3 ST35 and ST36, which is to have a nursery and primary school, healthcare facilities, parks, enhanced transport networks, flood risk management and a new railway station etc demonstrating what is deemed necessary for a development of 750 homes. However, there is nothing specific for PHF, a development of the same size, other than for example, a road across the estate and a local bus service. The Plan clearly implies minimal infrastructure investment on and around this site and waives the Community Infrastructure Levy other than for that required to enable the development to take place.Connectivity in and out of Worksop is already inadequate and under stress. I now commute to Sheffield by train. It is a poor service:- often dirty, overcrowded, unreliable, infrequent and increasingly difficult to park at the station. I used to commute by car, a journey that used to take 35 minutes to the centre and now takes about an hour. According to the Planning section, income will need to be raised from the building of these huge developments - presumably via Council Tax and some developer contributions if evidence can be deemed to support need - in order to raise the income needed to build infrastructure, section 5.1.18 in the Plan. The level of Council Tax needed will not be raised until all properties are built and sold, this may take decades and how can we simply extend already land-locked facilities (the train station, schools and surgeries) to accommodate increases in population? Will this in turn, create the constant chicken and egg situation of increasing the destruction of further green-space?I accept the need for additional housing but not of this magnitude, especially on prime farming land that should provide locally produced food, and the surrounding green-space which has been countryside since time immemorial.National evidence shows that local authorities have limited power to enforce the provision of affordable housing on development sites and developers, who are interested in maximising their profits, do not appear to be voluntarily providing them.Worksop has a population of 42,000+. The housing currently being built and also proposed is</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm	<p>largely 3, 4 and 5 bedroom detached. The average house price in Worksop is £139,000. New developments - see Rippon Homes development off Blyth Road - are 'luxury homes' being marketed to commuters. Gateford site is selling their 'luxury homes' homes starting at £300,000. These are not what many local people can afford to buy and I cannot find evidence to support the concept that by building lots of houses - sustainable, local and professional (with salaries sufficient to fund large houses) employment will follow - in less affluent locations. It is more feasible, that the purchasers of large homes in less well off areas will be commuters who will be unlikely to work within and spend large amounts in the local economy, preferring other locations such as Meadowhall, Sheffield, Lincoln and Nottingham. The recent tragic flooding of Worksop Town Centre is unlikely to increase investor confidence to that location. The Plan consistently uses the term 'sustainable development'. This is absolute 'greenwash'. How can, by it's very nature, the irrevocable loss of farmland and countryside be deemed sustainable? All the national and international agendas and concerns of, for example, global warming, locally-sourced food, light/noise/traffic pollution, urban drainage, local infrastructure capacity, health and wellbeing etc will continue to be eroded if destruction of the countryside is allowed at this housing saturation level. As our elected members, and as members of the public, it is our collective responsibility to protect and enhance our natural environment for current and future generations to appreciate, enjoy and benefit from. To allow destruction on this scale of this beautiful landscape and wildlife habitat at PHF, would simply be irresponsible and wrong. I implore this Council to reconsider their plans. We live in a changing world but let's work together and change it for the better. If my concerns are overruled, I want to see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife • New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor • Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline • New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change) • Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution • Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses • Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport • Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook • Build enough housing that local people can actually afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings • Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings.' 	
REF300 -	Natural England	<p>This site includes areas of deciduous woodland some of which is priority habitat. We are therefore pleased to note that this has been recognised in 5b of the policy wording. We suggest that there is potential for net gain to enhance these woodland areas and link them with the proposed community woodland and the wider ecological habitat network.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF301 Peaks Hill Farm (LAA)	Freeths	<p>Firstly, we are in full support of Policy 15: HS1 Peaks Hill Farm and ST51 which acknowledges an east-west link/distributor road between Blyth Road (B6045) and Carlton Road (A60) at HS1 Peaks Hill Farm in accordance with Policy 15. The representations are in respect of Policy 15: HS1: Peaks Hill Farm (page 78); Policy ST51: Safeguarded Land (page 168) and Policy ST34: Landscape Character (Page 121). This representation is in relation to a significant opportunity to expand on this allocation to the west of Carlton Road to incorporate an extension to the distributor road to link with the roundabout at Ashes Park Avenue. The potential to link the proposed distributor road (ST51) to Ashes Park Avenue would significantly improve the flow and movement of traffic in and around Worksop, including the town centre. This letter sets out our client's representations in accordance with the Regulation 18 Public Consultation; and takes into account a number of other documents comprising part of the Local Plan's Evidence Base (Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan, January 2020 – Appendix 2: References). National Planning Policy Context – NPPF The NPPF sets out the planning context for the preparation of the Local Plan. In this respect paragraph 11 establishes a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development', which for planning requires local planning authorities to positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area; and for Local Plans provide for objectively assessed needs for housing and other uses, as well as needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas. Part 5 of the NPPF sets out advice on 'Delivering a sufficient supply of homes'. As such paragraph 60 requires local planning authorities to determine the minimum number of homes needed, strategic policies should be informed by a local housing need assessment, conducted using the standard method in national planning guidance. Paragraph 61 goes onto to state that within this context, the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policy. Paragraph 65 requires strategic policy-making authorities to establish a housing requirement figure for their whole area, which shows the extent to which their identified need can be met over the plan period. The NPPF therefore makes it clear that Local Plans should provide for and deliver their full Objectively Assessed Need for Housing. The consequences of not doing so include a lack of housing supply to meet needs; economic and social inequalities; a lack of workforce mobility; inability to match jobs with housing; and, poor overall economic performance.</p>	Support noted and welcome

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF302	Resident	<p>I believe that further planning consents in the Parish of Carlton in Lindrick is in contravention of the Carlton Neighbourhood Plan which was agreed upon only last year. This plan highlighted two suitable sites that were agreed upon ... the Riddell, currently being built on by Avant Homes and the Old Firbeck Colliery site. To allow further housing development breaks this agreement between the council and the people of Carlton.1. In support of other residents I forward the following objections and information. The Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation) 2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm and anywhere else in Bassetlaw. There has simply been enough already. 3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime 4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction 5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable 6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems 7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster 8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change 9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character 10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife 12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor 13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline 14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change) 15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution 16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses 17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport 18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook 19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings 20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>
REF303	Resident	<p>I believe that further panning consents in the Parish of Carlton in Lindrick is in contravention of the Carlton Neighbourhood Plan which was agreed upon only last year. This plan highlighted three suitable sites that were agreed upon ... the Riddell, currently being built on by Avant Homes, the Old Firbeck Colliery site, and in addition to the Thievesdale site which is in the boundary of Carlton in Lindrick but will not be counted towards their allocation of housing To allow further housing development within the Parish boundary breaks this agreement between the council and the people of Carlton.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
1197218	Resident	<p>A local centre is to be provided at proposed HS1 Peaks Hill Farm but my objection is any development of this agricultural land site. The north side of Worksop has already seen significant housing development at Gateford Park and Kilton/ Thievesdale areas. A large proportion on agricultural land. These are all large modern housing developments which are commuter estates.</p>	<p>existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p> <p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF308 -	Resident	<p>Page 26</p> <p>5.1.17 'Worksop will deliver a minimum of 2180 new dwellings over the plan period (2018 to 2037). Since the start of the plan period Worksop has seen 230 housing completions and currently has 1404 commitments (at 30/11/2019). Combined, this equates to a supply of 1634 dwellings. Consequently, there is a requirement to allocate land for a minimum of 546 dwellings in Worksop'.</p> <p>5.1.18 'However, the level of housing identified by Policy ST1 in Worksop is broadly comparable with the promotion of successful economic growth and regeneration and to facilitate the infrastructure required in support'. If only 546 further dwellings are required in Worksop, a considerable part of Peaks Hill Farm site will not be required. However, the Council's plans for housing volume, which are clearly, ambitious, appear to go well beyond that which is required by government directive or some of the objective assessments carried out on behalf of the Council - eg the Economic Development Need Assessment, which has partly informed the proposed level of houses to be built. This concluded that around 390 dwellings per annum would be needed but that this could be less as 'Growth rates projected forward to 2035 don't reflect any structural changes to the economy taking regard of macro-economic factors - most notably issues relating to Brexit'. Even with 390 dwellings a year for the period of the plan, this falls far short of BDC's figures of over 9,000 dwellings required - which seems to equate to a huge 20% increase. Further, as reported on page 29, national planning practice guidance states that the minimum number of homes needed should use the NPPF Standardised Methodology, using DCLG 2014-based Household Projections. This results in a minimum housing need of only 307 dwellings per annum for the plan period (2018 to 2037). This figure is then bumped up hugely by taking into consideration the Economic Development Needs Assessment, 2019 which identifies that the housing requirement be increased to a minimum of 478 dwellings per annum to support economic growth in the District. Yet how certain is the Council that this figure is accurate? Has the BDC got it's assessment and justifications right on this issue? I would challenge this. This is a critical issue as the majority of development is proposed for greenfield sites - ie many hectares of high grade agricultural land - a diminishing resource both locally and nationally. It would appear that BDC is taking a cavalier approach to the permanent destruction of many hectares of this high grade land, by calculating housing numbers on some ideal scenario which may never materialise. Is this just pie in the sky? So much is at stake. This approach is contrary to Strategic Objective 1 of the Draft Plan - 'To locate new development in sustainable locations and through new settlements that respect the environmental capacity of the District, support a balanced pattern of growth across urban and rural areas, makes best use of previously developed land and buildings and minimises the loss of the District's highest quality agricultural land'. Whatever happens, the Council should try and ensure as far as practicable that all brownfield sites are developed before any greenfield sites. Many small rural communities will be devastated by a 20% increase to Housing. Even residents who are not directly affected by development on adjoining land are likely to be horrified by such a radical change to the places where they live and often, where they were born and brought up. I fully accept the need for additional housing (and am aware that the Council finds itself in an onerous position in some respects) - but not on this magnitude, especially on prime farming land (that should be retained to provide locally produced food - which falls in with the urgent need to reduce our carbon footprints) and the surrounding green-space which has been countryside since time immemorial. Surely, it would be more appropriate to keep the target down to around 10% and any additional development needs could be considered as 'windfall' as and when it arises, particularly because of the uncertain economic situation? Already there would seem to be oversupply at Gateford in Worksop, where houses are not selling well. There are also over 600 empty properties in Worksop.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF308 -	Resident	<p>Peak Farm is a huge site with 750 (minimum) dwellings proposed for Phase 1 and a further 750 for phase 2. There are already 174 houses being built adjacent to this site - The Lodge. The impact on the north of Worksop will be considerable. The roads surrounding the site are single lane, country-style roads and these will become clogged by traffic, as will other nearby roads. Already there are traffic issues at certain junctions. A good example is the Cannon crossroad which already during the rush hour has long tail-backs. No amount of modifications will significantly improve this. With an average of 1.4 cars per household in the East Midlands (2017-8), the new estate will probably spawn around 2,300 additional cars - massively adding to the local congestion. The proposed new road within the estate, may facilitate development on the site but it will do little to help local congestion. Reference is made in the Report to improvements to the town's infrastructure including road, schools and medical facilities but they are invariably vague and ill-defined and retrospective and not guaranteed. This seems to be a sop, designed to avoid close scrutiny and mask the fact that the Council has very limited powers to demand appropriate infrastructure spend in relation to development volume. The impact on the already stretched infrastructure, including local roads will extend right out of Worksop along the A57 and other commuter roads where journey times are already substantially longer. For example, it now takes literally twice as long (over 1 hour) to drive to Sheffield than it did 20 years ago. The Plan does not offer any real answer to the additional pressures on the Town's infrastructure, and inevitably, therefore will be to the detriment of existing residents. Commuting is contrary to the Plan's objectives and ethos but perversely, this will be increased because of the type and location of proposed new housebuilding. The size of the PHF site means its development will be spread over years. For many members of the local community, this will mean decades of anxiety, continued disruption, inconvenience, noise, heavy plant, dust and other pollution. It will be particularly bad for the elderly living close by, who will be forced to suffer from this, literally until they die. Focusing the bulk (75%) of Worksop's development onto one site might be easier for the Planning services to deal with but it will be a living nightmare for residents in the immediate vicinity and will overwhelm local infrastructure, including schools, doctors' and dentists' surgeries and amenities.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
REF311	Resident	<p>I believe that further planning consents in the Parish of Carlton in Lindrick is in contravention of the Carlton Neighbourhood Plan which was agreed upon only last year. This plan highlighted two suitable sites that were agreed upon ... the Riddell, currently being built on by Avant Homes and the Old Firbeck Colliery site. To allow further housing development breaks this agreement between the council and the people of Carlton.</p> <p>This is not what i signed for when i read the Carlton development plan, i would ask the council to re consider any future developments outside the above mentioned plan.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF312	Resident	<p>Please find below my comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF313	Resident	<p>I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed development shown in the Bassetlaw local plan, Peaks Hill Farm Policy 15.</p> <p>I had not been informed of this development despite owning the property for 8 years.</p> <p>I have found out about this development from a friend this week.</p> <p>The council has a duty to inform property owners of such plans with time for them to comment.</p> <p>I trust, therefore that my objections arrive in time (and are acknowledged) for consideration.</p> <p>The proposal for at least 750 dwellings is excessive and combined with other proposed developments well outnumbers the housing need outlined in the Bassetlaw plan.</p> <p>There will be huge detriment to the quality of life of residents in the Thievesdale area in terms of noise, pollution and loss of amenities. The green environment will be severely impacted in terms of habitat of wildlife and destruction of a natural area well loved by the people of Worksop.. The council will, I trust, publish as legally required the environmental impact study for this large development.</p> <p>As I am already retired I expect this building work will last and disrupt the remainder of my life, causing me unnecessary stress.</p> <p>Please keep me advised of any further developments regarding Peaks Hill Farm Policy 15.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
1197260	Resident	<p>Peaks Hill Farm is within the Parish of Carlton in Lindrick, not Worksop. Carlton has produced a Neighbourhood Plan, accepted by BDC and approved by the Independent Examiner. This Plan set out the approved sites for housing, and more than covered the number required. The Peak's Hill Farm site was not introduced in the land availability assessment and the construction of 750 homes, with another 750 in the following Plan period is excessive and not required in the village. Insufficient thought seems to have been given to the provision of health care and education. If the developer is to provide funding for an extension to the new, as yet unbuilt Gateford School, why not build a larger school to start with. Health and social care services are struggling already, so surely these should be provided before even considering building so many more dwellings.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
REF317	Resident	<p>I am emailing to object to the planned development at Peaks Hill Farm.</p> <p>The disruption caused by the construction alone will be considerable. There are neither the amenities nor the infrastructure to support further growth. There are not the employment opportunities locally for so many additional residents.</p> <p>In addition, the Carlton Neighbourhood Plan, which was voted upon only last year, highlighted two suitable sites that were agreed upon: fields surrounding the Riddell, currently being built on by Avant Homes and the Old Firbeck Colliery site. To allow further housing development breaks this agreement between the council and the people of Carlton.</p> <p>Please do not mar our countryside any further by building on more farmland.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
1197267	Resident	<p>Large rural villages number of dwellings 1764. Carlton-in-Lindrick Parish has supplied 600 houses which is more than 20%. Now a further 1500 at Peaks Hill. The Parish Neighbourhood plan 'made' last year'.has the same status as this Local Plan in making decisions about planning applications' and as such should not be deemed Worksop. Rather than 'support existing facilities' the exceeded development in Carlton In Lindrick Parish would strain existing facilities. Peaks Hill development roads and junctions capacity will not support traffic. How will new roads take traffic is unclear. Green gap ignores the Parish boundary as detailed in Carlton in Lindrick neighbourhood plan. Clear encroachment. The report for the Green gap was produced to support the plan. Thus different on East side of A60 to the West. Flooding in Carlton in Lindrick over the last 10 years in various parts of the village. As much up hill planning needs to be done. Can this be ensured by housing on green field areas.</p>	<p>continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p> <p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/jobs, new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF321 (owners of the Carlton Forest Distribution Centre and surrounding land adjoining the existing Worksop settlement boundary)	IBA Planning	<p>Similarly, the proposed housing allocation at Peaks Hill Farm (HS1 – in accordance with Policy15) is also supported.The above housing and employment land allocation at Peaks Hill Farm is considered to comprise an extremely logical and sustainable urban extension to this part of Worksop and is of sufficient size to facilitate a much needed and long overdue new distributor road1 linking BlythRoad (B6045) to Carlton Road (A60).It is noted that further benefits of the development of this land and the provision of the new distributor road (aside from supporting a green corridor with complementary pedestrian and cycle links and public transport connections) will be seen elsewhere within Worksop, including significantly improving the flow and movement of traffic in and around Worksop (including the town centre – and necessarily improving a number of strategic and local junctions around the town which are already at capacity and already serving to constrain sustainable housing, economic and regeneration growth initiatives moving forward).Indeed, it is considered that without the proposed housing and employment allocation, the new distributor road is not achievable (either in terms of the land required to facilitate it, or the development required to help fund and deliver it) – and this will inevitably have important and detrimental knock-on effects in terms of the Council's Vision and Strategic Objectives for 2037 and Worksop's regeneration aspirations for the town centre which are vital for attracting new homes, businesses and strategic investment as required. Clearly, the overall allocation is a large one and a great deal of work will be required to coordinate all various stakeholders in order to achieve overall delivery within the timescales envisaged.On my client's part, they remain happy and willing to collaborate closely with the Council, the local Highway Authority and the developers with the interest in the balance of the land subject of the overall allocation to achieve the above.Dialogue is already under way with Hallam Land and my client and their own development team will continue to be willing to attend all developer meetings alongside the Council and local Highway Authority (and all other relevant stakeholders) between now and the Examination in Public to offer all and every support necessary in demonstrating full confidence in the delivery of the site and the new distributor road within the Plan period (with the balance of the housing provision beyond).In the above connection, the Council will be aware that my client is a longstanding significant local employer and has a strong record in housing delivery – having secured local housebuilder, Rippon Homes, immediately following the grant of outline consent for 182 dwellings, who themselves submitted their own reserved matters very early within the life of the outline (and have since already made a start on site).Continuing this theme of early delivery, my clients are already in discussions with an innovative housing provider2 (who is keen to establish a presence within the town) who has indicated a strong interest in building out the housing element on my client's land as the first phase of development from the Blyth Road direction as part of an agreed Comprehensive Masterplan Framework which will include an independent design review, community consultation and, of course, Council approval. As required, this masterplan framework will be prepared to enable it to be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document.The same housing provider has also expressed interest in building the already-consented datacentre and my client's landmark office HQ as the first of the clean-tech/green-tech B1 office development approved under LPA reference 15/01477/OUT.Notwithstanding the above, as per our previous representations to the Council, the commercial element of the overall mixed-use outline consent has yet to be finalised via reserved matters approval and therefore it continues to make great sense for this element to be incorporated within the overall housing and employment allocation for Peak Hills Farm to allow complete flexibility over the alignment of the new distributor road and the Comprehensive Masterplan Framework in general. This being the case, the Council can be comforted that nothing will be agreed between my clients and any developer in the short-term that could influence the efficient or most appropriate layout of the Comprehensive Masterplan Framework and/or delivery of the overall site moving forward.In the above connection, whilst the extent of the overall mixed-use allocation at Peak Hills Farm shown on the draft Policies Map is supported, my client is concerned that the indicative line of the proposed new distributor road (identified on the same map as safeguarded land) does not unwittingly fix the alignment through the site or its access points onto either Carlton Road or Blyth Road in advance of the detailed design work being carried out by the local Highway Authority and all other relevant stakeholders including my client's design team and that of Hallam Land.My client welcomes the Council's policies that seek to introduce a suitable mix of housing types and tenures3 (including affordable homes, starter homes, specialist accommodation and self-build/custom homes), quality employment and education provision, a local centre and community hub including for sports pitches, quality green space and development that fosters healthy, active lifestyles4 and is resilient to climatic change5.Indeed, the proposed allocation at Peak Hills Farm offers the opportunity to integrate significant new</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm	<p>woodland/strategic planting to tie in with existing green infrastructure (whilst also securing carbon sequestration)6 and provide a logical buffer between the new settlement edge of Worksop and Carlton to the north (which is noted will be further reinforced by the proposed Green Gap (Policy ST34)). In this connection, it is anticipated that, if allocated, the new settlement boundary for Worksop would be most logically drawn around (i.e. to include) the existing Carlton Forest Distribution Centre – providing a long term and easily recognisable northern limit to the town. With this in mind, my client has asked me to convey to you as part of these formal representations that they might also be willing to consider re-locating their existing logistics (big shed) development to an alternative location within the District as part of any measures to improve the gateway into this part of the town and to provide further flexibility for the alignment of the new distributor road and its entry point onto Blyth Road. Finally, the proximity of the already-consented waste-to-energy facility on my client's land at Carlton Forest Distribution Centre also presents a locationally unique opportunity to provide some or all of the housing and employment development with clean/green heating and power. In summary, the Draft Plan is supported in its current guise (subject to ensuring sufficient flexibility regarding the alignment of the new distributor road on the Worksop Policies Map and associated Policy ST51) and is considered sufficiently aspirational yet appropriately realistic to achieve the Council's Vision and Strategic Objectives for the District up to 2037 and beyond. As above and before, my client remains a willing, able and active participant in their role to support the Council in the identification and timely delivery of the development of the Peak Hills Farm mixed-use allocation and will look forward to meeting the Council's representatives and the local Highway Authority and Hallam Land shortly to programme the necessary strategic/design meetings. I trust the above is of assistance in confirming my client's wholehearted support for the proposed allocation and reaffirming my client's appetite and willingness to bring this site forward, in collaboration with the adjoining landowner/developer within the timescales anticipated by the Draft Plan.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF329	Resident	<p>After reading the proposal for Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm, could you inform me how the LPA have considered reasonable alternatives to the site? I have deep reservations about transport links, further school places and medical and social facilities for new and existing residents. If the plans go ahead then I would like you to write to me to guarantee the required infrastructure will be in place. Please find below further comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm.</p> <p>1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation).</p> <p>2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm.</p> <p>3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime.</p> <p>4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction.</p> <p>5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. This is in addition to delays in seeing medical staff at Larwood surgery. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable.</p> <p>6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems.</p> <p>7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster.</p> <p>8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change.</p> <p>9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character.</p> <p>10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population.</p> <p>If my concerns are overruled, I want to see:</p> <p>11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife.</p> <p>12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor.</p> <p>13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline.</p> <p>14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)</p> <p>15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution.</p> <p>16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses.</p> <p>17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport.</p> <p>18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook.</p> <p>19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings.</p> <p>20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings!' (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF340	Resident	I believe that further panning consents in the Parish of Carlton in Lindrick is in contravention of the Carlton Neighbourhood Plan which was agreed upon only last year. This plan highlighted two suitable sites that were agreed upon ... the Riddell, currently being built on by Avant Homes and the Old Firbeck Colliery site. To allow further housing development breaks this agreement between the council and the people of Carlton	Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.
REF341	Resident	I believe that further planning consents in the Parish of Carlton in Lindrick is in contravention of the Carlton Neighbourhood Plan which was agreed upon only last year. This plan highlighted two suitable sites that were agreed upon ... the Riddell, currently being built on by Avant Homes and the Old Firbeck Colliery site. To allow further housing development breaks this agreement between the council and the people of Carlton.	Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.
REF342	Resident	I believe that planning consents in the parish of Carlton in Lindrick Is in contravention of the Carlton neighbourhood plan which was Agreed upon only last year This plan highlighted two suitable sites That were agreed upon.. the Riddle and the old Firbeck colliery site To allow further housing development breaks this agreement breaks This agreement between the council and the people of Carlton	Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF348	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>Overall, the draft Bassetlaw Local Plan (BLP) has aspects that are commendable, including innovative ideas, such as the garden villages, green energy site and welcome references to the need for cycling and walking connectivity and green infrastructure. However, I have serious objections to the inclusion of a special area of countryside on the western fringe of the large proposed Peaks Hill Farm (PHF) housing development site. I also have concerns about the overall sustainability of this large Greenfield site. If you travel north from Worksop towards Carlton on the A60, on the edge of the town, you pass the G4S offices on the right in woodland. This mature wood on the right covers a hill and ridge that curves round north-eastwards to Peaks Hill farm enclosing a sloping, triangular shaped field on the right/front, bordered by the A60 (circled blue on the map below). This field is included in the plans for residential development. As you carry on north you pass Freshfields house on the left and down the hill, extensive and beautiful views of the rural landscape open out across the horizon towards Carlton direction. This landscape, the views, the mature woods and fields to the right and front, is one of the most beautiful I know. Often, as I travel back from Worksop this view will lift my spirits. It is unique and precious landscape. Once it's built on, it will be spoilt and lost for ever. It is current and future generations that will lose the enjoyment of this landscape. The 'public good', 'amenity value' or wildlife value of that landscape is priceless and is not reflected in the cost-benefit of commercial development decisions. I was shocked when I saw the plans to build on this field (just a few days before it went public). It is out of sight from Worksop, on land sloping down to Carlton and enclosed by woods. From this site is a beautiful and extensive view to the North West – the site is visible from Owday lane, over a mile away. This would be building in pristine countryside clearly separated from the town envelope. The plan states the need for a green buffer between Worksop and Carlton. I would argue that this field and its surrounding trees and ridge must be included in that green buffer zone (it's visible from the Carlton direction but not from Worksop). To build on it would set a precedent and surely other fields and woods will be built over until Worksop merges with Carlton. I would urge all councillors and relevant officers to visit the site to see with their own eyes. On p.59 of BDC's commissioned report Site Allocations: Landscape Study, is their conclusion on the Peaks Hill Farm (site 12H in the report) site: 'A combination of topography, the landscape value of existing woodlands and the extent to which the site extends north into open countryside, suggest that only a limited development in the middle and southern sections of the site could be achieved without an overall adverse landscape impact. However, care should be taken to respect topography, retain woodlands and if possible improving connectivity.' https://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/media/5295/bassetlaw-draft-landscape-study-2019.pdf That means, it is the western, A60 side of the site that will be most adversely affected and the boundary of the green buffer should therefore follow the line of the topography - i.e. follow the ridge that separates this field and Peaks Hill farm from the rest of the development site and from Worksop. Not only is this a beautiful landscape - between Worksop and Carlton/Blyth – but it is also a designed heritage landscape. The rolling fields and wooded ridges and copses were designed and planted by estate managers in the 18th and 19th centuries to be attractive and create an impact. Some of the older, 'veteran' trees found on this Peaks Hill site might pre-date this period. I do not object quite as strongly about the other parts of the proposed Peaks Hill development, as the largest part is to the East of the Peaks Hill woods, stretching over to Blyth Rd – backing on to Thievesdale, and joined on to Worksop. It is a concerning, serious loss of countryside – the site gives extensive views towards the Trent in the NE direction - but the development will be less visible from the roads running into Worksop from the North. Therefore, like the Landscape Study Report, I think development on the south and middle sections of the site can be managed better in terms of acceptable landscape impact than any development near the A60 on the west side of the site. However, in this, my amendment to my original submission, I have reflected on other submissions made on this site and thought through concerns of others re the sustainability of the PHF site. Although I'm most concerned about the landscape impact on the western part of the site, I now think the sustainability of the whole PHF site is questionable. The proposal for PHF is for 1500, mainly 3 or 4 bed 'executive' homes, probably to be occupied by commuters working in South Yorks (a reasonable expectation, given what's happened at similar recent developments such as Gateford). This will put more traffic on the roads and more strain on local health and education services for decades to come. There will be the irrevocable loss of a large wildlife resource. There are still areas of Brownfield sites, possibly in Bassetlaw, (more will become available in the future) certainly in South Yorks, - that could be developed for housing (but are less attractive to developers). Instead, large proposed Greenfield</p>	<p>continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p> <p>The field adjacent to the A60 will be protected as green infrastructure so will remain open. However the road is considered to be necessary to manage traffic flow in Worksop so will remain part of the scheme. Any trees lost will be replaced on site.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm	<p>sites, such as PHF, in the Draft Plan are in danger of eroding the clear asset that Bassetlaw has – beautiful landscape and quiet roads. Government, at all levels, should take in the wider regional and national picture of sustainability – and that needs to be factored into this District Local Plan. Developing Greenfield sites is clearly profitable for landowners, developers and builders (and car manufacturers) but is damaging the environment, quality of life (and the planet) for future generations in Bassetlaw by removing the amenity value of this attractive countryside. Another aspect of the proposed development is a relief road running through the site from Blyth road and coming out on the A60 near the Peaks Hill farm (though this location is not confirmed). Highway matters are clearly for the County Highways to consider but I have serious concerns as it a dangerous stretch of fast road, on a bend and a hill, and it has had several fatalities in recent years. If there has to be a new road – and I'm not convinced there is a need for one – it should be at the south end of the proposed site and come out onto the A60 closer to G4S offices. I also believe the consultation period should be extended. From talking to residents in Carlton and in Worksop, it seems few members of the public are aware of the Draft Local Plan, let alone that this piece of land is affected. Such an important plan with huge changes for Bassetlaw needs extensive publicity and consultation. Yes, consultation on the Local Plan in its various guises seems to have been going on years but there have been such drastic changes to the LP in the last few months - such as the PHF site coming forward, and abandoning the previously proposed garden village sites – changes that even many BDC clrs were not aware of (until just before it went public). The PHF site is within the Carlton in Lindrick Parish boundary but even ward District clrs were not consulted on full details of this site until early January 2020 and Parish Clrs learned about it only when public consultation started. The village developed its own Neighbourhood Plan, finalised last year, with assistance from BDC planners and the PHF site is not mentioned because it had not been brought forward at that time. It is fair to say that the concerns I am expressing here in my submission are shared by most of the Parish Council. BDC planning officers can confirm that, as they attended the PC meeting on 11th February 2020, (that I attended as a resident) that discussed the PHF site, the Draft LP and concerns around that. I do recognise the pressures on the council from government to find space for more housing to allow Worksop to grow and prosper but Bassetlaw is well ahead of government targets in that respect. I also note there are opportunities to develop much needed safe cycle links between PHF, Worksop and Carlton, as referenced in the Plan. In Conclusion, if PHF site is to go forward, despite doubts about its sustainability, I believe the particular field, woods and views alongside the A60, are precious to local people, to wildlife (deer, buzzards and many other species are regularly seen here) and to future generations, and therefore, the boundary of Green buffer zone should be redrawn to follow the natural boundary of the wooded ridge between Worksop and the open country to the north, to include and protect this relatively small but special piece of land (and remove it from the PHF site). Policy ST15 – Peaks Hill Farm Specifically I object to the inclusion of a triangular field to the east of the A60, between G4S and Peaks Hill Farm. The view, the aspect of this field, surrounded by mature trees on a woodland ridge is really beautiful. It is also separated from Worksop, and from the rest of development by this woodland ridge. To build in this field would be urban intrusion into pristine countryside. It will set a precedent – moving Worksop down the hill towards Worksop. (rest of the development, east of the ridge is on the Worksop side of the ridge and adjoining thivesdale and therefore less damaging. The quality of life (and wildlife) will be damaged for everyone who walks, cycles or drives along this route – losing such a wonderful vista/aspect. Damage to woods and its wildlife – deer, buzzards etc... will be considerable. In conclusion, any buffer zone between Carlton and Worksop should follow the topography – follow the wooded ridge line from G4S to Peaks Hill Farm and the field in question should be removed from the residential designation. I am also concerned at the safety implications of a link road joining the A60 near Peaks Hill. It is a fast, busy road and there have been several fatal accidents on the hill/bend at Peaks Hill – visibility is very poor.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF369	Resident	<p>We are writing to you to raise awareness and express our deep concern at the inclusion of large amounts of farmland and countryside, designated for housing development in the above Plan. We are members of the RSPB, WW Fund For Nature and the National Trust. Our concerns are not simply NIMBY, but national and global. Our belief is that we are part of nature, not separate from it and we all, therefore, have a moral duty to protect what we are all currently custodians of. We are particularly horrified at the extent of destruction of local greenfield sites especially that proposed for Peaks Hill Farm (PHF) Policy 15. An urban sprawl of this size would have a catastrophic impact on wildlife habitats including for buzzards, owls, sparrow hawks, invertebrates, mammals (including bats) and pollinators, all of which inhabit the site. There are already 174 houses being built adjacent to this site (The Edge) with The Plan adding 'at least 750' more in phase 1 on 54 hectares and '750' in phase 2. The impact on Worksop will be immense. The roads surrounding the site are single lane, country-style roads. The impact on the already stretched infrastructure, including local roads, the A57 to Sheffield, GP surgeries (the waiting time for appointments at Newgate Medical Group for example, is already 6 weeks) dentists, the hospital, schools etc will be more intolerable when added to the huge sprawling developments currently in progress at Gateford and near Shireoaks and all the other sites. The size of the PHF site means its development will be spread over decades. For many members of the local community, this will mean the anxiety of continued disruption, inconvenience, noise, heavy plant, dust and other pollution, and in the case of the elderly, literally for the rest of their lives. The proposal at PHF has very little, if any, concrete evidence of appropriate, new infrastructure support compared particularly to the proposed Bassetlaw Garden Village ST1 ST3 ST35 and ST36, which is to have a nursery and primary school, healthcare facilities, parks, enhanced transport networks, flood risk management and a new railway station etc demonstrating what is deemed necessary for a development of 750 homes. However, there is nothing specific for PHF, a development of the same size, other than a road across the estate and a local bus service. The Plan clearly implies minimal infrastructure investment on and around this site and waives the Community Infrastructure Levy other than for that required to enable the development to take place. Connectivity in and out of Worksop is already inadequate and under stress. We now commute to Sheffield by train. It is a poor service:- dirty, overcrowded, unreliable, infrequent and increasingly difficult to park at the station. We used to commute by car, a journey that used to take 35 minutes to the centre and now takes about an hour. We accept the need for additional housing but not of this magnitude, especially on prime farming land that should provide locally produced food, and the surrounding green-space which has been countryside since time immemorial. National evidence shows that local authorities have limited power to enforce the provision of affordable housing on development sites and developers, who are interested in maximising their profits, do not appear to be voluntarily providing them. Worksop has a population of 42,000+. The housing currently being built and also proposed is largely 3, 4 and 5 bedroom detached. The average house price in Worksop is £139,000. New developments - see Rippon Homes development off Blyth Road - are 'luxury homes' being marketed to commuters. These are not what many local people can afford to buy and we cannot find evidence to support the concept that by building lots of houses - sustainable, local employment will follow - in less affluent locations. It is more feasible, that the purchasers of large homes in less well off areas will be commuters who will be unlikely to work within and spend in the local economy. One of Worksop's Unique Selling Points is its rural location which is what attracted us to move here from Sheffield 23 years go. It is now being turned into a sprawling commuter belt. The Plan consistently uses the term 'sustainable development'. This is absolute 'greenwash'. How can, by its very nature, the irrevocable loss of farmland and countryside be deemed sustainable? All the national and international agendas and concerns of, for example, global warming, locally-sourced food, light/noise/traffic pollution, urban drainage, local infrastructure capacity, health and wellbeing etc will continue to be eroded if destruction of the countryside is allowed at this housing saturation level.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
REF370	Resident	<p>Are houses definitely being built between Worksop/ Carlton on Blyth Road side I object to further development of housing near to Carlton.</p>	Comments noted

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF376	Resident	<p>We write to you with grave concern over the proposed planning development at the above site. We wish to make you aware of a number of strong objections that we have with regard to the proposed development of 174 houses on the open space to the side of Thievesdale Lane. As an immediate neighbour to the site or a resident of Worksop, we are of the view that the proposed development will have a serious impact on our standard of living, our community and environment. Our specific objections are as follows:</p> <p>Worksop is identified as a service centre. While Worksop does have schools, GP surgeries, train station, shop and local bus services, these facilities, particularly the schools and surgeries, are already at capacity. The train line is an artery in to the town, the station car park is usually full, and in addition to this there are plans to encourage drivers to use public transport.</p> <p>1. "A development should not set an undesirable precedent for other sites where equity development would be difficult to resist and where cumulatively the resultant scale of development would erode the character and environment of the area". We believe this proposal would do exactly that. To add more than this number of houses to Worksop would significantly erode the character and community of the Town.</p> <p>2. "Proposals which would generate significant levels of traffic will not be permitted in location where travel by means other than a private car is not a realistic alternative". This is certainly the case here. The proposed development is over two miles from the station, so people are unlikely to walk, especially if commuting. People are likely to choose to drive, especially as:</p> <p>3. Buses along Thievesdale Lane are infrequent, unreliable and stop running before 7pm. There are no bus shelters or real time bus timetable information points. Buses are not timed to coincide with trains at Worksop Station. The bicycle lanes are inadequate and dangerous, putting cyclists in conflict with pedestrians if they ride on the bike lanes, and with drivers if they do not. Roads between the site and centre of town are dangerous to cycle on in the dark. There are no bike racks at bus stops, and inadequate bike racks at the station. This development is therefore likely to increase cars on the village roads significantly.</p> <p>The Council is proposing to increase the overall target for new housing on this site to at least 1634 homes on Peaks Hill Farm. The majority of this housing to be built in the near future. (As a matter of interest, the amount of added vehicles to our undeveloped roads would be over 1000 from this one site alone!). The town and outlying district roads would not be able to cope with this amount, not to mention other housing building sites in the district.</p> <p>Also with this amount of dwellings in place and the number of people involved, has the Council put any thought into our already over subscribed GP surgeries, where we have to wait up to six weeks for an appointment to see our own doctor? Our schools are also oversubscribed so much so that children are having to spend considerable time and distance travelling back and forth. It's not rocket science to see there will be more school runs for more vehicles to make.</p> <p>There was no mention in the consultation of what the council has planned for the disruption to the wild life in this area. There is proof that buzzards nest in the plantation wooded area, but consideration needs to be given to a variety of animal, insect and bird species that live and breed in the surrounding fields and hedges.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
REF391	Resident	<p>Policy 15 Bassetlaw Local Plan – Peaks Farm policy</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We are against the inclusion of prime farmland and green belt land at Peaks Hill Farm, Policy 15 within the Bassetlaw Plan. 2. The development site is too large it will have a great an impact on local residents of Worksop. At least 750 dwellings and business and employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently built by Rippon Homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all the local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of a least a 15 year building site. 3. Areas of prime local food-growing land when councils should be helping to mitigate climate change. 4. Loss of invaluable green space at has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character. 5. Effect loss of our established local wildlife and green environment (birds, sparrowhawk, owls, buzzards) frogs, toad, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. 	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF392	Resident	<p>Worksop is a pretty market town which we are all proud of the stretch of countryside on Carlton Road down to Carlton village is an example of lovely countryside with fields and woodlands is all this to be spoilt plundering woodlands and wildlife. We are being told about the importance of climate change this seems to be doing the opposite plus the traffic problems which according to the planners will be improved seems to be unbelievable. On a personal level I have lived on Winster Grove 22 years and my property is on the boundary of the site, through the years we have suffered quad bikes, motor cycles leaving the site as a race track and if the plan for a footpath comes about have we now to suffer people using our street as a short cut to all the amenities we are told about. Great, we will have to look forward to all and sundry passing our bungalows owned mostly by over 80's on there way back and forward to the local public houses and houses looking down on our gardens taking our hard earned privacy. A suggestion at one of the meetings was that the site be made into smaller sites housing a retirement village and sites for first time occupants and one for young families. Could something on these lines be considered. We realise more houses have to be available but can't we try to live together in harmony and think more carefully when planning.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
REF393	Resident	<p>Housing requirement is shown by settlement Worksop 2180 Large Rural Villages 1764 (includes Carlton in Lindrick) Site HS1 Peaks Hill Farm Peaks Farm is in Carlton in Lindrick people clarify who is administrating this site. The first line reads "the type and mix....ensures the needs of local people are met". This is not Carlton Parish Council experience.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF395	Resident	<p>My opposition for the proposed planning of 2X 750 houses. I am against the Peaks Hill Farm policy 15, within the Bassetlaw Local Plan. With the loss of prime farmland and green belt land. It will have a great impact on the local residents as the development proposed is too far too large. It will mean that the noise, pollution from heavy ground working vehicles, disruption and the inconvenience of at least 15 years of building work. Why does Worksop need another 1500 houses? Especially on green belt land with ancient woodland and wildlife. What happened to the plan to build on the brownfield site at the back of the Kilton Golf Club? It seems to be a re-occurrence of the Firbeck pit site and the new builds adjacent to the Riddle Arms. The roads in and out of Worksop are really congested and couldn't cope with the extra influx of traffic. The railway is insufficient and the road off Thievesdale Lane/ Blyth Road is an accident waiting to happen. At certain times it's like dicing with death, it's so unbelievable. Worksop has a newish built hospital which is only running at half capacity! i.e. the children's ward. This means Worksop people have to go to Doncaster Royal (another county) which is in dire need of a good deep clean. The children are shipped out to other hospitals. What would the effect be with more homes being built? Also waiting time to see doctor (6 weeks) at any one of the surgeries in the area, how will they cope? Also the loss of prime food growing land and the green space that's always been there that helps form the character of Worksop. It will effect the loss of established local wildlife i.e. (pheasants, owls, buzzards, jays, sparrowhawks etc, plus the beautiful skylark that makes its nest on the ground. It will also take its toll on the hedgehogs, hares, bats, toads, frogs, newts and the different species of insects. At the end of the wood on Long Plantation there is a public footpath. It seems that someone has removed the said sign, probably the farmer that's been renting this land! What will you do about this? How did the farmer irrigate his crops on the Long Plantation and surrounding fields? Through the dry spells I've seen this done on a number of occasions! I know that there is a post with the letters S.V. on it (Service Value) does this mean that there is a lake or reservoir beneath the land? If this is so we the residents could be prone to flooding when all the concrete and tarmac roads are put down. An extension to deadline 26/02/2020 Because of the failings of the consultation process. Appendix 4 (page 193) of the Bassetlaw Local Plan document outlines the community consultation process. Concerns if over-ruled We need to see:1. A green buffer zone between current resident's homes and the new development with a minimum of 15 metres to provide a green corridor for privacy. 2. The new homes to have gardens that back onto the buffer zone to increase the distance between the existing homes and the new buildings to extend the green corridor. 3. Low level housing near to the bungalows and existing homes (no high rise town houses).4. Pathways to connect to existing woodland and access to public transport.5. Any communal areas to be behind the treeline and away from any existing homes. i.e. sports field, youth facilities, playgrounds, shops etc....I had my bungalow valued on the 19/2/20 because of what's going on with this said policy 15 plan, only to be told that the value would depreciate as the outlook from my home is a big selling point. Does this mean I can get compensation from the Bassetlaw District Council if the said policy 15 goes ahead??</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
REF396	Resident	<p>Already 174 new homes being built at Thievesdale/ Blyth Road. New housing near the Innings. Plan proposes at least 750 more houses and businesses units and other retail and commercial use. Then after 2026 – 750 more houses! I disagree with these numbers, far too many in the same location with unfair adverse effect on the local community. This will cause congestion to the area, more traffic, more free parking on roads near hospital which already causes difficult driving on Blyth Road.</p> <p>Also put extra pressure on an already stretched hospital, A&E department and the Doctors surgery At Larwood. The plan states retail and commercial uses – surely the retail shops at the Innings (a good mixture post office, chemist, sainsburys express) Morrisons supermarket, the new ASDA store all within easy reach, a corner shop would be more in-keeping, no need for yet another supermarket.</p> <p>I like to shop locally and in the town, and want Worksop to flourish, but have noticed many empty houses and premises could some of these premises be utilised into dwellings which would lower the need for such a large development off Blyth Road. I wish to keep the countryside approach to Worksop and keep existing hedges, trees, woods will remain and new development will be in-keeping with the area, having low rise, bungalows, two storey houses and no flats.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF397	Resident	<p>1. The proposed pathway linking Winster Grove with the new development is of concern. A similar path of Ambleside Grange had to be closed due to vandalism and noise. 2. The effect on the local wildlife could be devastating. Owls, Buzzards, Woodpeckers and foxes to name a few. The fields are also home to numerous butterflies most of which are in danger of extinction. 3. The impact on the local community and its services is also of concern, where most of the new householders will be commuters who will invest little into the locality in particular a dying town centre.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
REF398	Resident	<p>Peaks Hill Farm Development</p> <p>The notice for proposed allocation in the draft Bassetlaw Local Plan 2018 - 2037 posted around the Thievesdale Area on the lamp posts stated proposed 750 houses 5 ha employment land, supporting road infrastructure shop and community facilities. Location land at Peaks Hill Farm Gateford Worksop S81 04N. I read the one posted on the lamp post on Kingsdale Thievesdale S81 0JX. At first glance I thought why is this proposed development at Gateford anything to do with our area Thievesdale. Most people would not have given it a second glance, but of course that was not the case and maybe done deliberately to keep people away from the proposed meetings?</p> <p>If the announcement about this development had been made before the general election, I wonder if people may have voted differently, and what is the views of our new Member of Parliament about the proposed development.</p> <p>The Long Plantation</p> <p>I do believe you will destroy the Long Plantation and all the wildlife in this area, it will be lost forever, you say for every house built 5 trees will be planted this does not compensate for the loss of the wildlife habitat and ancient woodland.</p> <p>Bridleway</p> <p>The bridleway sign at the end of the Long Plantation has gone missing, it is said the farmer removed the sign, and what are you proposing to do about this bridleway?</p> <p>The local amenities i.e. hospitals, doctors, police, bus services, school and roads cannot cope now without the populations as it is, so how will it cope with an influx of more housing and all that comes with it. The brownfield sites around Bassetlaw area could and should have been used for housing instead of more supermarkets and fast food outlets. As for Worksop Town Centre it is a ghost tow, it is time to develop this and not the greenfield sites. Save our greenfields for future generations</p> <p>This development will destroy the visual aspects of the northern end of Worksop. Bassetlaw should look at the brownfield sites with Government grants, clearing these sites and developing them for housing and not using the greenfield sites saving them for future generations to enjoy. It is said the landowner wants to sell the land at Peaks Hill Farm, whoever buys it should not be allowed to use the site for anything else but farming land</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF399	Resident	<p>Disagree with building on farmland</p> <p>Disagree with building of roads cycle routes and pathways. Not only will building on this land strip valuable farmland and will also impact on wildlife and plant life and woodland.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
REF405	Resident	<p>Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm</p> <p>1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)</p> <p>2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks at Peaks Hill Farm</p> <p>3. The development site is too large and will have too great impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon Homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime.</p> <p>4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction.</p> <p>5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station car park is often full and the train services poor and unreliable.</p> <p>6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems.</p> <p>7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster.</p> <p>8. Loss of prime local-food growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change</p> <p>9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character.</p> <p>10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including Sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population.</p> <p>If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:</p> <p>11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife.</p> <p>12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the buffer zone to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses to extend the green corridor.</p> <p>13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgrounds, car parks and sports pitches to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the tree line.</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultation events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm	<p>14. New developments to have a minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change).</p> <p>15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution</p> <p>16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher rise town houses</p> <p>17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport.</p> <p>18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook</p> <p>19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings</p> <p>20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan) 21. Any square meter of ground built upon means it's one less square meter of earth to soak away rain water.</p>	
REF410	Resident	<p>Policy HS1 Proposed development at Worksop Peaks Hill Farm, between Carlton Road and Blyth Road. My concern is the congestion this will potentially cause on Blyth Road. Particularly if the proposed plan for a Lidl store at the end of Blyth Road goes ahead. During peak times it is very difficult of the end of Westfield Drive trying to get onto Blyth Road. Whilst any development must be good for the town we do need it – hopefully new residents will want to shop in the town centre – here I think this needs developing, bringing in new shops, high street names if possible. How will the hospital cope with all these extra residents? Many of the facilities have been transferred to DRI. Bassetlaw Hospital should be for people of the area and patients not be sent further afield for treatment.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF413	Resident	<p>Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm</p> <p>1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)</p> <p>2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks at Peaks Hill Farm</p> <p>3. The development site is too large and will have too great impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon Homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime.</p> <p>4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction.</p> <p>5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station car park is often full and the train services poor and unreliable.</p> <p>6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems.</p> <p>7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster.</p> <p>8. Loss of prime local-food growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change</p> <p>9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character.</p> <p>10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including Sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population.</p> <p>If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:</p> <p>11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife.</p> <p>12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the buffer zone to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses to extend the green corridor.</p> <p>13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgrounds, car parks and sports pitches to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the tree line.</p> <p>14. New developments to have a minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change).</p> <p>15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution</p> <p>16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher rise town houses</p> <p>17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport.</p> <p>18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook</p> <p>19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings</p> <p>20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p> <p>21. Any square meter of ground built upon means it's one less square meter of earth to soak away rain water.</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF414	Resident	<p>Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon Homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime. 4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction. 5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station car park is often full and the train services poor and unreliable. 6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems.7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster. 8. Loss of prime local-food growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character.10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including Sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. If my concerns are overruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife.12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the buffer zone to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses to extend the green corridor. 13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgrounds, car parks and sports pitches to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the tree line.14. New developments to have a minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change). 15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport.18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)21. Any square meter of ground built upon means it's one less square meter of earth to soak away rain water.</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultation events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF415	Resident	<p>Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon Homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime. 4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction. 5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station car park is often full and the train services poor and unreliable. 6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems.7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster. 8. Loss of prime local-food growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character.10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including Sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. If my concerns are overruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife.12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the buffer zone to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses to extend the green corridor. 13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgrounds, car parks and sports pitches to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the tree line.14. New developments to have a minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change). 15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport.18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)21. Any square meter of ground built upon means it's one less square meter of earth to soak away rain water.</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>
REF419	Resident	<p>Peaks Hill Farm, Worksop Brooks Farm, Fresh Fields. I am opposed to the volume of properties to be built on this site. I am also opposed to the proposed building on open countryside adjacent to the A60 Worksop – Carlton Road.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF420	Resident	<p>Please do not plan for a walk through into Winster Grove. We moved into the grove in 1996 and front gardens are across the road (it is a banking now full of shrubs etc...). The first years was used by teenagers jumping over the new fences as a short cut to Hemmingfield Rise. It took nearly a year to convince them to stop using it as a short cut. We also had people bring their dog and letting their dog use it as a toilet. A path between houses on Ambleside from Lodore Road had to be closed because of vandalism.</p>	<p>continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p> <p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
REF421	Resident	<p>Policy ST15</p> <p>1. Concerned for the overall impact on the community where services are already over stretched. Examples: Health care facilities, Doctor's surgeries, hospitals and schools.</p> <p>2. Increase in traffic and pollution to the environment.</p> <p>3. Adverse effects on our wildlife to name a few birds, butterflies and hedgehogs.</p> <p>4. The pathway proposed linking the new development with Winster Grove is also a concern especially when a similar pathway on Ambleside Grange had to be closed off due to noise and vandalism.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF427	Resident	I am writing in connection with the above potential development. I oppose this development due to many factors. I moved into my house nearly 25 years ago as it was on the verge of the countryside, being the last road in Worksop. Once these fields are built on the countryside is lost forever, what about the wildlife? Also how are the Doctors surgeries going to cope, we have problems getting appointments now. Schools will be another problem, I understand they are already full. There is already enough upheaval with the smaller development in Thievesdale Lane, multiply that by many times and one can only imagine the noise and pollution. I wish the Council to think long and hard before going ahead with the disastrous plan.	Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.
REF461	Resident	Re the above development, I have noted all your ideas for housing and business and of course tree planting. I note you have said upto (4 trees per house). Excellent but? You will have to stipulate that the trees must not be moved or removed by the householder. I also note that we do have a couple of well developed woods towards the Farm and Carlton Road areas. Any amount of tree planting will not remove Carltonlindrick like these extensive woods do at present. Any plans to remove any of these trees is misguided and downright criminal? Given the outcry it would have both locally and nationally. Houses can be built sympathetically around them with a bit of thought. I didn't see anything on the plans re-the junction at the bottom of the hill- surely a roundabout is needed. It is a (blackspot) and increased traffic there would make things worse. I do understand that people need homes but given the needs of the planet. I think much thought is needed for forward planning. Which also must take note from people already living here, who have to live with it if you got it wrong!!	Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF481	Carlton Ward Members, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>As members for Carlton, we wish to represent the views heard from residents about the proposed Peaks Hill Farm development. There were a group of comments summarised by the phrase – this is Carlton not Worksop. Residents wanted to know how the site can go ahead if it's not in the neighbourhood plan and, correspondingly, why it wasn't included in the Neighbourhood Plan, given that the plan is so young. Likewise, residents feel that Carlton should be involved in the site's development. It is noted that the site is CIL exempt, a site that would have seen 25% go to the Parish. Residents want to be compensated for that loss and ask that some 106 monies benefit Carlton; a cycle-way linking Red Lane/Wigthorpe across the estate to Peppers was suggested. Protecting the green buffer or Greenbelt as it's colloquially known. Residents see this site eroding the existing buffer between Worksop and Carlton. For some this means no building at all, for others, it means siting all development behind the natural buffers of existing woodland and escarpment. This second group would not want to see houses along the A60 and some residents report that such assurances were given by officers at consultation meetings. Our sense is that this is the main concern of Carlton residents: namely that the existing feeling of separation along the A60 remains intact. During the consultation we have visited the site on three occasions and it's a route used by pedestrians and cyclists in some numbers. Maintaining this natural green barrier is in accordance with advice of the landscape consultant and would protect the character of the non-designated heritage site in the immediate vicinity. The proposed link road is problematic in this regard. Residents do not want the road to 'tear' through the woodland. This would uproot many existing established trees and given the topography, leave a wide scar in the woodland that would take years to green over. In this regard we would support the opinion of the tree consultant who identifies a less intrusive route in the extreme south of the site. This takes out less established trees and would provide a shorter straighter and, being a right angles to the A69 as well as to the escarpment, less intrusive route to A60 road users. It would also come out opposite or close to the road through Gateford and so, give the feel that this is a continuous ring-road link. Finally, landscape. Some residents noted that the draft plan protects land to the north of Red Lance, land to the west of the A60 towards the Rotherham boundary as well as land to the east of the A60 through Costhorpe towards Blyth Road. In effect residents believe this will stop the current Avant homes development from creeping northwards. This is to be welcomed and gives added weight to the protection of village views identified in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>The Plan will be amended to clarify that the site sits with Carlton Parish. Should it be evidenced that impacts from the development affect Carlton Parish then developer contributions will be sought. The Local Plan will require for example a contribution to the civic centre/youth facilities in Carlton. A green gap has been designated between Carlton and Worksop. This restricts development. There are no plans for Worksop to grow further north. The field adjacent to the A60 will be protected as green infrastructure so will remain open. However the road is considered to be necessary to manage traffic flow in Worksop so will remain part of the scheme. Any trees lost will be replaced on site.</p>
REF486	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>The link road through Peaks Hill Farm site Is the case for this road made water-tight against potential developer challenge when planning applications come in? I read that such a link road will reduce congestion in and around Worksop. Which incoming traffic flows will it divert from Worksop? I can't think of any flows it will divert away from Victoria Square, Carlton and Gateford Roads, Watson Road or on any of the junctions identified as requiring upgrades on the A57. Presumably, the hope is, that it will reduce flows along Raymouth and Thievesdale Lane and the Cannon Crossroads junction by providing an alternative route from the A57 through Gateford and Peaks Hill. Yet, I can find no evidence in the supporting documentation which quantifies how much traffic this will divert. I accept there is traffic on the Gateford/A1 route which would happily divert but what proportion of the lanes total is that? Maybe some Kilton/A57 traffic will divert also but given that it will require cars to travel 2 KM's north up Blyth Road past Farmers Branch before lopping around to join the B6041 it is unlikely to prove the route of choice for many. That journey would be even more unattractive if the link road exits onto the A60 and not directly opposite the existing entrance to Gateford Park, requiring motorists to negotiate an extra two junctions on the busy A60. An assessment of the traffic flows from within the development is made. No mention is made of its impact on Cannon cross roads, as far as I can see. Yet, traffic from the site will use the crossroads, traffic to Worksop centre, to the station, to Celtic point, to Valley schools and the leisure centre and even to Claylands industrial factories. It is assumed that the £1.2 m set aside for improvements there will be sufficient to cope with this increase?</p>	<p>The Council's Transport Assessment shows that this road will aid traffic flow and movement around the town. The development will have impacts on various junctions including Cannon Crossroads and Kilton Road roundabout. These will be referenced in future policies.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST16 HS2 Pupil Referral Centre			
REF201	Severn Trent	<p>As the site is a proposed redevelopment site it is important that the drainage and sewerage systems are designed in accordance with current industry best practice, looking to identify separate systems for surface water and foul water, so that the drainage Hierarchy and SuDS, can be used to provide a sustainable development and improve resilience to flooding and climate change. New developments should also be designed with water efficiency in mind. Development should also consider the need to incorporate Water efficiency and Water re-use within the development to ensure that it is delivered in a sustainable way. Severn Trent would therefore recommend that Policy 16 incorporates specific statements to require the development to consider design principles outline above, some example wording that we feel would assist with this is provided under the Bassetlaw Garden village comments above. The Former Pupil Referral Centre site is located within a within Source Protection Zone (SPZ), please refer to Protection of Groundwater sources section of our response.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Appropriate changes have been made to the relevant parts of the Plan.</p>
REF222	Notts CC	Figure 15 - should the access and frontage car park be included in the site area? There does not appear to be access from the public highway without it.	Agreed. Site area will need amending to reflect this.
REF116	Network Rail	Although there are no direct planned allocations adjacent or close to railway lines at Worksop, as is the case in Retford we presume a strategic look at road vehicle traffic patterns has been or will be undertaken and the effects of increased traffic over Worksop station LC will be considered as part of that strategic exercise.	Noted. Thank you for comment.
REF023	Water Management Consortium	'This site is outside of the Board's district'.	Noted. Thank you for comment.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST18 HS4 Former Manton Primary School			
REF026	Resident	<p>i wish to raise some concerns about the proposed new plans for the buildings that are planned for manton school site i live on kingston road straight across from were its looks like that were the access is going to be for the new houses its already heavy with the traffic from cars and vans parking both side of the road i have to park my car outside my house as i dont have a drive and i have my car damaged on more than one occasion i am concerned about the noise and extra traffic and all the disruption were i live its also going to spoil the view i have to were all i see his the houses im also concerned about what kind of people its going to bring as on phelham street and shrusbury road all the antisocial behaviour and drug related crimes its going to be chaotic its alright proposing these new plans but the people who live there already have just got to put up with what will come its lovely at the moment love getting up to the view also i think it will cause parking problems on our street because if the plans go a head people will just park outside our houses and i need to park outside our house as my husband is disabled and also to let you know that someone has taken the one sign down with the proposed plans if you could please put these concerns forward and keep me informed about how things are going i will try and email so photos so you have an insight on how it will in pack we i live many thanks</p>	<p>The upcoming Design SPD for the site will address access into the site and will make sure that the scale, density and design of the site is location appropriate. The SPD will also detail suitable open space provision on site so the landscape of the site can be retained. The design SPD will detail the request for off road parking, which will address any concerns regarding parking capacity as well.</p>
REF137	Resident	<p>There is no school in the area nearest 2 mls away. NO bus service to get children to school. Where the entrance appears to be there is an electric sub-station in the middle. Road cannot sustain an influx of traffic. There has already been sink holes in the area. One of which was on Kingston Road. No access for H.G.V.</p>	<p>In order to make the development of the site sustainable, a design SPD will be created to set out development principles. This will also include the establishment of appropriate access into the site. The provision of schools falls under Notts County Council, however large development sites are required to make monetary contributions towards additional school spaces/upgrading infrastructure as appropriate.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST18 HS4 Former Manton Primary School			
REF201	Severn Trent	<p>There are surface water sewers indicated within the vicinity of the site therefore no connection of surface water to Foul Sewers shall be permitted. Severn Trent note that Section 1 of Policy 18 details the development of a Design Quality SPD, we would recommend that Water Efficiency design and Water re-use is either covered specifically within policy 18 or covered by the Design Quality SPD. It is noted that Section 5 of policy 18 also refers to the re-location of existing open space within the site boundary to provide a multifunctional open space, we would also recommend that specific reference to SuDS and the Drainage Hierarchy are made either within this policy or the SPD. The Former Manton Primary School Site is located within a within Source Protection Zone (SPZ), please refer to Protection of Groundwater sources section of our response.</p>	<p>The principle of water efficiency design are covered by the Policies ST46 and ST48. The upcoming Design Quality SPD will however, make specific reference to water efficiency design. The development of this site will be sensitive to available open space in the area and will require contribution towards the provision/impovement of open space in the District. Please see the policy edited as requested as well.</p>
REF379	Resident	<p>Agree with the need for social and affordable new build. Stress both social ad affordable, not provide housing. Concerns about access roads and infrastructure. For example, local services, GPs, Hospitals, schools already struggle due to cuts and demand. Are have plans to look at this as well. Also Retford Road – old knitwear site – absolutely needs to be re-developed but already it struggles to cope with traffic plans for this need to be alongside new builds. Also same at the old Manton School.</p>	<p>The upcoming Design SPD for the site will address access into the site and will make sure that the scale, density and design of the site is location appropriate. HS6 The Old Knitwear Site has planning permission (20/00183/FUL). Any upgrades to road infrastructure would have been considered through the planning process.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST19 HS5 Talbot Road			
REF201	Severn Trent	<p>There are surface water sewers indicated within the vicinity of the site therefore no connection of surface water to Foul Sewers shall be permitted. Severn Trent note that Section 1 of Policy 19 details the development of a Design Quality SPD, we would recommend that Water Efficiency design and Water re-use is either covered specifically within Policy 19 or covered by the Design Quality SPD. It is noted that Section 5 of Policy 19 indicates that open space will not be provided by the development directly. Severn Trent would therefore note that SuDS and the Drainage Hierarchy are key design considerations for this development.</p> <p>Whilst we appreciate that due to the scale of the development there is limited space available for green features, it is still important that any surface water leaving the site is discharged in a sustainable way, and is of suitable quality that it would not cause harm to the water environment to water resources within the underlying Principle Aquifer. We would therefore recommend that a specific statement is made regarding SuDS and the Drainage Hierarchy within Policy 19 some example wording that we feel would assist with this is provided under the Bassetlaw Garden village comments above. The Talbot Street Site is located within a within Source Protection Zone (SPZ), please refer to Protection of Groundwater sources section of our response.</p>	<p>The principle of water efficiency design are covered by the Policies ST46 and ST48. The upcoming Design Quality SPD will however, make specific reference to water efficiency design. The development of this site will be sensitive to available open space in the area and will require contribution towards the provision/impovement of open space in the District. Site HS4 Former Manton Primary School will also provide new accessible open space in close proximity to the site. Furthermore, please see policy ammended the refer to SuDs.</p>
REF222	Notts CC	Strategic Highways There is a problem with the formatting in section 4 'Lincoln Street' and there are two 4, a)	Thank you for your comments, please see policy ammended as suggested.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST20 Former Knitwear Factory			
1189777	Resident	Welcome this development, but regret that the adjacent derelict site facing directly onto the Chesterfield Canal that includes the fabulous Bracebridge Pumping Station, is not mentioned anywhere in the Local Plan.	The Bracebridge Pumping Station has not been submitted for consideration as a site allocation in the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST20 Former Knitwear Factory			
REF115	Canal and River Trust	The site lies in proximity to a watercourse to the north, which interacts with the Chesterfield Canal. As the site has been historically utilised for industrial use, there is a risk that contamination is present on site. To prevent pollution towards the local waterway environment, opportunities could be taken to expand the policy to require the submission of relevant geoenvironmental surveys to categorise the risk and to recommend appropriate mitigation measures to limit any risk to the river Ryton and canal. The site is in proximity to an access point to the Chesterfield canal (150m north of the site), which would provide pedestrian and cycle access to the town centre and to the wider Green infrastructure network. Recommend that the policy include the inclusion of measures to promote wayfinding to the canal, which could be of benefit to new residents.	A criteria will be added to ensure remediation forms part of the development proposal, where appropriate. Connectivity to the pedestrian and cycle network is identified by Policy 20. A requirement for directional signage to the network will be added to Policy 20.
1195884	Resident	Support regeneration of old factory sites and derelict sites.	Support welcome and noted.
REF201	Severn Trent	The northern Boundary of the site is the River Ryton and a Canal Feeder, there are also surface water sewers indicated within the vicinity of the site therefore no connection of surface water to Foul Sewers shall be permitted. Whilst Severn Trent appreciate that this is a brownfield site and that there will be additional challenges to overcome as part of development it is essential that development is still designed in accordance with current best practice as much as possible, this will include ensuring the surface water is discharge sustainably in accordance with the Drainage Hierarchy, and that a presumed outfall to existing connection points is not automatically used. Development should also look to incorporate SuDS within the development looking to enhance water quality, amenity and biodiversity within the area as well as providing surface water storage. Recommend that Policy 20 specifically details these elements, some example wording that we feel would assist with this is provided under the Bassetlaw Garden village. Water efficiency and water re-use should be considered for this development. This could be covered by Policy 20 directly or within the Design Quality SPD. The Former Kinitwear Factory Site is located within a within Source Protection Zone (SPZ), please refer to Protection of Groundwater sources section of our response.	Policy ST47 requires major development to incorporate SUDS. Criteria will be added to Policy ST48: Water Quality to ensure all development follows the drainage hierarchy. Both are strategic policies so apply to all relevant development. There is no need to repeat the requirements in Policy 20. Water efficiency is covered by Policy ST45: Climate Change and further detail will be provided in the Design Quality SPD.
REF213	Pegasus Group	As a housing developer with involvement in the site, Dukeries Homes Ltd have interest in supporting Policy 20. Dukeries Homes' land interest is contained within the allocation boundary identified in the draft Local Plan. Pegasus Group have submitted a planning application on behalf of Dukeries Homes Ltd for 54 no. affordable residential units and associated works which is currently pending validation. It is proposed that the development site forms an affordable scheme, including an element of shared ownership housing. As stated within paragraph 7.7.3 the Land Availability Assessment 2020 identified the Former Knitwear Factory site as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Worksop and consider it deliverable in the early part of the plan period. Policy 20 sets out that the Council have confirmed they will support the delivery of mixed-use development at the site, including at least 40 dwellings. Dukeries Homes Ltd support the wording of draft Policy 20 as it represents an appropriate housing allocation site within a sustainable location for residential development, which is also supported by National and Local Planning Policy. This site fulfils the requirements of paragraph 67 of the National Planning Policy Framework in relation to identifying a supply of deliverable and developable sites within the plan period. Dukeries Homes Ltd are committed to delivering the site in the short term and the proposed allocation at Site HS6: Former Knitwear Factory, Worksop is supported.	Support welcome and noted.
REF222	Notts CC	Strategic Highways Part 4, a) should include a through route between Retford Road and High Hoe Road.	Through access added to Policy 20 as requested.
REF116	Network Rail	Although there are no direct planned allocations adjacent or close to railway lines at Worksop, as is the case in Retford we presume a strategic look at road vehicle traffic patterns has been or will be undertaken and the effects of increased traffic over Worksop station LC will be considered as part of that strategic exercise.	The Transport Study 3 will identify if there are any potential impacts associated with level crossings in the District.
REF300	Natural England	In section 5 of the policy note the provision for the protection and enhancement of River Ryton Green Corridor, which is welcome.	Support welcome and noted.
REF023	Water Management Consortium	This site is outside of the Board's district.	Noted. Thank you for comment.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST22 - Trinity Farm			
1177432	Resident	Seems sensible, good local infrastructure.	Thank you for your comment. A Transport Assessment have taken place to assess the impact on existing infrastructure. Appropriate mitigation is proposed where required. This assessments can be found on the Council's website.
REF070	Resident	<p>We would like to state our objections to the The Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to the Trinity Farm development on North Road, Retford and detail our main concerns. Road capacity - North Road to Hallcroft roundabout: serious concerns regarding the volume of cars who could potentially be using North Road due to the current proposal to build 440 houses and 3 ha of employment units. The current road infrastructure already struggles and during peak times it backs up from Hallcroft roundabout, sometimes all the way to Randall Way (opposite the new development site) and it is often difficult to join from the existing side roads. With potentially another 800 cars and lorries using an already busy road and no proposals as to how the current road layout can be adapted to help with the flow of traffic, this building scheme will contribute towards major hold-ups. This could also increase the number of road traffic accidents. The majority of the people purchasing the proposed houses will already have jobs and will not work in the proposed employment areas and will require the road structure to travel to their places of work. So far, there have been very few new jobs created from the new employment sites as the majority of firms have re-located from other areas in and around Retford. When the original plans for the 196 houses were passed, the concerns regarding the road capacity weren't taken seriously. The report to quell any objections stated that the people who would buy the new houses would work in the local industrial area, use the local facilities and if they needed to travel, they would either use their bike or walk if the journey was less than 3 miles. In reality, this response was just to get the plans passed and no solution was given as to how the road structure could be improved to cope with the additional cars or who would be paying for the changes i.e. council or developers. Additional cycle routes and footpaths are welcome in addition to the existing, as we already use these whenever possible. The Hallcroft estate could also see an increase in cars as drivers seek alternative routes to cut their journey times. Hallcroft Road also backs up from Hallcroft roundabout at peak times.</p> <p>Drainage / flooding risks - currently rain water drains into the fields. Concerns about the ground level height of new area and the risk of water running off the new estate and flooding existing properties as in the original plans there is only a water attenuation area proposed at the opposite end of the site (stage 2). The footpaths to the front and rear of our property do not have any drainage (no road to our property). We would like assurances that this development will not cause flooding to existing properties especially as the Environmental agency had concerns regarding flooding and whether enough provision had been built into the plans. There has been little information as to whether the new drains will lead into the drains on the existing estate and if the current drainage system will struggle to cope with the additional water. Agricultural 'Greenfield' land – some agricultural land has already been lost for business development with very few employment opportunities being created. When our house was purchased, the proposed area was outside the town boundary and highly unlikely to be built on as it was Greenbelt land (now Greenfield land). The boundary, as we understand, has since been extended without consultation so that proposals for housing and employment development could be pushed through. The land is currently rented to farmers and has been in constant use for over 40 years including sheep grazing on winter feed. Idle Valley is already accessible to the public and therefore the green areas are being reduced. Environmental effect - habitats and hedges will be lost and the wildlife who utilise this area i.e. birds (including swallows and hawks), hedgehogs, butterflies, bees, foxes and deer will lose their homes / hunting grounds. The proposed area is larger than the existing North Road housing estate and this must surely have a big impact on wildlife. We believe there are other areas around Retford which could be utilised without the environmental impact such a large development would make. Visual effect and other impacts – There is no mention of buffers (i.e. green spaces) between existing housing and new housing and visual impact on existing residents due to density and mass of buildings. Additional concerns - noise, smell, being overlooked (narrow walkway at back of our house and currently no road either to front or rear of property), loss of privacy and possibly reduced signal strength for television aerials. The range of houses is very generalised with no clear guide as to how many of each style will be built i.e. 3 story town houses, 2 story houses or bungalows or location of any proposed roads around the new estate. The Trinity Farm field contains overhead electricity cables, gas pipe (not mentioned), sewage pipes and flooding risk which would all contribute to additional problems whilst developing the area. Does the current sewage works and pipe work have the capacity to deal with the additional huge influx? Will the current infrastructure such as schools, hospitals and doctors surgeries cope with approximately 1000 more people from the additional 440 houses that will occupy this land, let alone all the other developments going on around Retford?</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST22 - Trinity Farm			
REF160	Resident	<p>I have the following comments on the draft Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>1, My main area of concern is major potential development which will increase traffic on Tiln Lane and the junction with Moorgate, with particular concern over the effect of traffic passing Carr Hill School. There have been two children killed on Tiln Lane in the past ten years or so and in the last fortnight a delivery driver lost control and damaged a number of cars - fortunately just before the children were due to come out of school. Any development will increase traffic and the potential hazard.</p> <p>2, I welcome the proposal to create a cordon round Retford with no development permitted outside it but am concerned that until the Plan is formally Implemented (2022?) further development may get through.</p> <p>3, Any further development will increase the congestion at the Moorgate junction unless lights or a roundabout are installed - this should be at developers expense.</p> <p>4, I understand that the proposed development for over 100 houses beyond the end of Bigsby Road is likely to require major infrastructure upgrade.</p> <p>In any case this proposal is outside the draft development boundary of the town.</p> <p>I have no objection to my comments being public</p>	A Transport Assessment have taken place to assess the impact on existing infrastructure. Appropriate mitigation is proposed where required. This assessments can be found on the Council's website.
REF198	Consultant	<p>In general, housing allocation is to be welcomed here but the scale, page 93 the proximity of this allocation to the railway and also to the industrial allocation on Randall Way is somewhat concerning. Firstly, the railway line in question is the main East Coast route, very fast and busy and should get busier with the rail network improvements suggested by the government and operators. Being this close to the railway will have a detrimental effect on living conditions for future inhabitants. There should be a clear planted and screened area between the residences and the railway line. In hindsight, the industrial/employment site may well have been better located on this site. Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist – February 2020 Page 5 The fact that a large swathe of Randall Way Industrial Site is now to be houses is somewhat worrying. Expansion of this industrial estate northward is limited due to the presence of Idle Valley Nature Reserve and to the east by the River Idle and existing developments. There is the industrial allocation on the ready mix concrete site just north of Idle Valley but this is limited and will increase vehicular traffic flow in and out of the current junction which is shared by the nature reserve.</p>	The Council has consulted a number of organisations such as Network Rail and Environmentla health to see whether a development in this location would be impacts from or impact existing infrastructure and development in the area. The Council is comfortable that a residential led development at Trinity Farm will not be impacted from existing developments and infrastructure nearby.
REF201	Severn Trent	<p>Severn Trent note that section 1 of Policy 22 detailed the need to develop green infrastructure and sustainable design that will be in keeping with the nearby Nature Reserve. We would therefore recommend that a specific reference to SuDS and the drainage hierarchy are made to ensure that design considered the need to convey water through the development and return it to the natural water system. The policy should also look to highlight the need to design SuDS to delivery against all 4 objectives as highlighted by the SuDS best practice (The SuDS Manual Ciria C753). Some example wording is provided above as part of the Bassetlaw Garden Village section. There are surface water sewers detailed within the vicinity of the site, it is therefore not anticipated that any surface water connection to the foul sewer will be permitted. The site is indicated to be intersected by an existing rising main, it is important that development does not have an adverse impact on this asset. Whilst the physical asset will be covered by easements to ensure rights of access for maintenance, it is recommended that the need to protect existing assets is still detailed within Policy 22. We would recommend that wording to the effect of: The development boundary for (Site name) is identified to contain an existing sewer(s) / water main(s) within the ownership of Severn Trent. Development layouts should account for the alignment of these assets and the associated easements, ensuring that access for maintenance is not impeded. The policy should then be supported by additional information including text to the effect of: "The existing infrastructure is protected by easements and should not be built over or located in private gardens where access for maintenance and repair could be restricted. The existing sewer/water main should be located in highways or public open space. If this is not possible a formal application to divert Severn Trent existing assets may be required." Severn Trent note that Section 1 of Policy 22 details the development of a Design Quality SPD, we would recommend that Water Efficient design and Water re-use is either covered specifically within Policy 21 or covered by the Design Quality SPD.</p> <p>The Trinity Farm Site is located within a within Source Protection Zone (SPZ), please refer to the Protection of Groundwater sources section of our response.</p>	Agreed. Amendments made to the revised policy for Trinity Farm in line with STW recommendations

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST22 - Trinity Farm			
REF222	Notts CC	<p>Minerals and Waste</p> <p>Policy 22: HS8, Trinity Farm site as mentioned above falls within the MSA/MCA for sand and gravel. As per Policy SP7, any applications will need to demonstrate the need for non-mineral development and where this is shown, the applicant should consider the feasibility of prior extraction and so prevent the unnecessary sterilisation of the mineral resource. A mineral operator has indicated interest in extracting sand and gravel 240m to the west of the allocated mixed-use site. The Draft Minerals Local Plan (July 2018) did include this promoted site, called Botany Bay, as an allocation within the plan to help meet the required demand throughout the plan period under Policy MP2r. However, this site has now been removed from the Publication Version of the Minerals Local Plan and is no longer allocated. This is due to changes to the mix of site-specific allocations identified by the County Council across the County and not due to the site being withdrawn by the operator. The County Council would therefore recommend that Policy 22 highlight the presence of the MSA/MCA and that any future application will need to demonstrate the need for non-mineral development in this area and if this can be demonstrated, consider prior extraction so to prevent the sterilisation of the resource.</p>	Thank you for your comments
REF253	Fisher German	<p>The land, illustrated by the redline, benefits from an outline planning permission (ref: 15/00493/OUT) for up to 196 dwellings and 11.11ha of employment land, with all matters reserved except for access on part of the site. The site is currently being marketed for disposal to a housebuilder and commercial users. These representations fully support the proposed allocation of the site under Site HS8: Trinity Farm, Retford. As demonstrated through the planning consent, the site is available, deliverable and developable. The site is optimally located for residential development, adjoining the Retford urban fringe and in close proximity to employment and other services and facilities. Trinity Hospital support the proposed allocation of the wider site and is committed to bringing forward a planning application for the remaining housing numbers on the site. For ease of reference, these representations follow the order the Policies appear in the Plan.</p>	Thank you for your comments
REF253	Fisher German	<p>The proposed allocation land at Trinity Farm, North Road for 440 dwellings and 8 hectares of employment land is fully supported. As demonstrated through the outline planning consent, the site is available, deliverable and developable. The consented site is currently being marketed to housebuilders and commercial users; it is anticipated that development on site should commence in late 2020/early 2021. Trinity Hospital is committed to the delivery of the wider site, as identified by HS8, and will bring forward a planning application as early as possible in order to support the Council deliver its housing needs early in the Plan period. Trinity Hospital also support reference within paragraph 7.9.11 which states that the site should be exempt from a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charge. It is considered that this text should be included within the policy wording of HS8, as well as the supporting text. Whilst Trinity Hospital support the allocation of Trinity Farm, some amendments are required to the policy wording, as set out below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> B. This new neighbourhood will be developed in accordance with a masterplan framework, to be agreed with the Council and informed by an independent design review and community consultation. <p>Trinity Hospital have no objections to the principle of an independent design review and will seek to ensure a comprehensive, well designed scheme is delivered across the site (Phase 1 which has already been consented, and Phase 2 comprising the remaining part of the proposed allocation). However, it needs to be recognised that Phase 1 will have been progressed ahead of Phase 2 being brought forward; the need for an independent design review at that stage is questioned. Furthermore, it is not clear who is expected to fund such a review. It is requested that reference to an independent design review is removed from the policy wording. This does not prevent one from happening, but provides flexibility given the progression of Phase 1 of the site. Trinity Hospital understand the need and importance for community consultation, and as they did for the outline planning application for Phase 1, will ensure full community consultation for Phase 2 going forward. Trinity Hospital are content for this reference to remain within the policy text.</p> <p>1. Good Quality Design and Local Character</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Green Infrastructure – led high quality design that integrates the new development with Phase 1 of the scheme, that enhances ecological value and endures over time. b) Trinity Hospital support the delivery of a high-quality design across the site and as set out above will seek to ensure that a comprehensive well-designed scheme will be delivered across Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the site. High quality design can however impact scheme costs; this does not appear to have been reflected within the Council's Viability Assessment. Trinity Hospital's aspirations will always be to seek to ensure high quality design however caution needs to be exercised in adopting such terminology within the Plan without sufficient evidence sites can deliver this, as doing so may artificially raise expectations. c) At least 440 dwellings during the Plan period to 2037 d) As set out above, the allocation of the site for 440 dwellings is fully supported. <p>Phase 1 has outline planning permission for 196 dwellings. This is currently being marketed to housebuilders and it is anticipated</p>	<p>The Council is preparing an evidence that includes the viability of proposed developments in relation to their required contributions. In addition, the Council is working closely with the site promotor to make sure that the site is considered deliverable and sustainable and that all reasonable impacts can be appropriately mitigated.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST22 - Trinity Farm		<p>that development on site should commence in late 2020/early 2021.b) A mix of housing types, including affordable and specialist housing, and serviced plots for self-build and custom homes as appropriateAs discussed under Policy ST27: Housing Mix, Type and Density is it requested that reference to serviced plots for self-build and custom homes is deleted from Policy 22: HS8.c) Housing Standards to promote climate resilience in accordance with Policy ST45Trinity Hospital has concerns with Policy ST45, as set out later in these representations. The requested amendments to Policy ST45 need to be reflected within Policy 22: HS8 and the supporting text.d) At least 11.11ha for commercial and employment (B1, B2, B8) development, with 3.0ha of employment land provided in this Plan period and 5.0ha thereafter. The Policy wording requires amendment to reflect the updated quantum of employment land to be provided on the site, as set out in Policy ST6. The reference to 11.11 hectares of land needs to be replaced with 8 hectares. Trinity Hospital are comfortable that at least 3.0 hectares of employment generating uses will be brought forward within the Plan period.It is also requested that the wording seeking "commercial and employment (B1, B2, B8) development" is deleted and amended to "employment generating uses". Reference to "employment generating uses" provides far greater flexibility in securing end users for the site, encouraging economic growth and jobs, rather than being overly restrictive to particular uses. The proposed amendment would also ensure that the policy better reflects the outline planning permission for Phase 1 which provides for employment generating uses beyond the traditional B uses. It is also requested that the Council give consideration to some retail uses at the site to provide for local day to day needs. 5. Landscape, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure b) A multifunctional green infrastructure network that connects to the existing, including publicly accessible open space and at least 0.5ha for community woodland. The future management and maintenance shall be agreed through a planning application. The importance of tree planting for the environment and in respect of place making is fully recognised however the proposed policy requirement to deliver a 0.5ha community woodland is not supported. There is no evidence to justify this requirement. Even if justification for this policy requirement can be evidence there is a wholly inconsistent approach to its application. For example, the Bassetlaw Garden Village, which is to deliver 750 dwellings over the Plan period, with a further 3,250 dwellings in the next Plan period and 15ha of employment land in total, is only required to deliver 0.5ha of community woodland during the Plan period and 2ha in total for the site over its lifetime; disproportionately less than at Trinity Farm. Furthermore, the Plan is unclear on how the community woodland functions in conjunction with Policy ST45: Climate Change and Mitigation. Does the 0.5ha of woodland negate the requirement to deliver 5 tree's per dwelling or is it in addition to it (assuming there is even justification for a requirement of 5 trees per dwelling)? Finally, it must also be recognised that a large area of the site already has outline planning permission, therefore whilst a comprehensive scheme will be progressed, any requirements such as this, should consider the Phase 2 land only. This is consistent with the approach adopted with the Council's other committed sites.It is considered that the requirement for a community woodland of 0.5ha lacks justification and is not sound. It is requested that the reference to delivery of a community woodland is deleted from the policy. Additional comments in respect of tree planting are provided in response to Policy ST45, which should be read alongside the above. c) The relocation of Leaffields allotment site: fenced, with a water supply with appropriate access and parking arrangements. As set out above in response to Policy 21: HS7: Leaffields, it is considered that this allocation should be deleted and in so doing, the reference to the relocation of the allotments deleted from Policy 22: HS8, Trinity Farm. d) A project level Habitats Regulations Assessment screening in accordance with Policy ST39.The Policy requires a 'project level habitat regulation assessment screening' in accordance with Policy ST39. This request and the justification for it, is not clear. Firstly, there should be no need to screen individual development sites given the Local Plan will need to be supported by a full HRA. Secondly, Policy ST39 does not appear to relate to HRA assessments at all. On this basis this requirement should be removed.</p>	
REF257	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Part of the site lies in a flood zone. I note the commitment to undertake land raising to defend against floods. However, with climate change and increasing flooding, should we be building in this zone at all, or are there additional measures being considered, eg, the building of stilt houses. I am pleased to see that it is planned that cycle routes would be extended. As a larger development, I assume that provision of school and doctors places etc have been taken into account.	Appropriate assessment have taken place to assess the impact on existing infrastructure and the risk from flooding. These assessments can be found on the Council's website.
REF273	Anglian Water	The wording which appears in Policy 22 (point 5. a) should be amended as set out in our comments relating to Bassetlaw Garden Village. We would ask that the criteria be consistently applied to all residential allocation sites. Please see suggested changes to the wording of the Bassetlaw Garden Village policy for the wording to be used.	Agreed. Amendments made to the revised policy for Trinity Farm

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST22 - Trinity Farm			
1197063	Resident	Another large development at the north western edge of Retford which will have a similar impact re traffic congestion as with Leafields.	Thank you for your comment.
REF283	Resident	22 HS8 92 7.8 Despite the access arrangements in the extant planning consent ref: 15/00493/OUT, this site's southern access should be provided by a single 'gateway' roundabout junction where Randall Way meets the North Road (A638), thereby alleviating the existing delays there instead of aggravating them. Access to the site east of North Road could then be off Randall Way, like Randall Park Way, etc. In the longer term, an eastwards extension of Randall Way, bridging the River Idle and connecting via Bolham to Tiln Lane/Smeath Lane, could form a northern distributor road for Retford, bypassing Welham and Clarborough: add to ST51.	Thank you for your comment.
REF300 -	Natural England	Natural England advises that the impact of this housing allocation on the Sutton and Lound Gravel Pits SSSI should be fully considered. The site falls within the Impact Risk Zone for this SSSI which is notified for its exceptionally rich assemblage of breeding wetland birds. The location of the SSSI is not included on the policy maps however we do note that the SSSI is mentioned within the Sustainability Appraisal.	This has been subject to a detailed assessment of impact through the Council's Sustainability Appraisal and the Habitat Regulations Assessment. Appropriate mitigation will be required where necessary.
REF327	Scrooby Parish	A major development, it is very sad to see so much good agricultural land disappear, under the weight of the banner of "Housing and Industry Needs", surely there are other brownfield sites available. · What analysis has been made on the Idle Valley Nature Reserve both during the development and the longer term after residence. That is a must before a blade of grass has been cut.	The Council has assessed a number of sites throughout the town and will promote and allocate brownfield land where is suitable. However, due to there not being a sufficient number of brownfield sites, it means that some greenfield sites are proposed. Agricultural land classification isn't considered a constraint for this particular site.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF056	Resident	Am a 13 year old resident of Tuxford, and being a teenager at Tuxford Academy I have the insight which you need in order to make your plans appropriate for a range of ages. I am suggesting a skate park because I know many people living in Tuxford who have an interest in skating and would like to have a skate park that they can access easily without having to make their parents drive. It will benefit our local community as currently there is not much available for the youth.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF061	Resident	Whist I appreciate that development needs to take place across the whole of Bassetlaw the plan mentions but dose not make best use of the brown field sites within the district. Brown field development should be given much greater weight and promoted within the plan. Neighbourhood Plans have been developed at great expense, both financial and the time local residents have put in. Please stop the planning department showing total disrespect for these plans, they should be followed to the letter and if exceptions are made by planning authorities them a FULL and DETAILED explanation should be provided. 'CIL' should not be waivered for ANY development.	The Council supports the priority to reuse brownfield land where available. However, due to the high density and constraints within Tuxford, there is very little existing brownfield land to reuse. Therefore we are needing to allocate some land to the edge of Tuxford on Greenfield Land. CIL would apply to developments within Tuxford.
REF062	Resident	Very pleased to see no vehicle access from Long Lane. Interested to see detailed planning application.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF064	Resident	This area includes Roman remains and artefacts. An archaeology survey is of the upmost importance. The sites NP04 and NP11 and adjacent areas are productive farmland. We do not need to lose this facility in this County, let alone Tuxford village.	Any area that has identified historical merit will be subject to the necessary national and local policy requirements in relation to protecting the historic environment. The Council's Conservation Officer has been consulted on the sites and has not provided any comment that would restrict its development potential. However, the Conservation Officer has noted the importance of the design of the site and how it can be appropriately incorporated into the wider landscape.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF088	Resident	<p>Tuxford is a small town with little on offer in the way of employment. It is highly likely that most houses on the site would be using motor vehicles to leave Tuxford for their place of work elsewhere. NP04 is a very large site with very clear impact to traffic and town infrastructure. It appears no traffic survey has been completed for this site and it would have a direct impact on the existing traffic problems found at the intersection of Ollerton road (A6075) and Eldon Street (B1164) and the intersection of Newark road/Newcastle street to Lincoln road (A6075). This is just the impact to the closest roads to the site but it would also push problems further into Tuxford with queuing from the A1 on Ashvale road (A6075) becoming worse. PG 98 - Policy 24: Site NP04 Ollerton Road, Tuxford</p> <p>3. a) Tuxford primary school has a capacity of 240 pupils, currently they have 333 pupils. The secondary school has a capacity of 1462 with current numbers standing at 1554. How will this be supported by the contributions for expansion?</p> <p>Other comments relating to this site:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The land is Grade 2 agricultural land which I have been informed should not be developed upon according to the national plan. Please confirm or clarify if my understanding is incorrect. 2. Previous sites that were put forward in the local plan, NP09 and NP10 were rejected by the council as they fall outside the envelope, I am under the belief NP04 also falls outside the envelope. I'd therefore like to understand why this is being put forward as it seems conflicting reasons are being used per site if this is the case. 3. Previous planning permission has been sought on land opposite this site for development (http://publicaccess.bassetlaw.gov.uk/online-applications/propertyDetails.do?activeTab=relatedCases&keyVal=000HU9CSLI000) and has been refused twice. The details for the refusal are not available on the website but local knowledge was given that it was due to the impact to traffic on Ollerton road. <p>4. The houses could be affected by sun flicker and noise from the nearby wind turbines.</p>	There is a requirement for additional housing growth in Tuxford over the plan period. This complies to all other designated Large Rural Settlements in Bassetlaw. Tuxford has a key role to play in supporting its residents and other smaller settlements in the area with important services and facilities. It is acknowledged that Tuxford is a constrained settlement with a complex road network, historic assets and an important landscape surrounding the area. The site at Ollerton Road provides an opportunity to plan for some additional growth. The site is close to the main road network and has access to the town centre and its services and facilities. The development will respect the landscape character and be planned to improve existing infrastructure where required such as the road network and the school. Access to and from Long Lane will only be for pedestrian as the road is not suitable for any additional vehicles.
REF097	Resident	Before any development, traffic issues must be addressed. Medical facility to be improved both schools to be improved.	Thank you for your comment.
REF100	Resident	<p>I live on Ollerton Road and face the road. The amount of traffic is already ludicrous. Between 6am and 9am then 4.30pm to 6.30pm the amount of cars and pollution being spilled into our home is awful.</p> <p>We have to listen to car music, telephone conversations and people sat with engines running. Getting from Ollerton Road onto Eldon Street at peak times is dangerous, especially for lorries plus the amount of construction lorries needed for the site.</p>	Thank you for your comment
REF102	Resident	If the proposed plan for NP04 goes ahead will the surface and drainage of Long Lane be improved? My wife and I live on Long Lane. I am 79 years of age and my wife is 76. My wife tripped coming back along Long Lane from Tuxford Christmas Market 2019 and suffered a badly gashed hand which needed medical treatment. If there is no vehicle access to NP04 there will need to be better, safer surface for pedestrians to use. I would be interested to hear the planners views on this matter before development commences.	Long Lane will only be used by existing vehicles to houses along the lane and by pedestrians from the new development. It will not become a new vehicular access point to the new development.
REF103	Resident	Before anything is done in this village and all the traffic needs to be seen to. The sewage does as well the school will not cope and doctors.	Thank you for your comment.
REF104	Resident	The traffic need seeing to the sewage needs dealing with the schools need more room for all the children. The doctors will need to be a lot bigger all these things need to be dealt with.	As part of new development, existing and future infrastructure is fully considered. Any additional infrastructure required from the development will be identified within the Policy for the site.
REF119	WH Bett and Sons	<p>Support the development for 1. There has been very little development in Tuxford over the last few years. It is important for people to be able to live in rural villages and towns rather than being ushered to living in major towns such as Worksop and Retford. The building of new houses in Tuxford will provide more opportunity for people to live in Tuxford. I believe that it is very important for young people to have the choice to continue to live in the village/town that they have been brought up in.</p> <p>2. Tuxford is an ideal village for development because it already has facilities such as schools, shops, library, museums, community centre and a doctors surgery. It has character, being an old coaching town, and an attractive rural setting. It has good infrastructure with the A1 passing through the village and the A57 close by.</p>	Thank you for your comment.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF119	WH Bett and Sons	<p>6. The land on Ollerton Road is only a short walk to the shops and other facilities.</p> <p>7. Ollerton Road would provide good access to the land.</p> <p>8. The Ollerton Road site only has houses proposed on one boundary, all the other boundaries are farmland therefore the only a small number of people would boarder the development.</p> <p>9. Both sites could potentially expand beyond the area currently marked in the plan and could provide more houses if there was a requirement.</p>	Thank you for your comment.
1194897	Resident	<p>Using grade 2 prime agricultural land, to build housing in a rural community, surely contravenes all environmental policy. Brown field sites should be utilised. The proposed building work will be directly adjacent to the old age pensioner bungalows. With a prevailing South Westerly wind, this will cause dust and noise issues that will adversely affect the most vulnerable as well as contaminate a significant part of the rest of the village.</p>	The farmland around Tuxford is of a high-grade. However, to restrict development on this basis would mean there are no opportunities for development. The Council has looked at all sites around Tuxford and considered an appropriate area of land that would have the least impact on the environment, infrastructure and the community.
1195187	Resident	<p>NP04 is grade 2 agricultural land. This is the highest grade for the area. It is highly productive. Should land of this quality be given over to housing development when there are many pockets of lower grade land in the area, including NP10, that are far less value in these days of attention to increased carbon emissions? Currently this land, being at one of the highest points in the area, absorbs rainfall. This will not be the case if replaced by housing, roads and drains. NP04. This land, though it falls just outside the development footprint for the existing wind turbines, is in direct line from the prevailing (and continuous) SW wind that would give constant noise and flicker.</p>	The farmland around Tuxford is of a high-grade. However, to restrict development on this basis would mean there are no opportunities for development. The Council has looked at all sites around Tuxford and considered an appropriate area of land that would have the least impact on the environment, infrastructure and the community.
REF141	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.11.1 on page 97 states “The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019.” <p>This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.11.3 on page 97 states “The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026.” <p>The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and “topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here”. It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that “Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site” because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because “Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting.”</p> <p>No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60’s bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road. <p>Although “Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site.” it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-</p> <p>“Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction.”</p> <p>Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.)</p>	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also included to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any “known” planning constraints and those are taken into account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road		<p>Quoting from Cllr J Ogle's objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford, "large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties." The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments. A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view. Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states:- 9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a sense of well-being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health.</p> <p>and POLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page134 states:- B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action. <p>However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, "Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land." <p>The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	<p>on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be requirement for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered.</p> <p>Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.</p>
REF142	Resident	I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:-• 7.11.1 on page 97 states "The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019." This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states "The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026." The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and "topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here". It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that "Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site" because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because "Views from the road into the open countryside are an important	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also included to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road		<p>part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting."No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmont Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60's bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents.● 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road.Although "Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site." it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-"Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction."Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.)Quoting from Cllr J Ogle's objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford,"large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties."The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments.A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view.Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years.● Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states:-9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a sense of well-being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health.and POLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action.However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow</p>	<p>smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any "known" planning constraints and those are taken in to account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place wil be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be requirement for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
		at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, "Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land." The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.	
REF170	Consultant	NP04 is open countryside, it is located on the edge of the village and, as indicated, will have negative impacts on the open views of farmland (southern part). It too has grade 2 soil and it does not have any conservation constraints, identical to NP16. NP04 will provide a housing estate on the entry into Tuxford from Ollerton, this may or may not be a bad thing but there is one thing for certain, it will change this approach into the village for good. NP04 is identified also as requiring possible access through allocations NP05 and NP15, neither of which are included within the Draft Local Plan. If this is the preferred access aim then it is unclear how this can be achieved over land that is not allocated.	The farmland around Tuxford is of a high-grade. However, to restrict development on this basis would mean there are no opportunities for development. The Council has looked at all sites around Tuxford and considered an appropriate area of land that would have the least impact on the environment, infrastructure and the community.
REF176	Resident	I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds: • 7.11.1 on page 97 states "The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019." This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states "The Land Availability Assessment 2020 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026." The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and "topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here". It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that "Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site" because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because "Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting." No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60's bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road. Although "Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site." it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:- "Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction." Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.) Quoting from Cllr J Ogle's objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford, "large loads from the present industrial/commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties." The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the	The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also included to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any "known" planning constraints and those are taken into account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be required for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road		<p>norm, and can only be increased by the new developments. A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view. Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states:-9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a sense of well-being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health. and POLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page 134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by 7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action. However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, "Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land." The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.
REF177	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.11.1 on page 97 states "The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019." This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states "The Land Availability Assessment 2020 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026." The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and "topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here". It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that "Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site" because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because "Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting." No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60's bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road. Although "Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a 	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also included to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any "known" planning constraints and those are taken into account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road		<p>Transport Assessment for the site." it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-"Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction." Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.) Quoting from Cllr J Ogle's objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford, "large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties." The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments. A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view. Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states:- 9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a sense of well-being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health. and POLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page 134 states:- B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by 7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action. However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, "Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land." The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	<p>place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be requirement for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.</p>
REF181	Consultant	We object to the proposed allocation of Site NP04 (Ollerton Road, Tuxford) contained in the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan. We consider that it fails the tests of soundness as follows: Housing Need2. The Bassetlaw Local Plan is based on an annual housing provision of 478 dwellings per annum which is 55.7% above the 307 housing need per annum level that is required using the NPPF Standardised Methodology.3. Whilst the Local Plan might want to pursue a growth strategy based on a higher annualised	The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road		<p>housing provision for the period 2018 to 2037; this does not justify the allocation of inappropriate or unsuitable sites. As such there is no unmet strategic housing need requirement to justify the allocation of site NP04.4. The Local Plan proposes 1,764 dwellings for the 'Large Rural Villages' which includes Blyth; Carlton in Lindrick and Coston; Langold; Misterton; Tuxford; and Cottam Garden Community. Unfortunately the Local Plan does not indicate what existing level of committed housing exists in these settlements. As such it is unclear what is the residual unmet level of housing; which still has to be found through proposed site allocations.5. Unusually there is no housing background paper or other evidence document to help readers understand the unmet residual level of housing for the 'Large Rural Villages' or the choice of distribution for the site allocations in the Local Plan between the 6 settlements in this category. Of these 6 'Large Rural Villages' only Tuxford and Cottam Garden Community have had allocations identified. It is noted for example that Misterton has no allocations or committed housing sites identified in the Local Plan.6. It is understood that Blyth; Carlton in Lindrick and Coston; and Misterton have neighbourhood plans either made or in the final stages. However the Local Plan does not indicate any detail as to how many dwellings these neighbourhood plans allocate; this further compounds the inability for plan users to understand how the Local Plan is aiming to deliver the identified housing figure for the 'Large Rural Villages'.7. It would appear that the proposed 1,764 dwellings for the 'Large Rural Villages' is based on the suggested blanket 20% growth figure in Policy ST2; although the figures in Policy ST2 in fact only adds up to 1,747 which is not quite the same as the figure in Policy ST1. Policy ST2 suggests a figure of 250 dwellings for Tuxford which it appears the Local Plan suggests would be largely delivered through site allocations NP04 and NP11 together with the 86 dwellings committed under 19/01165/RES on Ashvale Road.8. In this respect the allocation of site NP04 would make a contribution towards delivering the housing figure identified for Tuxford. However the site would result in planning harm that outweighs the benefit of housing delivery; particularly given the Local Plan proposing an annual housing provision some 55.7% above the actual standardised housing requirement. In addition there are other reasonable alternative sites elsewhere in Tuxford that would be more appropriate.Relationship to Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan9. Tuxford has a 'made' Neighbourhood Plan and this plan is currently undergoing a review. As part of that review process there has been consultation on possible site allocations. This was undertaken very recently in September 2019 and the fact that some allocations have now been included in the draft Local Plan is undermining the Neighbourhood Plan process, including the consultation undertaken. In addition local residents are now confused about the relationship between the Neighbourhood Plan consultation and the sudden inclusion of two sites in the draft Local Plan.10. The Neighbourhood Plan consultation responses were returned to Bassetlaw DC which does not help with confusion between the two separate plans.11. This confusion and misunderstanding is exacerbated by the draft Local Plan referring to the consultation undertaken in September 2019 on the Neighbourhood Plan in paragraph 7.11.1. However the Local Plan states: "The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019." This is a misleading quote however as the results of the consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan sites only recently published by the Town Council in the Tuxfordian clearly shows only 18% of people supported development on site NP04 whilst 41% of people did not support development on this site. In that respect it is the joint 6th ranked site in terms of level of objection and only the joint 8th ranked site in terms of level of support. As such the site was not supported by the local community in the recent consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan.12. We are aware from our client that many local residents are unaware that the comments they made on the Neighbourhood Plan will not automatically be considered by the LPA in drawing up the Local Plan. The timing and duplication is highly unfortunate and given that Bassetlaw has traditionally sought to promote neighbourhood planning; this lack of clarity means that in our view that the Local Plan fundamentally fails to meet the test of soundness requiring the plan to be positively prepared.Evidence13. The proposed site NP04 has not been comprehensively assessed in either the Land Availability Assessment process or the Site Selection Methodology in the form proposed for allocation.14. The proposed site allocation NP04 is not supported by sufficient robust evidence to justify its allocation and its omission from proper assessment in key evidence documents renders the proposed allocation and the entire Local Plan unsound. In particular the site is not assessed within the 'Site Allocations: Landscape Study' document (dated November 2019). That document only looked at proposed allocations in Harworth/Bircotes; Worksop; Retford; alongside possible employment sites around Markham Moor and the possible sites considered for a new settlement. Accordingly assessment of Tuxford appears to be a serious omission, particularly given that this is the only settlement proposed for site allocations which has not been assessed in landscape terms.15. The Local Plan in paragraph 7.11.2 states: "Careful, sensitive design should be informed by the landscape character of this town fringe location identified by the Site</p>	<p>landscape and heritage were also included to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any "known" planning constraints and those are taken into account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be required for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road		<p>Allocations Landscape Assessment." However this statement is misleading as this study does not address this proposed allocation.¹⁶ The 'Transport Study Update' dates from January 2019 and is based on the former spatial strategy that is no longer proposed. As such this evidence document is out-of-date and does not support the proposals now being advanced in the Local Plan.¹⁷ The site assessment methodology for both of the proposed Tuxford site allocations indicates that these need to be supported by a strategic transport model including the fact that several off-site junctions may require capacity improvements. Given this conclusion it is surprising and disappointing that the 'Junction Assessments Report' dated January 2020 does not assess the impact on any junctions within Tuxford. Given the nature of the low bridge in the centre of Tuxford; the presence of the A1 slip roads; the A6075; and the use of the B1164 as a local diversion route for the A1 there are particular highway considerations in Tuxford. These should have been assessed in order to confirm what off-site junctions may require capacity improvements and whether such improvements can actually be delivered.Sustainability Appraisal¹⁸. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) contains contradictory information in relation to the assessment of site NP04; as such this document is fundamentally flawed and undermines confidence in whether the site has been properly assessed. The site is assessed in Table 5.2 (Summary of SA Scores for the Site Options) and in the table in paragraph 6.107 that assesses Policy 24 which allocates site NP04.¹⁹ The differences between the SA tables is as follows:²⁰ ObjectiveTable 5.2Table in paragraph 6.1071. Biodiversity +10. Air Quality N/A +11. Climate Change N/A +13. Cultural Heritage 0 -14. Landscape & Townscape - +/-20. These differences involve more than a third of the SA assessment criterion, as such this is a substantial level of difference.²¹ We have taken the SA assessment in the table in paragraph 6.107 as our starting point as this relates to Policy 24 which allocates site NP04. This concludes that the site is likely to have a significant negative effect on the SA objectives of 'land use and soils' and 'cultural heritage'. We agree with these conclusions which weigh heavily against the suitability of this site to be allocated.²² However in addition in our judgement the SA appears to incorrectly assess aspects of the site, the differences between the SA table and our assessment is as follows:²³ ObjectiveTable in paragraph 6.107Our Assessment1. Biodiversity + 02. Housing + +3. Economy & Skills + +4. Regeneration & Social Inclusion + +/5. Health & Wellbeing ++ +/-6. Transport + +7. Land Use & Soils -- --8. Water 009. Flood Risk 0 ?10. Air Quality + ?11. Climate Change + ?12. Resource Use & Waste 0 +13. Cultural Heritage -- --14. Landscape & Townscape -/+? --23. There is no explanation as to why the biodiversity criterion has moved from having a 'negligible or no effect' to a 'minor positive' effect between the above mentioned two tables. In our view the site location and proposal would have a 'negligible or no effect'.²⁴ Whilst the site location does provide reasonable accessibility to some town centre services and facilities there is poor accessibility to some key services including the secondary school and GP surgery. Tuxford suffers from limited accessibility due to the road bridge under the A1 being the only connection between the two halves of the Town. The site is not within 800m of the GP Surgery as the SA suggests, it is 910m away from the closest part of the site by the most direct route and 1.6km from the secondary school.²⁵ The proposed development would result in harm to primary school capacity as we explain in detail later. Policy 24 does refer to contributions towards the improvement of the existing public right of way at Long Lane for pedestrian access into the town. However Long Lane is not an adopted highway and we understand that the Lane has no clear ownership. Accordingly this policy requirement cannot be delivered and this will make the social integration of this site more difficult. The proposal involves no regeneration benefits, given this and the issues of accessibility and integration and impact on primary school capacity means that we consider that the proposal has a 'mixture of positive and negative effects' on Regeneration and Social Inclusion.²⁶ In terms of Health and Wellbeing the poor accessibility to the GP Surgery; along with the need to enter an area of poorer air quality and a noise corridor (under the A1) to get to the GP Surgery; and the distances required to access other primary healthcare facilities together with harm to primary school capacity means that in our view the proposal has a 'mixture of positive and negative effects' on this criterion. In addition any allocation in Tuxford will result in vehicle movements through the A1 underbridge, this is an area of poorer air quality and as this provides the only pedestrian and cycle linkage between the two halves of the town in our view it must be deemed 'uncertain' what effect the site would have on the air quality criterion.²⁷ Parts of Long Lane is at high risk of surface water flooding and the Environment Agency surface water flood risk mapping indicates that the farmland proposed to be allocated is the source of this surface water. Consequently the allocation of this site has the potential due to the topography to exacerbate this surface water flood risk, therefore we consider that the assessment should be 'uncertain' what effect the site would have on this criterion.²⁸ The site is within the shadow of an existing wind turbine, there was previously concern expressed about the inter-relationship between this wind turbine and development with regard to noise and shadow flicker. There has been no assessment of this aspect, as such there is potential</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road		<p>that new development could result in the need to cease use of the wind turbine. Therefore we consider that the assessment should be 'uncertain' what effect the site would have on the climate change criterion.²⁹ In terms of the impact on landscape and townscape the comments of BDC Planning Policy on the Neighbourhood Plan concluded that: "The landscape is very open, with long distance views to the south west. Character: the site adjoins a residential area which is suburban in character with residential development to one side. However, the site is not contained and is very open in character." This view of the LPA is not currently reflected in the SA conclusions. The proposed site has no existing boundaries to the south or west and would represent an artificial sub-division of a large area of high quality farmland.³⁰ The site is located within the Mid-Nottinghamshire Farmlands Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone MN11 and is classified for conserve and reinforce. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'good' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. Introduction of a stark urban edge would harm the existing landscape character where the transition from the open fields to the town is mitigated by existing mature boundary treatments; the dipping topography; and the single storey nature of the western half of The Pastures.³¹ The site will be highly prominent from the western approach along the A6075 where the site will be unduly visible due to the approach road being over 10m in height above the site. The A6075 is at 75m AOD west of the Walkers industrial estate and is 73m AOD as you approach past the Walkers industrial estate; the site is at a height of around 60 to 62m AOD. Therefore on this approach you get clear uninterrupted views of the edge of Tuxford; these views become more prominent as you reach the Walkers industrial estate.³² Given the previously stated conclusions of the LPA; the landscape character sensitivity; the lack of any existing boundaries; and the prominence; we are of the view that the site would have a 'significant negative' effect.³³ In our view the SA fails to comply with paragraph 32 of the NPPF which states: "Local plans and spatial development strategies should be informed throughout their preparation by a sustainability appraisal that meets the relevant legal requirements¹⁷. This should demonstrate how the plan has addressed relevant economic, social and environmental objectives (including opportunities for net gains). Significant adverse impacts on these objectives should be avoided and, wherever possible, alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued. Where significant adverse impacts are unavoidable, suitable mitigation measures should be proposed (or, where this is not possible, compensatory measures should be considered)." Landscape & Townscape and Heritage Assets³⁴. We have explained above under the SA heading the landscape and townscape impact including lack of physical boundaries, topography, prominence in views and landscape sensitivity which we don't repeat here for brevity. This harm would be exacerbated by the need to create a 2m wide footway along the highway which would require the removal of the existing hedgerow along Ollerton Road. Furthermore the Ollerton Road street lighting will also require extending accordingly as will the village gateway signing and road markings. This will significantly change the western gateway into the town and result in a harsh urban gateway rather than the semi-rural gateway that exists at present.³⁵ This change from semi-rural to harsh urban character would change the character and appearance of the Tuxford Conservation Area which runs along the southern side of Ollerton Road. This would harm the significance of this designated heritage asset and the provision of housing would not represent a public benefit that is sufficient to outweigh this harm, particularly when there are reasonable alternative sites available elsewhere that do not result in heritage harm and when the site is not required to meet the actual strategic housing need due to the Local Plan choosing to over-allocate housing. Consequently in our view the statutory duty in s72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 on local planning authorities to preserve and enhance conservation areas while undertaking their planning duties is not met.³⁶ The adjacent part of the Conservation Area is within the Market Place character area where the Character Appraisal indicates that: "The historic layout and plan form of the character area is predominantly characterised by buildings that front onto the street, often directly onto or close to the highway. Any new development, including infill or replacement, should seek to respect this character." If this character were to be followed this would introduce substantial harm through the strong urbanisation of Ollerton Road. Modern suburban type of development that would be likely in a modern housing estate would be contradictory to this character which would also harm the character or appearance of the Conservation Area gateway.³⁷ Paragraph 194 of the NPPF states that: "Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification." In this case we consider that there is no such justification, as such the policy and allocation conflict with national planning policy.³⁸ It would also conflict with paragraph 127 c) of the NPPF which requires planning policies and decisions to ensure that developments: "are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road		(such as increased densities); "Environmental Constraints39. Paragraph 170 b) of the NPPF seeks planning policies and decisions to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: "recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland;" The site is Grade 2 agricultural land which is of high quality and forms part of the definition of 'best and most versatile agricultural land'.40. Grade 2 agricultural land is defined by Natural England1 as: "Very good quality agricultural land - Land with minor limitations which affect crop yield, cultivations or harvesting. A wide range of agricultural and horticultural crops can usually be grown. On some land in the grade there may be reduced flexibility due to difficulties with the production of the more demanding crops, such as winter harvested vegetables and arable root crops. The level of yield is generally high but may be lower or more variable than grade 1."41. Although most of Tuxford lies on Grade 2 agricultural land the proposed site here forms part of an extensive tract of best and most versatile agricultural land which makes it of greater agricultural benefit. Reasonable alternatives exist around Tuxford such as the 12 hectares of land between Lodge Lane and the Tuxford Academy which will become landlocked and unconnected to wider agricultural land.42. The proposed allocation would result in housing becoming closer to the site of the wind turbine permitted under 50/10/00046. Condition 6 on this consent requires "The level of noise emissions from the combined effects of the wind turbine shall not exceed 5dBA above the background noise level at any occupied property." The proposed allocation extends into the yellow area illustrated in Figure 5.1 Noise Emissions in the Environmental Appraisal which supported application 50/10/00046; as such there is potential for the site allocation to prejudice the operation of this wind turbine which would reduce the contribution that it can make to climate change. The noise emission contour was developed having regard to the advice in ETSU-R-97: The assessment and rating of noise from wind farms which remains the relevant advice as specified in Planning Practice Guidance (Reference ID: 5-015-20140306). There has been no assessment as to the effect the proposed allocation would have on the wind turbine utilising ETSU-R-97: The assessment and rating of noise from wind farms.43. The consent for that turbine also has a condition 5 which states "No development shall commence until a scheme to satisfactorily alleviate the incidence of shadow flicker at any occupied property with windows facing towards the wind farm has been submitted to and approved in writing by the District Planning Authority." It is understood that a scheme to discharge this condition includes shutdown periods; although the actual details discharging the condition are not published on the LPA website.44. The Figure 6.1 Shadow Flicker in the Environmental Appraisal which supported application 50/10/00046; indicates that the proposed allocation would be located within the zone for shadow flicker potential. Given this if allocated the site would be likely to impose further restrictions on the operation of the wind turbine due to complaints that would be likely to arise which may be deemed to constitute statutory nuisance.45. The proposed allocation has significant potential to adversely affect the operation of the existing wind turbine which would not be in the interests of proper planning or the impact on climate change. In this respect the proposed allocation would not constitute sustainable1 https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/agricultural-land-assess-proposals-for-development/guide-to-assessing-development-proposals-on-agricultural-land#agricultural-land-classification-aldevelopment as set out in paragraph 8 c) of the NPPF and undermine the ambition of paragraph 148 of the NPPF for the planning system to support the transition to a low carbon future. Accessibility and Highway Impact46. As indicated earlier whilst the site location does provide reasonable accessibility to some town centre services and facilities there is poor accessibility to some key services including the secondary school and GP surgery.47. Tuxford suffers from limited accessibility due to the road bridge under the A1 being the only connection between the two halves of the Town. Policy 24 does refer to contributions towards the improvement of the existing public right of way at Long Lane for pedestrian access into the town. However Long Lane is not an adopted highway and we understand that the Lane has no clear ownership. Accordingly as we indicated earlier this policy requirement cannot be delivered and this will make the social integration of this site more difficult.48. The proposed allocation would represent a 'bolt-on' to the edge of Tuxford with few opportunities to create integration and linkages. It will be reliant upon pedestrian and cycle access running alongside the main A6075 which provides for a poor environment due to the HGV movements to/from the Walkers industrial estate and the Boughton industrial estate which is reliant on the A6075 for access due to low bridge in Ollerton. For example Clipper logistics, a large scale B8 storage and distribution use for ASDA and others based at Boughton industrial estate is frequented by lorries too high to get under the low bridge in Ollerton. In addition the Walkers industrial estate generates numerous HGV crane movements and other movements including some exceptional loads which already have to utilise the footways and verges at the Ollerton Road and Eldon Street in order to manoeuvre the	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road		<p>junction.49. There has been no assessment of the traffic generation from the proposed allocation as such the requirement for junction capacity improvements has not been assessed. Accordingly the impact of a new access onto the A6075 on the free flow of traffic and in particular the relationship to HGV traffic using the Walkers industrial estate has not been assessed.50. The A6075 road adjacent to the proposed site has a natural dip in the road, this creates a partial blind spot for cars entering or leaving the village. This has the potential to limit the potential locations for any new access and would be likely to need the access to be created on the rise which together with the slight curve in the A6075 would result in any new access being highly prominent in the streetscene.51. Long Lane is a narrow lane which is not an adopted highway which directly serves around a dozen properties. Existing residential householders have indemnity insurance in place to protect their right of use due to this lack of ownership. It has no defined footway and as a shared surface private road pedestrian and vehicular conflict already arises.52. The lane is not of sufficient width to allow two vehicles to pass and we understand that Long Lane is already used for regular access to agricultural fields by farm vehicles/heavy goods vehicles. It also provides access to Westwood Farm on occasions, access to maintenance of wind turbine on land owned by Westwood Farm, access to maintain the railway line and bridges by Network Rail and associated contractors. This use already presents a conflict between vehicles and pedestrians using the footpath or residents and their children living on Long Lane. Encouraging greater use of the public right of way would exacerbate the potential for vehicular and pedestrian conflict. Infrastructure Demand53. The site as with all new housing development will generate demand of additional pupil numbers. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan indicates that site NP04 will generate a need for 20 primary school places and 15 secondary school places.54. Obtaining school capacity figures is not particularly straightforward as these are often not widely published, we have therefore used the school capacity figures published by Ofsted. It is accepted that parental choice impacts upon school planning and forecasting, however it would be reasonable to assume that development within Tuxford will impact on pupil numbers at Tuxford Primary Academy and Tuxford Academy.55. Tuxford Primary Academy has a capacity of 240 pupils, but the school is currently oversubscribed by having 333 pupils. The 2020-21 Nottinghamshire schools admission statistics anticipates the roll to be 339 pupils. This represents an anticipated roll of 99 pupils in excess of capacity, which is 41% over capacity before any additional development occurs.56. The allocation of Site NP04 and the other proposed allocation NP11 together with the committed housing site at Ashvale Road will collectively generate additional demand for a further 53 pupils (NP04 – 20; NP11 – 14; Ashvale – 19). This will result in an anticipated roll of 152 pupils in excess of capacity, which would then be 63% over capacity.57. Tuxford Academy has a capacity of 1,462 with current numbers standing at 1,554. The 2020-21 Nottinghamshire schools admission statistics anticipates the roll to be 1,550 pupils. This represents an anticipated roll of 88 pupils in excess of capacity, which is 6% over capacity before any additional development occurs.58. The allocation of Site NP04 and the other proposed allocation NP11 together with the committed housing site at Ashvale Road will collectively generate additional demand for a further 39 pupils (NP04 – 15; NP11 – 10; Ashvale – 14). This will result in an anticipated roll of 127 pupils in excess of capacity, which would then be 9% over capacity. (Note – this figure would be increased by development proposed outside Tuxford but within the catchment area which extends beyond Bassetlaw into Newark & Sherwood)59. Although financial contributions will be sought for expansion, it is noted that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan assumes that this additional capacity can be accommodated within expansion at existing schools. However in relation to the Primary Academy the school site measures 11,991m² including the Sure Start Centre and Nursery or 10,847m² excluding the Sure Start Centre and Nursery. The Primary Academy operates on a constrained site with no additional land available for expansion.60. Nottinghamshire County Council2 states that a 210 pupil Primary School requires a gross area of 10,900m², with a 420 pupil Primary School requiring a gross area of 19,300m². With the increased pupil numbers arising the Tuxford Primary Academy will potentially have a total of 392 pupils. The61. Tuxford Primary Academy site is only sufficient in size for a 210 pupil school which is in fact less than its designed capacity. With the predicted impact of the developments proposed in Tuxford the school site will be around 8,450m² too small. This will substantially harm primary education in Tuxford and as such the Local Plan should be planning for a second site for the school or the relocation of the school to a new site and redevelopment of its existing site for housing. In this respect there would seem to be more logic in planning for a more comprehensive development centered on NP11, the Ashvale Road committed housing site and a new primary school created as part of an extended education campus next to Tuxford Academy.2 Strategic Planning of School Places - areas of land required for schools based on current DCSF guidanceOther Matters62. The proposed allocation would require the diversion of a low voltage electricity line, although not uncommon the required re-routing would need to be along the eastern site edge and along Long Lane which would not aid a layout that could successfully integrate</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
		<p>with the existing built form. Conclusion63. For the reasoning set out above we consider that the proposed allocation would have an unacceptable:- landscape and townscape impact; relationship to existing built form; impact on the significance, character and appearance of designated heritage assets; relationship to nearby land uses including the nearby wind turbine; level of accessibility; impact on highway and pedestrian safety; and impact on Grade 2 agricultural land.64. Consequently the proposed allocation would fail the tests of soundness as explained earlier and it would not constitute sustainable development. Change Requested65. Delete the proposed site NP04 and consider other reasonable alternatives such as site NP11 Land off Lodge Lane which could prevent strategic benefits of securing access and connectivity through to Tuxford Academy; would have a better relationship to existing built form brought about by the industrial estate and rail lines; and remove what would otherwise become a remnant piece of land left isolated from wider farmland</p>	
REF198	Consultant	<p>Policy 24 Site NP04 This site should not be included, its assessment is flawed.</p> <p>page 98 Tuxford does not have a Neighbourhood Plan therefore its inclusion, if based on this document, is incorrect.</p> <p>In terms of location, it is on the very edge of the town on a main entrance to Tuxford. It will extend Tuxford into the viewed open countryside which in itself will have a very negative effect on the town.</p> <p>It has heritage and conservation constraints and did not score as well as other promoted sites in Tuxford.</p> <p>The site at St John's College Farm is a far better site with excellent existing connectivity infrastructure. It is surrounded on 2 sides by housing and does not affect the visual attractiveness of the entrances to Tuxford.</p> <p>This policy needs to be readdressed.</p>	<p>Tuxford does have a made Neighbourhood Plan. However that plan does not have identified development sites and the town council are now in the process of reviewing such work. The smaller area identified at NP04 has considered the environmental and heritage issues. The appropriate stakeholders and departments have been consulted as part of the process.</p>
REF201	Severn Trent	<p>There are surface water sewers detailed within the vicinity of the site, it is therefore not anticipated that any surface water connection to the foul sewer will be permitted. Severn Trent would note that whilst Policy 24 section 1 states the need for high quality Sustainable design, there no definition of what this means, we would therefore recommend that statements are included to highlight that development should incorporate Water Efficient Design, SuDS and the Drainage Hierarchy. Development should also consider Water re-use where appropriate.</p>	<p>A reference to water efficeiency will be included within a revised Policy for the site.</p>
REF222	Notts CC	<p>Strategic Highways Part 4, a) (i) - one point of access from Ollerton Road and a layout suitable for the provision of public transport up to the southern boundary of the site.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>
REF273	Anglian Water	<p>No reference is made to the inclusion of water efficiency/re-use or SuDS provision unlike other housing allocation policies for Retford. We would ask that the criteria be consistently applied to all residential allocation sites. Please see suggested changes to the wording of the Bassetlaw Garden Village policy for the wording to be used.</p>	<p>A reference to water efficeiency will be included within a revised Policy for the site.</p>
REF389	Resident	<p>My views on the housing plan for Tuxford. I am afraid I do not have any policy numbers as I am not online.</p> <p>My main concern is the use of Gilbert Avenue as an exit for the houses on the play area.</p> <p>Tuxford has three very good youth football teams where are they going to play if you build or use their field as an exist road.</p> <p>Surely Lodge Lane would be a more sensible exist for the house behind this field, thus saving the field for all Children. Gilbert Avenue is a nightmare as far as traffic is concerned, you should be looking at ways to improve not make matter worse.</p> <p>Lots of children live on this estate so you should be looking at ways to make a safe place for them to live and play, not increasing the traffic flows thus making it unsafe. The ideal place to build is either Marnham Road or Ollerton Road.</p> <p>Another great problem Tuxford as a whole is the drains. Lincoln Road has been closed recently due to raw sewage running down the road. This is not the first time problems have occurred, nor is it the only place. The whole sewage system wants a big overall before any more houses are built.</p>	<p>The amount of public open space would remain the same. However, if there was a proposal on the land to the south of Gilbert Avenue then this would provide a better recreational facility than the current one.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF429	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.11.1 on page 97 states "The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019." This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states "The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026." The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and "topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here". It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that "Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site" because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because "Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting." No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60's bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road. Although "Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site." it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-"Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction." Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.) Quoting from Cllr J Ogle's objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford, "large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties." The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments. A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view. Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states: 9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a 	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also included to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any "known" planning constraints and those are taken into account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be required for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
		<p>sense of well-being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health. and POLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page 134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by 7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action. However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, "Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land." The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	<p>land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF430	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.11.1 on page 97 states "The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019." This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states "The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026." The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and "topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here". It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that "Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site" because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because "Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting." No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60's bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road. Although "Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site." it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-"Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction." Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.) Quoting from Cllr J Ogle's objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford, "large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties." The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments. A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view. Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states: 9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a 	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also included to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any "known" planning constraints and those are taken into account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be required for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
		<p>sense of well-being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health. and POLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page 134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by 7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action. However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, "Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land." The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	<p>land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF431	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.11.1 on page 97 states "The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019." This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states "The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026." The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and "topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here". It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that "Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site" because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because "Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting." No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60's bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road. Although "Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site." it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-"Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction." Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.) Quoting from Cllr J Ogle's objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford, "large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties." The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments. A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view. Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states: 9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a 	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also included to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any "known" planning constraints and those are taken into account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be required for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
		<p>sense of well-being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health. and POLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page 134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by 7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action. However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, "Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land." The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	<p>land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF432	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.11.1 on page 97 states "The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019." This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states "The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026." The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and "topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here". It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that "Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site" because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because "Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting." No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60's bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road. Although "Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site." it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-"Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction." Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.) Quoting from Cllr J Ogle's objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford, "large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties." The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments. A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view. Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states: 9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a 	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also included to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any "known" planning constraints and those are taken into account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be required for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
		<p>sense of well-being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health. and POLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page 134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by 7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action. However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, "Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land." The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	<p>land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF433	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.11.1 on page 97 states "The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019." This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states "The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026." The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and "topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here". It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that "Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site" because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because "Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting." No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60's bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road. Although "Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site." it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-"Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction." Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.) Quoting from Cllr J Ogle's objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford, "large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties." The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments. A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view. Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states: 9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a 	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also included to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any "known" planning constraints and those are taken into account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be required for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road		<p>sense of well-being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health. and POLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page 134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by 7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action. However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, "Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land." The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF434	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.11.1 on page 97 states "The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019." This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states "The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026." The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and "topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here". It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that "Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site" because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because "Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting." No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60's bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road. Although "Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site." it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-"Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction." Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.) Quoting from Cllr J Ogle's objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford, "large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties." The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments. A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view. Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states: 9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a 	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also included to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any "known" planning constraints and those are taken into account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be required for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
		<p>sense of well-being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health. and POLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page 134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by 7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action. However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, "Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land." The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	<p>land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF435	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.11.1 on page 97 states "The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019." This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states "The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026." The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and "topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here". It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that "Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site" because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because "Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting." No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60's bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road. Although "Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site." it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-"Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction." Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.) Quoting from Cllr J Ogle's objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford, "large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties." The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments. A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view. Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states: 9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a 	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also included to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any "known" planning constraints and those are taken into account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be required for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road		<p>sense of well-being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health. and POLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page 134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by 7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action. However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, "Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land." The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF436	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.11.1 on page 97 states "The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019." This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states "The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026." The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and "topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here". It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that "Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site" because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because "Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting." No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60's bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road. Although "Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site." it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-"Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction." Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.) Quoting from Cllr J Ogle's objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford, "large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties." The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments. A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view. Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states: 9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a 	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also included to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any "known" planning constraints and those are taken into account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be required for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road		<p>sense of well-being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health. and POLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page 134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by 7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action. However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, "Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land." The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF437	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.11.1 on page 97 states "The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019." This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states "The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026." The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and "topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here". It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that "Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site" because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because "Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting." No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60's bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road. Although "Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site." it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-"Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction." Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.) Quoting from Cllr J Ogle's objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford, "large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties." The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments. A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view. Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states: 9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a 	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also included to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any "known" planning constraints and those are taken into account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be required for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
		<p>sense of well-being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health. and POLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page 134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by 7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action. However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, "Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land." The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	<p>land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF438	Resident	<p>The public footpath and road from the pastures along Ollerton Road going into Tuxford narrows. At present 2 people can pass each other comfortably, this is made worse when vehicles park on or halfway on the pavement and someone on a mobility scooter, pushchair and wheelchair have to go out onto the road to go round that parked car. We have large vehicles now come thundering along this narrow part of Ollerton Road creating a side draft and its quite frightening for a normal able bodied person. The young and less mobile person cannot move out of the way quick enough. Ny new build will create an increase of large vehicles into the area and an increase of vehicles to the new properties and put more lives at risk along this already problem neck at Ollerton Road. I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:• 7.11.1 on page 97 states "The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019." This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states "The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026." The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and "topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here". It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that "Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site" because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmont Road. It qualifies the lack of support because "Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting." No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmont Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60's bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road. Although "Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site." it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-"Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction." Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.) Quoting from Cllr J Ogle's objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford, "large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties." The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments. A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view. Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to</p>	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also included to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any "known" planning constraints and those are taken into account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be required for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road		<p>come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states:-9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a sense of well-being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health. and POLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page 134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by 7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action. However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, "Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land." The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF439	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.11.1 on page 97 states "The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019." This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states "The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026." The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and "topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here". It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that "Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site" because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because "Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting." No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60's bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road. Although "Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site." it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-"Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction." Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.) Quoting from Cllr J Ogle's objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford, "large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties." The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments. A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view. Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states: 9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a 	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also included to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any "known" planning constraints and those are taken into account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be required for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NPO4 Ollerton Road		<p>sense of well-being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health.</p> <p>and POLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page 134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by 7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change;</p> <p>Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassettlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action. However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NPO4 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, "Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land." The site NPO4 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.
REF440	Resident	<p>Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments. A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NPO4 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view. Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states:-9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a sense of well-being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health.</p> <p>and POLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page 134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by 7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of</p>	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also included to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any "known" planning constraints and those are taken into account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road		<p>safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action. However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, "Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land." The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	<p>place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be requirement for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.</p>
REF440	Resident	<p>We would also like to note that when the traffic is running freely on Ollerton Road (as it often does outside peak hours) there is a tendency for vehicles to travel too fast in both directions, not taking into account the SPEED limit parked cars etc. Many vehicles do not slow to 30mph as soon as they should if at all, whilst others travelling were often speed up before the end of the 30mph zone. Perhaps this could be considered along with any investigation into traffic congestion. Thank you.</p>	<p>Any necessary improvements to the existing highway network will be considered through the planning of the site. Any additional infrastructure requirement(s) will be identified within a revised policy for the site.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF441	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.11.1 on page 97 states "The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019." This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states "The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026." The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and "topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here". It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that "Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site" because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because "Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting." No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60's bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road. Although "Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site." it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-"Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction." Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.) Quoting from Cllr J Ogle's objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford, "large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties." The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments. A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view. Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states: 9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a 	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also included to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any "known" planning constraints and those are taken into account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be required for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road		<p>sense of well-being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health. and POLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page 134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by 7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action. However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, "Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land." The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF442	Resident	<p>Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments. A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view. Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years.</p> <p>• Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states:- 9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a sense of well-being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health.</p> <p>and POLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page 134 states:- B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; <p>Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action. However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford.</p> <p>• 6.6.3 on page 64 states, "Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land." The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also included to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any "known" planning constraints and those are taken into account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be required for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NPO4 Ollerton Road			land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF443	Resident	<p>Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments.</p> <p>A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view.</p> <p>Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states:- <p>9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a sense of well-being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health.</p> <p>and</p> <p>POLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page134 states:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by <p>7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved;</p> <p>8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change;</p> <p>Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, "Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land." <p>The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also included to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any "known" planning constraints and those are taken into account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be requirement for the development.</p> <p>Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application.</p> <p>Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered.</p> <p>Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield land to use to</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NPO4 Ollerton Road			
			accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF444	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.11.1 on page 97 states "The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019." This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states "The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026." The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and "topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here". It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that "Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site" because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because "Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting." No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60's bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road. Although "Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site." it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-"Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction." Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.) Quoting from Cllr J Ogle's objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford, "large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties." The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments. A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view. Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states: 9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a 	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also included to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any "known" planning constraints and those are taken into account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be required for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
		<p>sense of well-being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health. and POLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page 134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by 7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action. However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, "Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land." The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	<p>land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF445	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.11.1 on page 97 states "The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019." This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states "The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026." The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and "topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here". It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that "Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site" because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because "Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting." No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60's bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road. Although "Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site." it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-"Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction." Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.) Quoting from Cllr J Ogle's objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford, "large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties." The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments. A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view. Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states: 9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a 	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also included to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any "known" planning constraints and those are taken into account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be required for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
		<p>sense of well-being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health.</p> <p>and POLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page 134 states:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by 7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; <p>Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action. However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, “Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land.” The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district. 	<p>land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF446	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.11.1 on page 97 states "The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019." This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states "The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026." The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and "topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here". It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that "Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site" because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because "Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting." No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60's bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road. Although "Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site." it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-"Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction." Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.) Quoting from Cllr J Ogle's objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford, "large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties." The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments. A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view. Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states: 9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a 	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also included to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any "known" planning constraints and those are taken into account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be required for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
		<p>sense of well-being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health.</p> <p>and POLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page 134 states:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by 7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; <p>Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action. However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, “Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land.” The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district. 	<p>land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF447	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.11.1 on page 97 states "The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019." This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states "The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026." The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and "topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here". It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that "Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site" because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because "Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting." No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60's bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road. Although "Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site." it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-"Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction." Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.) Quoting from Cllr J Ogle's objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford, "large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties." The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments. A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view. Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states: 9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a 	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also included to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any "known" planning constraints and those are taken into account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be required for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road		<p>sense of well-being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health.</p> <p>and POLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page 134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by 7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change;</p> <p>Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford.</p> <p>• 6.6.3 on page 64 states, “Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land.” The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	<p>land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF448	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.11.1 on page 97 states "The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019." This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states "The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026." The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and "topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here". It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that "Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site" because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because "Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting." No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60's bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road. Although "Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site." it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-"Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction." Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.) Quoting from Cllr J Ogle's objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford, "large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties." The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments. A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view. Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states: 9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a 	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also included to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any "known" planning constraints and those are taken into account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be required for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road		<p>sense of well-being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health.</p> <p>and POLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page 134 states:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by 7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; <p>Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action. However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, “Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land.” The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district. 	<p>land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF449	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.11.1 on page 97 states "The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019." This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states "The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026." The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and "topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here". It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that "Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site" because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because "Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting." No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60's bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road. Although "Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site." it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-"Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction." Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.) Quoting from Cllr J Ogle's objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford, "large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties." The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments. A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view. Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states: 9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a 	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also included to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any "known" planning constraints and those are taken into account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be required for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road		<p>sense of well-being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health.</p> <p>POLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page 134 states:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action. <p>However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, "Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land." <p>The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.
REF450	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.11.1 on page 97 states "The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019." This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states "The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026." The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and "topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here". It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that "Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site" because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because "Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting." No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60's bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road. Although "Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a 	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also included to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any "known" planning constraints and those are taken into account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road		<p>Transport Assessment for the site." it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-"Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction." Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.) Quoting from Cllr J Ogle's objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford, "large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties." The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments. A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view. Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states: 9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a sense of well-being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health. and POLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page 134 states:- B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by 7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action. However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, "Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land." The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	<p>place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be requirement for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.</p>
REF453	Resident	<p>ST24</p> <p>I think NP04 is a better site for housing the services wouldn't affect an already old and failing service system. Personally I'm not in favour of any more building in Tuxford, roads, junctions, schools, doctors, sewers, parking are all under stress as it is. Extra housing extra people, children and services requires not so good for an already stretched village/town. We have no public toilets,</p>	<p>Existing infrastructure is considered during the site allocations process. Consultation is undertaken with all key stakeholders and infrastructure providers to identify</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
		village hall or extra spaces within Tuxfords school catchment. Building outside of this village with new drains, roads etc would be better than tagging on and cramming in which is what you are proposing. You asked which sites we would prefer then discounted those everything in this village comes and goes along the very overcrowded and heavily polluted A6075 this would only get worse with any building within Tuxford.	whether any new or additional infrastructure is required as part of a new development.
REF454	W. H. Bett and Sons	I am a partner in a farm at Tuxford, and have an interest in the land parcels, on Ollerton Road (ST24) and (ST25) the field behind Tuxford School. I am in favour for these sites to be developed for housing. I feel strongly there is a need for new housing in Tuxford, particularly so that young people can choose to stay in their local area. I would be happy for these parcels to go forward for development.	Thank you for your comment

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST26 - Affordable Housing			
REF136	A and D Architecture	5) Policy ST26 should be modified to state that static caravans are recognised by the Council as legitimate affordable housing. A new sub-section G should read: "G. The Council values the role the park home sector plays in the housing market offering an affordable alternative to mainstream housing for many people, often over the age of fifty, in mainly rural and semi-rural locations and will support applications for the development of new Park Home static caravan sites."	The Council does not consider it necessary to allocate sites for Home Parks. There are policies in the plan which can be used to determine applications for Park Homes.
REF205	Consultant	The Policy proposes the provision of 10% affordable on brownfield sites and 20% provision on greenfield sites. This policy is supported at the Church Farm site which is a combination of brown and greenfield land. It is also accepted that the development should have a mix of size of properties. Open book viability assessment is accepted. Information has been submitted to Hayton Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group.	The Council will consider new sites submitted through the Land Availability Assessment process. Potentially suitable sites will be taken through the Sustainability Appraisal process.
1196559	Resident	ST26; The Policy on Affordable Housing must be maintained if not increased. This is essential for future generations, However, the Council and its Planning Department MUST be strong with Developers who obtain approvals to include such housing and then apply for deferments and the Affordable element is lost.	The Local Plan can only deliver affordable homes where viable. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment has informed this policy. The Council will use a range of other mechanisms, working with other agencies, such as Registered Providers, as well as the Local Plan to deliver affordable housing.
REF270	Barton Willmore	Uplift for affordable housing 2.71 Notwithstanding the case for an uplift in housing numbers to account for the economic conditions within Bassetlaw, we consider that there is a case to be made for the level of housing provision to be further increased to account for the need to provide affordable housing within the District. 2.72 The newly revised PPG notes that the SMOAN makes an 'affordability adjustment' to ensure that the standard method for assessing local housing need responds to price signals and is consistent with the policy objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. This specific adjustment in this guidance is made in response to the 'affordability' of housing rather than to meet the needs for 'affordable housing'. The adjustment is made only to ensure that housing provision is set at a level to ensure that the minimum housing need "starts to address the affordability of homes". As a minimum, this policy requirement of a Local Plan is only that it does not make the affordability of homes worse. The above makes no requirement on the solving of affordable housing shortfalls within Districts. 2.73 The Council's 2017 Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) identifies affordable housing needs for the District separately, which the SMOAN does not. That affordable housing need shows a need of 134dpa for affordable homes between 2014 -2035. The Local Plan (at paragraph 7.13.5) shows that, taking into account current under delivery of affordable housing, there is a residual requirement for 2,578 affordable homes to be delivered within the plan period. 2.74 The Local Plan suggests that the above affordable housing needs will not be met due to viability issues. Whilst the ability of the open market to deliver affordable housing is an issue which must be addressed, including allocation of Sites in more buoyant market areas, the main contributing factor to the lack of affordable housing that can be delivered is the lack of housing proposed	The Housing and Economic Needs Assessment Update 2020 provides the basis for the housing numbers in the Local Plan and the approach taken to affordable housing. The housing requirement exceeds the standard method baseline therefore it is considered that the Local Plan does provide for an uplift to account for affordability and to provide more affordable homes through market led schemes than would have been the case if the standard method was used.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST26 - Affordable Housing			
		<p>overall.</p> <p>2.75 The Council has not provided a breakdown of what the maximum number of affordable units the proposed supply could deliver. However, from a review of the AMR data available it is clear that the delivery of affordable housing is likely to fall significantly below the 134dpa required through the plan period. In 2016/17, the Council's most successful year for delivering homes (459 dwellings) 67 of those were affordable which equates to circa 15%.</p> <p>2.76 In addition, of those 67 affordable housing commitments, one site was in Harworth and the remaining in Retford. Paragraph 2.13 of the AMR states that most of the affordable housing completions and commencements for the monitoring period are situated in Retford with a lack of affordable housing elsewhere. This further demonstrates that Retford is an important location within Bassetlaw for housing development and affordable housing. An uplift in the housing requirement for Retford will ensure that the Council can provide affordable housing within the District.</p> <p>2.77 If the above rate of delivery of affordable homes was maintained, the District would need to deliver some 893dpa to deliver the level of affordable housing it needs. With regard to the above, and in light of increasing difficulties facing the District with regard to affordability, it is considered that an additional uplift should be applied to the Council's housing requirement to boost the supply of housing to help meet affordable housing needs.</p>	
REF281	Notts Campaign to Protect Rural England	<p>The affordable housing requirements of 10% for brownfield sites and 20% for greenfield sites are low and unlikely to create the mixed, sustainable communities Bassetlaw aims for. However, we appreciate the constraints imposed by current national planning policy guidance. CPRE has consistently produced evidence showing that this regime does not and cannot deliver the affordable housing needed.</p> <p>We welcome F. :</p> <p>"Any proposed amendments to a planning permission that results in a reduction in affordable housing of the original permission should be assessed by an Open Book Viability Assessment in accordance with Policy ST52."</p> <p>as this introduces the accountability and transparency.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted.</p>
REF285	Home Builders Federation	<p>As set out in the 2019 NPPF, the Council should understand and test the influence of all inputs on viability. The cumulative impact of infrastructure, other contributions and policy compliant requirements should be set so that most sites are deliverable without further viability assessment negotiations (para 57). The deliverability of the Local Plan should not be undermined (para 34). The Council should prepare a viability assessment in accordance with the NPPG to ensure that policies are realistic and the total cost of all relevant policies are not of a scale that will make the Local Plan undeliverable (ID : 61-039-20190315). The Council's viability evidence is set out in Bassetlaw Interim Whole Plan & Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Viability Assessment by NCS Nationwide CIL Services dated August 2018. It is noted that the Council's viability assessment only includes costs for policy compliant requirements for accessibility, space and water efficiency standards. The Council consider that all other policy requirements such as provision of self & custom build plots, at least 10% on-site biodiversity net gain and provision of electric vehicle charging points do not have a significant impact on development costs. Such assumptions under-estimate the cumulative financial impact of policy compliant requirements on the viability and deliverability of residential development.</p> <p>Before the pre-submission Local Plan consultation, the Council should undertake further viability work. Policy ST26 should also be modified to be more flexible regarding on-site and off-site provision of affordable housing. On smaller sites, on-site provision may not be practical because it is not mathematically possible, no registered provider is willing to manage the new affordable units or other legitimate planning reasons.</p>	<p>The most up to date Whole Plan Viability Assessment is 2019 not 2018 and concludes that all policy requirements can be achieved as part of a viable plan. The policy does make reference to on and off site affordable housing delivery.</p>
1197091	William Davis	<p>The approach to affordable housing is broadly supported. However, it is noted that reference to development with a combined floorspace for 1000sqm is no longer included in the national policy and should therefore be removed from the policy. Given the guidance in the NPPF/NNPG that it is for applicants to demonstrate what has changed since the plan wide viability assessment (NPPF para 47 and NPPG para: 007 Reference ID: 10-007- 20190509) any requirement should be robustly justified and flexible. In terms of the Interim Plan Wide Viability & CIL Viability Assessment it is noted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 4.22 of the Viability Assessment refers to National Housing Standards and does not appear to take into account the Future Homes Standard consultation (https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/the-future-homes-standard-changes-to-part-land-part-f-of-the-building-regulations-for-newdwellings) on changes to the Buildings Regulations which are to be introduced in 2020. These changes could add over £4,800 to the cost of a new dwelling. The Impact Assessment carried out on the Future Homes Standard consultation options identified a reduction in housebuilding as a potential impact. Given the likely introduction prior to adoption of the Local 	<p>The Council will ensure that the policy reflects national policy. Policies and evidence can only be based on current building regulations. There is no certainty that the changes mooted in the Future Homes Standard consultation will be implemented. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment has been subject to discussion with stakeholders. The purpose of Whole Plan Viability is to ensure that in general the development identified in the Local plan is deliverable. It is accepted that there may be exceptional cases where this is not feasible. Policy ST52 makes provision for those</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST26 - Affordable Housing			
		<p>Plan it will be important that any requirement is future proofed to avoid the need for viability assessments to be submitted as a matter of course.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction costs have been assumed to be £1183/sqm including consideration of policy requirements. This represents an industry average and may not be applicable to every developer; a range of assumptions would provide a more robust figure. • The NPPG requires that plan makers engage with landowners, developers, and infrastructure and affordable housing providers to secure evidence on costs and values to inform viability assessment at the plan making stage (para 006 Reference ID: 10-006-20190509). The Viability Assessment does not provide any details of engagement carried out on the assumptions used. As part of the updated Viability Assessment input on the assumptions used in the assessment should be sought from stakeholders. 	circumstances. These are detailed in the report. Further versions of the Viability Assessment will also be subject to stakeholder engagement.
REF299	Gladmans	<p>Policy ST26 sets out that on major developments, the affordable housing requirement will be 10% on brownfield sites of which all the provision should be for affordable home ownership, and 20% on greenfield sites of which 50% will be for affordable home ownership and 50% will be for affordable rent. Where the contribution of affordable housing provision is likely to have an adverse impact on viability the developer will be required to provide an Open Book Viability Assessment in accordance with Policy ST52. Welcome the flexibility and proactive approach provided by this policy with regards to meeting the affordable housing needs of the District. Only through positively planning for significant housing growth can the Council realistically tackle market signals in a way which is advocated by the PPG and in doing so tackle the affordability issues prevalent in Bassetlaw.</p>	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
REF310	P&DG	<p>Draft Policy ST26 relates to the affordable housing provision for schemes of 10 or more residential units. Part B1 of the Policy should incorporate the broader definition of affordable housing outlined within Annex 2 of the Framework. The affordable housing should not be limited to affordable home ownership and affordable rent, it should also refer to all elements expressed in Annex 2 to make it compliant.</p>	The Glossary provides the definition for affordable housing which was taken from the NPPF published at Jan 2020.
REF327	Scrooby Parish	<p>This must NOT mean any reduction in the quality / type of build and where built as part of a larger development, then the "Affordable Housing" element must match the rest of the development in size, design, quality and build.</p>	The policy states that affordable housing should be indistinguishable to market housing.
REF401	East Markham Parish Council	<p>EMPC fully endorses this policy and requests that it is enforced</p>	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council will continue to seek the delivery of affordable housing in accordance with national and local policy requirements.
REF486	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>Aspirational rather than categorical on how we will deliver the anticipated number of units. Despite policy and determined practice, we have achieved less than half of the five year target. The Plan will give us more 'clout' but our stated target is only a quarter of the expected need- 605 against 2578. Even allowing for those already on sites with permission that leaves a big gap to be filled by uncalculated alternatives. Moreover, the assumption that sites will deliver units does not address the appropriateness of those sites, (Harworth, I'm told, is a location people don't wish to move to) and will Cottam possibly have a similar problem?</p>	The amount of affordable housing to be delivered by market housing schemes in the Local plan is the maximum that can be achieved by viable development. However the Council will facilitate the delivery of affordable housing in a range of ways. There is a requirement for affordable housing in all areas of the District.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST27 Housing Mix, Type and Density			
1192312	Resident	<p>More information is required on how the council is going to create opportunities for Self and Custom Build. The reason many people want to self-build is that the large housebuilder companies create Identikit, homogeneous volume housing which does not suit the way they want to live (for example open plan living or home-workers). Self-builds tend to be more individual in their design and materials therefore, some flexibility and freedom of design needs to be allowed within planning policies.</p>	The Council supports self build development, and policies in the Local Plan are enabling. High quality design is a priority for the Council. Innovation is supported where proposals do not have a negative impact on the environment/residential amenity.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST27 Housing Mix, Type and Density			
REF108	Globe Consultation	<p>Whilst any such proposal would need to satisfy highways requirements, we are confident that this can be achieved, and discussions are ongoing with highways officers. Similarly, there are ongoing discussions regarding the development opportunity with the Council's Development Management team, it is considered that the redevelopment of this site would accord with Policy ST27, which seeks, amongst other objectives, making efficient use of land and maximising development densities on sites in and adjoining town centres. It is important to note that this site is included within the Council's brownfield land register and, as such, is deemed to constitute an appropriate location for development, and one which would reasonably be included as an allocated site within the upcoming Local Plan. It is for this reason that we have issue with Policy ST14 given the premature nature by which our client's site at Blackstone Lane was discounted from the LAA process.</p>	<p>The Council supports self build development, and policies in the Local Plan are enabling. High quality design is a priority for the Council. Innovation is supported where proposals do not have a negative impact on the environment/residential amenity.</p>
REF136	A and D Architecture	<p>6) Policy ST27 should be modified to promote Park Home static caravan sector growth by including a new subsection E as follows:</p> <p>"E Park Home static caravan sites</p> <p>The Council recognises the need to provide fair and equal treatment to the group in the community aspiring to live in Park Home static caravan sites run by competent Site Operators and will support applications for the development of such sites and will grant licenses to Park Home Site Operators who can demonstrate viability."</p>	<p>The Council does not consider it necessary to allocate sites for Home Parks. There are policies in the plan which can be used to determine applications for Park Homes.</p>
REF136	A and D Architecture	<p>These statistics indicate that the District includes an averaged sized group in the community of people living in static caravans. The evidence base does not make the claim that demand for the sector is in decline (the Nomis web site entry for October 2019 is no different to that cited above). The SHM A-OAN update 2017 states that the population of the District is likely to age over the life of the Local Plan and since Park Home Lifestyles are popular with older people it is likely that demand for static caravans will increase over the life of the Local Plan. There is no evidence therefore to support reducing the static caravan fraction of the District Housing Stock over the life of the Local Plan and yet, by providing for no growth in the sector and yet this is precisely the outcome DBLP Policy will unjustifiably deliver. The Local Plan should be "significantly boosting the supply of homes" in the static caravan sector. That duty is reinforced by the popularity of the type amongst older people who, as a group, is set to increase over the life of the Plan. To avoid a charge of "discrimination by ageism" the Council should not just provide land for static caravan sector growth that keeps pace with the average target for housing growth because that would unfairly reduce choice amongst a group in the community that is disproportionately increasing. Thus, a growth target of 35 static caravans (0.384% of 9087 dwellings) by 2037 would discriminate against older people. Since the number of people aged 65 and over is set to increase by 46% to 2107 one estimate of a fair and equal treatment of the sector would be to allow fractional growth of 46% i.e. that the static caravan fraction of the housing stock should grow from 0.384% to 0.56% (=0.384 x 1.46). On that basis one estimate of a reasonable growth target in the sector without attempting primary research would be 51 static caravans (=0.56% of 9087 dwellings).</p> <p>The Council should therefore allocate land for at least 51 new Park Homes over the life of the Local Plan. Market research suggests that for a person aspiring to release equity and to release onto the market an under-occupied dwelling the Park Home static caravan option is an opportunity that should not be denied by lack of housing supply. The Local Plan should significantly boost the housing supply in this sector accordingly. Allocating no land for growth to serve this sector and this group in the community is unjustified negative planning that is contrary to national policy and makes the Local Plan unsound.</p>	<p>The Council does not consider it necessary to allocate sites for Home Parks. There are policies in the plan which can be used to determine applications for Park Homes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST27 Housing Mix, Type and Density			
REF215	Resident	<p>46. The point was made in para. 37 above that there is little point in having a three tier settlement hierarchy if that split is to be ignored for evolution of more detailed policies.</p> <p>47. Draft Policy ST27 is yet another example of this disconnected approach.</p> <p>48. Draft Policy ST1 aligns the Main Towns and the LRS's - and that is a sound approach given the stated intended wider than normal role of these rural settlements.</p> <p>49. However ST27-2 states that for housing densities in the towns it should be an average of 30 dwellings per hectare (in fact at 12 dwellings to the acre a lower figure than is likely to make the most effective use of the land) whilst in all other settlements "... densities should reflect the character of the settlement and local housing needs unless otherwise promoted through a Neighbourhood Plan."</p> <p>50. As in ST2 a strict and limiting criteria is introduced (local housing needs) without indicating what "local" means and how that correlates with the broader aims of the Local Plan.</p> <p>51. What the Draft policy also seems to be stating is that the planning of all rural settlements, large or small, is to be done through Neighbourhood Plans</p>	The Design Policy will be used to guide the density and scale of development in each area. In urban areas, 30 dwellings per hectare is considered to be a suitable starting point. The Council will continue to support the development of Neighbourhood Plans, but it is not intending to require areas to produce a neighbourhood plan. There are sufficient policies in the draft Plan which will be used to determine planning applications in rural areas.
1196559	Resident	ST27; Densities and space around buildings are both critical items and must be dealt with in line with ST26.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
REF253	Fisher German	<p>Self-Build</p> <p>The requirement to deliver 2% serviced plots on sites of 100 dwellings or more is not supported. Whilst we agree that the Council should be actively seeking to support self-builders (it is a statutory requirement to do so), the method of delivery is considered fundamentally flawed.</p> <p>There are yet to see evidence that this method of delivery has been successful. In our experience most self-builders do not wish to be within or adjacent to a modern housing development, instead preferring bespoke, rural opportunities. Furthermore, just because individuals are registered on the self-build register it does not mean that they will all build their own property, even if suitable land was available. The reality is the difficulty and lack skills required will mean only a small percentage of those on the register will ever develop a self-build property. It is also important to note that individuals can be on multiple self-build registers, which inflates the figures across a number of areas.</p> <p>This policy requirement will serve to frustrate and slow housing delivery, given special consideration would need to be given to the location of the plots and how they can be accessed safely and independently from the typical development parcels. The delivery of plots following unsuccessful marketing is also considered to be more difficult than suggested within the Policy. The Policy assumes such plots could simply just be built out, but not many developers will want to build out single serviced plots. This could leave undeveloped plots for significant period of time. Such requirements will also deter developers, given the increased complexity and lack of certainty of outcomes.</p> <p>There appears to be no reference to self-build or the provision of serviced plots within the viability study and as such the impacts of such policy requirements and the impacts on site viability are not known. It is considered that such proposals are likely to negatively impact viability in both the costs of providing such plots and the reduced land values as developers seek to mitigate for potential risks.</p> <p>The Council should instead seek to ensure a positive policy environment exists where suitable self-build schemes, either of individual units or larger schemes providing serviced plots will be treated favourably. This encourages delivery in line with the Council's statutory duties, without compromising sites which make up a vital facet of the Council's overall proposed housing supply.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. There is a caveat within the policy which enables self-build plots to be returned to market housing: 'Plots should be made available and marketed appropriately for at least 12 months. If after that time, they have not been sold the plot(s) may either remain on the open market as self-build or be built out by the developer as market housing'. As such, your theory will be tested through this policy mechanism. Sites/plots will also be offered to households who have registered an interest with the Council (those on the self-build register).</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST27 Housing Mix, Type and Density			
REF285	Home Builders Federation	<p>Under the Self Build & Custom Housebuilding Act 2015, the Council has a duty to keep a Register of people seeking to acquire self & custom build plots and to grant enough suitable development permissions to meet identified demand. The NPPG (ID: 57-025-201760728) sets out ways in which the Council should consider supporting self & custom build. These are :- • developing policies in the Plan for self & custom build ; • using Council owned land if available and suitable for self & custom build and marketing such opportunities to entrants on the Register ; • engaging with landowners who own housing sites and encouraging them to consider self & custom build and where the landowner is interested facilitating access to entrants on the Register ; and • working with custom build developers to maximise opportunities for self & custom housebuilding.</p> <p>The HBF is supportive of the Council's policy approach towards self & custom build for its potential additional contribution to overall HLS as set out in Policy ST27 :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bullet Point (B) - the Council will support proposals for self-build & custom build housing that help meet the needs of those on the Self Build & Custom Housebuilding Register, provided they are compliant with other Local Plan policies ; and <p>10</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bullet Point (D) - Neighbourhood Plans will be expected to consider the local need for self-build housing and where appropriate identify allocations for self-build & custom housing. <p>The HBF is not supportive of restrictive policy requirements for the inclusion of self & custom build housing on housing site allocations, which only changes housing delivery from one form of house building to another without any consequential additional contribution to boosting housing supply. The HBF object to Policy ST27 Bullet Point (C), which states that :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On housing allocations of 100 dwellings or more 2% of the proportion of developable plots should be set aside for self-build & custom housebuilding. Plots should be made available and marketed appropriately for at least 12 months. If after that time, they have not been sold the plot(s) may either remain on the open market as self-build or be built out by the developer as market housing. <p>The provision of serviced plots for self & custom build on housing allocations of 100 or more dwellings should not be sought. This policy requirement seeks to place the burden for delivery of self & custom build plots onto developers contrary to national guidance, which outlines that the Council should engage with landowners and encourage them to consider self & custom build. The Council's proposed policy approach should not move beyond encouragement by seeking provision of self & custom build plots on allocated housing sites of 100 or more dwellings.</p> <p>All policies should be underpinned by relevant and up to date evidence, which should be adequate, proportionate and focussed tightly on supporting and justifying the policies concerned. The Council's Self & Custom Build Register alone is not a sound basis for setting a specific policy requirement. As set out in the NPPG, the Council should provide a robust assessment of demand including an assessment and review of data held on the Council's Register (ID 2a-017-20192020), which should be supported by additional data from secondary sources to understand and consider future need for this type of housing (ID 57-0011-20160401). The Council should also analyse the preferences of entries as often only individual plots in rural locations are sought as opposed to plots on larger housing sites. It is also possible for individuals and organisations to register with more than one Council so there is a possibility of some double counting. The Register may indicate a level of expression of interest in self & custom build but it cannot be reliably translated into actual demand should such plots be made available. The Council has provided no supporting evidence on entries on its Register.</p> <p>The Council's policy approach should be realistic to ensure that where self & custom build plots are provided, they are delivered and do not remain unsold. It is unlikely that the provision of self & custom build plots on allocated housing sites of 100 or more dwellings can be co-ordinated with the development of the wider site. At any one time, there are often multiple contractors and large machinery operating on a housing site from both a practical and health & safety perspective it is difficult to envisage the development of single plots by individuals operating alongside this construction activity. If demand for plots is not realised, there is a risk of plots remaining permanently vacant effectively removing these undeveloped plots from the Council's HLS.</p> <p>11</p> <p>Where plots are not sold, it is important that the Council's policy is clear as to when these revert to the original developer. It is important that plots should not be left empty to the detriment of neighbouring properties or the whole development. The</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. There is a caveat within the policy which enables self build plots to be return to market housing: 'Plots should be made available and marketed appropriately for at least 12 months. If after that time, they have not been sold the plot(s) may either remain on the open market as self-build or be built out by the developer as market housing'. As such, this provides a flexible approach which enables developers to test the market.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST27 Housing Mix, Type and Density			
		<p>timescale for reversion of these plots to the original housebuilder should be as short as possible from the commencement of development. The proposed marketing period of 12 months is too long. The consequential delay in developing those plots presents further practical difficulties in terms of co-ordinating their development with construction activity on the wider site. There are even greater logistical problems created if the original housebuilder has completed the development and is forced to return to site to build out plots which have not been sold to self & custom builders.</p> <p>The 2019 NPPF states that policies should be clearly written and unambiguous so that a decision maker knows how to react to a development proposal (para 16d). The requirement for appropriate marketing is vague, which means uncertainty for developers. If the policy is to be effective, the Council should provide further clarification of its requirements which should be justified by supporting evidence.</p> <p>As well as on-site practicalities any adverse impacts on viability should be tested. It is the Council's responsibility to robustly viability test the Local Plan in order that the cumulative impact of infrastructure, other contributions and policy compliant requirements are set so that most development is deliverable without further viability assessment negotiations at planning application stage and the deliverability of the Local Plan is not undermined. The Bassetlaw Interim Whole Plan & Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Viability Assessment by NCS Nationwide CIL Services dated August 2018. does not test the financial impact of Policy ST27.</p> <p>The Council is also reminded that self & custom build are exemption from Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) contributions and affordable home ownership provision as set out in national policy. On housing sites allocations of 100 or more dwellings, fewer dwellings are eligible to make contributions towards infrastructure and affordable housing, which may have detrimental impacts. The Council may have aspirations for self & custom build but this should not be pursued at the expense of delivering affordable housing.</p> <p>Before the pre-submission Local Plan consultation, Policy ST27 should be amended to delete Bullet Point (C).</p>	
REF285	Home Builders Federation	<p>Policy ST28 states that on schemes of 50 or more dwellings, at least 20% should be designed to meet the requirements for accessible and adaptable dwellings under Part M4(2) of the Building Regulations. The 2019 NPPF states that policies should be clearly written and unambiguous so that a decision maker knows how to react to a development proposal (para 16d). It should be clear that the requirement for 20% M4(2) compliant dwellings only applies to schemes of 50 or more dwellings for housing schemes for older people. There should be no conjecture that this requirement applies to general family housing schemes. Before the pre-submission Local Plan consultation, Policy ST28 should be modified.</p>	<p>This will be kept under review as the Plan progresses.</p>
1197091	William Davis	<p>The approach to mix, density and type set out in Part A is broadly supported. However, the wording of Part 3 is unclear. It states that new housing development will be supported where it provides "...a mix of market and affordable housing, and specialist housing for older people and disabled persons". This could be interpreted to mean that all residential sites should include specialist housing. This would be opposed as not every site is suitable for specialist housing or capable of accommodating it. The approach to self-build is not supported. It is not considered necessary or practical to provide self-build dwellings on residential schemes. It is understood that there are currently 75 people on the Self Build Register but the policy will provide 140 plots, substantially more than necessary. There are a number of practical issues related to the provision on market housing sites including health & safety, payment of developer contributions and phasing. A number of similar policies have been found not to be sound and removed from emerging Local Plans due to these issues. It is considered that it would be more appropriate to include a policy that is supportive of self-build subject to certain criteria. It may also be possible to include an element of self-build in the new settlements being proposed as suitable parcels can be more easily built into the masterplan.</p>	<p>Part 3 of the Housing Mix Policy will be amended to clarify 'an appropriate mix of housing' will be supported. The quantum of development will be determined by the Affordable Housing Policy and Specialist Housing Policy. The Government requires Councils to take a proactive approach to the delivery of self build plots. Whilst there is currently in excess of 84 households on the Self Build Register, this covers a three year period. As such, that equates to 28 households per annum (420 households over the Plan period). The Policy enables a flexible approach which could see plots returned to market housing within a 12 month period if there is no demand.</p>
1197091	William Davis	<p>As with Policy ST27, the broad thrust of the policy is supported. However, it is unclear if the requirement for 20% of schemes to be designed to meet Part M4(2) refers to residential schemes or schemes for care homes. If for residential schemes, it is considered that the evidence provided does not justify the requirement for Part M4(2). The wording is also considered unsound given that it says 'at least 20%' which does not provide certainty for developers. Given the concerns raised about the Viability Assessment, a review of the viability assessment will be required taking account of the increased costs resulting from Part M4(2).</p>	<p>This relates to residential schemes. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates that it is deliverable. The Council's evidence (Bassetlaw Local Housing Needs Assessment 2020) provides justification for this policy.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST27 Housing Mix, Type and Density			
REF299	Gladmans	<p>5.2.1 Gladman broadly support the suggested approach of Policy ST27 which seeks to provide a range of housing types to meet the ever-growing needs of the District. In particular, Gladman remain supportive of the fact that the above policy does not set out a prescriptive approach regarding the specific mix of properties.</p> <p>5.2.2 Reflecting on our previous representations, Gladman consider that reference to Neighbourhood Plans should not be referenced in the text of the policy. The approach advocated by the Council is better suited to dealing with housing mix, tenures, types and sizes. If a Neighbourhood Plan were to come forward and sought to impose specific requirements, then the flexibility proposed by Policy ST27 would be lost.</p> <p>5.2.3 The second element of Policy ST27 outlines the Council's proposed policy approach towards self and custom build housing. Whilst Gladman are broadly supportive of this policy element we are of the opinion however that criterion C of the Policy ST27, which states on housing allocations of 100 dwellings or more 2% of the proportion of developable plots should be set aside for self-build and custom housebuilding, should be deleted from the Plan.</p> <p>5.2.4 The provision of serviced plots for self and custom build on housing allocations of 100 or more dwellings places the burden for delivery of self and custom build plots onto the developer contrary to national guidance. Whilst acknowledging the Council's aspirations for self and custom build housing, the policy should not move beyond encouragement by seeking provision of self and custom build plots on allocated housing sites of 100 dwellings or more.</p> <p>5.2.5 Gladman would be happy to explore self-build and custom build plots further with the Council, in relation to our land interests at Bevercotes Colliery.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be in conformity with Local Plans. The Council will continue to support the development of Neighbourhood Plans where they propose to deliver the aims and objectives of the Bassetlaw Local Plan. The Government requires Councils to take a proactive approach to the delivery of self build plots. Whilst there is currently in excess of 84 households on the Self Build Register, this covers a three year period. As such, that equates to 28 households per annum (420 households over the Plan period). The Policy enables a flexible approach which could see plots returned to market housing within a 12 month period if there is no demand.</p>
REF299	Gladmans	<p>5.3.1 The above policy requires development proposals of 50 or more dwellings to provide a minimum of 20% of homes to meet M4(2) Building Regulations. In principle Gladman acknowledge the importance of delivering housing to assist in meeting the needs for older people and those with mobility issues. The proposed introduction of higher optional standards for M4(2) however must be supported by robust evidence that would address an identified need for such properties in line with the requirements of the Framework10.</p> <p>5.3.2 Gladman suggest the policy is modified and flexibility added to the policy wording which provides 'support' for the provision of M4(2) but does not set a policy requirement which could impact development viability.</p>	<p>This relates to residential schemes. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates that it is deliverable. The Council's evidence (Bassetlaw Local Housing Needs Assessment 2020) provides justification for this policy.</p>
REF310	P&DG	<p>Self-build Policy ST27 refers to self and custom build housing, stating that the Council will support proposals for self and custom-built housing to help meet the need of those wishing to build their own home. Part C stipulates that allocations of more than 100 dwellings should provide a 2% proportion of plots for self-build projects, which would expire after 12 months of no interest. While it is accepted that schemes of self and custom build homes should be encouraged through the Local Plan process, it has been proven not to be a sound process in neighbouring and more recent Local Plan Examinations (Bolsover and Mansfield) to put forward a distinct percentage requirement in policy.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. Lia Council I am reviewing the density Estates housing mix, type and will make any necessary amendments.</p>
REF327	Scrooby Parish	<p>Policy ST28: Specialist Housing Having a specific policy of this nature is welcomed.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted.</p>
REF401	East Markham Parish Council	<p>EMPC endorses this policy. However, it should be noted that recent developments have failed to reflect the character of the village and have not provided adequate starter homes or homes for elder residents. East Markham Parish Council also draws BDC attention to its Neighbourhood Plan policy NP2 that specifically states the following. 1. New housing developments should deliver a housing mix that reflects the demonstrable need for smaller dwellings. 2. Developers must show this local need has been taken into account in the different housing types and bedroom numbers proposed. It is our view that this policy has been ignored in recent planning submissions by BDC.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST28 - Specialist Housing			
REF136	A and D Architecture	<p>These statistics indicate that the District includes an averaged sized group in the community of people living in static caravans. The evidence base does not make the claim that demand for the sector is in decline (the Nomis web site entry for October 2019 is no different to that cited above). The SHM A-OAN update 2017 states that the population of the District is likely to age over the life of the Local Plan and since Park Home Lifestyles are popular with older people it is likely that demand for static caravans will increase over the life of the Local Plan. There is no evidence therefore to support reducing the static caravan fraction of the District Housing Stock over the life of the Local Plan and yet, by providing for no growth in the sector and yet this is precisely the outcome DBLP Policy will unjustifiably deliver.</p> <p>The Local Plan should be "significantly boosting the supply of homes" in the static caravan sector. That duty is reinforced by the popularity of the type amongst older people who, as a group, is set to increase over the life of the Plan. To avoid a charge of "discrimination by ageism" the Council should not just provide land for static caravan sector growth that keeps pace with the average target for housing growth because that would unfairly reduce choice amongst a group in the community that is disproportionately increasing. Thus, a growth target of 35 static caravans (0.38 4% of 9087 dwellings) by 2037 would discriminate against older people. Since the number of people aged 65 and over is set to increase by 46% to 2107 one estimate of a fair and equal treatment of the sector would be to allow fractional growth of 46% i.e. that the static caravan fraction of the housing stock should grow from 0.384% to 0.56% (=0.384 x 1.46). On that basis one estimate of a reasonable growth target in the sector without attempting primary research would be 51 static caravans (=0.56% of 9087 dwellings).</p> <p>The Council should therefore allocate land for at least 51 new Park Homes over the life of the Local Plan. Market research suggests that for a person aspiring to release equity and to release onto the market an under-occupied dwelling the Park Home static caravan option is an opportunity that should not be denied by lack of housing supply. The Local Plan should significantly boost the housing supply in this sector accordingly. Allocating no land for growth to serve this sector and this group in the community is unjustified negative planning that is contrary to national policy and makes the Local Plan unsound.</p>	<p>The Council is proposing to allocate land for a range of housing types. The Policies in the Plan are supportive of housing for older people and disabled people. It is not considered necessary to allocate land specifically for park homes.</p>
REF285	Home Builders Federation	<p>Under the 2019 NPPF, the Council should establish a housing requirement figure for their whole area (para 65). As set out in the 2019 NPPF, the determination of the minimum number of homes needed should be informed by an LHN assessment using the Government's standard methodology unless exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach (para 60). The standard methodology is set out in the updated NPPG. The LHN for Bassetlaw is set out in the Council's Spatial Strategy Background Paper dated January 2020. Bassetlaw's minimum LHN is calculated as 306 dwellings per annum between 2018 – 2037. This calculation is based on 2014 Sub National Household Projections (SNHP), 2018 as the current year and 2018 affordability ratio of 6.21. The calculation is mathematically correct. As set out in the NPPG, the LHN is calculated at the start of the plan-making process however this number should be kept under review until the Local Plan is submitted for examination and revised when appropriate (ID : 2a-008-20190220). The minimum LHN for Bassetlaw may change as inputs are variable and this should be taken into consideration by the Council. The Government's standard methodology identifies the minimum annual LHN. It does not produce a housing requirement figure (ID : 2a-002-20190220). LHN assessment is only a minimum starting point. The Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes as set out in the 2019 NPPF remains (para 59). Any ambitions to support economic growth, to deliver affordable housing and to meet unmet housing needs from elsewhere may necessitate a housing requirement figure above the minimum LHN. In Bassetlaw, there is justification for a housing requirement above the minimum LHN. The NPPG indicates that if previous housing delivery has exceeded the minimum LHN, the Council should consider whether this level of delivery is indicative of greater housing need (ID : 2a-010-20190220). In Bassetlaw, housing delivery between 2010 - 2018 has averaged 329 dwellings per annum. The NPPG also recommends that recent assessments of housing needs should be considered too (ID : 2a-010-20190220). The Council's latest Objective Assessment of Housing Need (OAHN) is set out in North Derbyshire & Bassetlaw OAN Update Final Report dated October 2017 by G L Hearn. This SHMA identified the following housing needs for Bassetlaw :-• 340 dwellings per annum based on a demographic calculation comprising of 2014 Sub National Population Projections (SNPP) plus adjustments for 10 year migration trends & household formation rates in younger age groups ;• 374 dwellings per annum with an uplift to enhance affordable housing delivery ; and• 417 dwellings per annum to align housing / jobs and to support an ambitious economic growth scenario (4,800 jobs).As set out in the recently published Planning Inspectorate Guidance for Local Plan Examination, evidence base documents, especially those relating to development needs and land availability, that date from two or more years before the examination submission date</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council will make the background evidence as clear as possible.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST28 - Specialist Housing		<p>of a Local Plan may be at risk of having been overtaken by events, particularly as they may rely on data that is even older. Any such documents should be updated as necessary to incorporate the most recent available information. The Council has prudently reviewed and updated its assessment of housing needs. Jobs growth in Bassetlaw will generate a need for an increased labour supply to meet increasing employment demand, which will in turn lead to a need for new homes to accommodate the new population. The 2018 Economic Development Needs Assessment (EDNA) by G L Hearn uses three economic forecasting models from Oxford Economics (OE), Cambridge Econometrics, and Experian to assess jobs growth over the plan period and to inform the number of new homes required to support such jobs growth. In the District over the last decade or more, evidence of the strong performance of the transport and manufacturing sectors implies that uplifted scenarios to the baseline economic forecasts are appropriate. After the inclusion of uplifts to the transport and manufacturing sectors, the OE forecasts are considered to reflect the District's economy. The OE midpoint has been identified as the expected future economic scenario. This results in an increase of 3,400 jobs to 2035, which in turn results in a need for an increase of 3,323 people in the resident labour supply. This translates into an economic led housing need of 390 dwellings per annum. A market for commercial development along the A1 corridor in the north of the District is emerging, which will serve a sub-regional market for distribution and industrial land that may exceed historic competitions. When jobs growth of 3,400 to 2035 is projected forward to 2037 (5550 jobs), the EDNA 2019 identifies a housing requirement of minimum 478 dwellings per annum. The NPPG states that total affordable housing need should be considered in the context of its likely delivery as a proportion of mixed market and affordable housing developments. As set out in the NPPG, an increase in the total housing figures may be considered where it could help deliver affordable housing (ID : 2a-024-20190220). The SHMA Update identified affordable housing need of housing need of 2,814 affordable homes (134 affordable dwellings per annum) 2014-2035. Only 236 affordable homes were delivered in the District between 2014 – 2019 therefore there is a residual requirement for 2,578 affordable dwellings. Even though the Whole Plan Viability Assessment identifies that it is not possible to deliver the full requirement for affordable housing through contributions from market housing schemes, a higher overall housing requirement will contribute towards delivery of greater number of affordable homes. The Council recognises the need to plan for more homes than the minimum LHN of 306 dwellings per annum. Policy ST1 – Bassetlaw Spatial Strategy states that there will be provision of land for a minimum of 9,087 dwellings (478 dwellings per annum). The Council's proposed housing requirement of 478 dwellings per annum for the plan period is justified to meet housing needs of the population, to support economic growth of the District and to help deliver affordable housing. However, the Council should make clearer statements about its LHN and housing requirement figures and the derivation thereof in the pre-submission Local Plan. There should also be a distinction between the District's housing requirement and its HLS.</p>	
REF285	Home Builders Federation	<p>Policy ST28 states that on schemes of 50 or more dwellings, at least 20% should be designed to meet the requirements for accessible and adaptable dwellings under Part M4(2) of the Building Regulations. The 2019 NPPF states that policies should be clearly written and unambiguous so that a decision maker knows how to react to a development proposal (para 16d). It should be clear that the requirement for 20% M4(2) compliant dwellings only applies to schemes of 50 or more dwellings for housing schemes for older people. There should be no conjecture that this requirement applies to general family housing schemes. Before the pre-submission Local Plan consultation, Policy ST28 should be modified.</p>	<p>The requirement is proposed to be applicable to all residential schemes, not just housing for older people. This will be clarified in the policy.</p>
1197091	William Davis	<p>As with Policy ST27, the broad thrust of the policy is supported. However, it is unclear if the requirement for 20% of schemes to be designed to meet Part M4(2) refers to residential schemes or schemes for care homes. If for residential schemes, it is considered that the evidence provided does not justify the requirement for PartM4(2). The wording is also considered unsound given that it says 'at least 20%' which does not provide certainty for developers. Given the concerns raised about the Viability Assessment, a review of the viability assessment will be required taking account of the increased costs resulting from Part M4(2).</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments, which are noted. The requirement is proposed to be applicable to all residential schemes, not just housing for older people. This will be clarified in the policy. The minimum 20% requirement has been identified as viable in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. The requirement for specialist housing is higher than 20% (evidenced by the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment). Where viable, the Council may seek a higher level of accessible housing, in line with national policy and guidance.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST28 - Specialist Housing			
REF299	Gladmans	The above policy requires development proposals of 50 or more dwellings to provide a minimum of 20% of homes to meet M4(2) Building Regulations. Acknowledge the importance of delivering housing to assist in meeting the needs for older people and those with mobility issues. The proposed introduction of higher optional standards for M4(2) however must be supported by robust evidence that would address an identified need for such properties in line with the requirements of the Framework10. Suggest the policy is modified and flexibility added to the policy wording which provides 'support' for the provision of M4(2) but does not set a policy requirement which could impact development viability.	The minimum 20% requirement has been identified as viable in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. The requirement for specialist housing is higher than 20% (evidenced by the Housing and Economic Needs Assessment). Where viable, the Council may seek a higher level of accessible housing, in line with national policy and guidance.
REF327	Scrooby Parish	Having a specific policy of this nature is welcomed.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST29 - Sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople			
1197063	Resident	There are currently 54 traveller pitches across the District (para 7.16.2) with an estimated additional need of 40 pitches by 2037. This equates to a 74% increase in gypsy/traveller need in the District over 15 years. There are currently 4 pitches at Daneshill and this is already having an impact upon the village of Sutton cum Lound in terms of the school; there is evidence of village residents moving their children out of the school because of this, which will undoubtedly have a longer term impact upon the sustainability of the school in the village. The closure of the village school will have a considerable impact upon the village and the Local Plan, reducing any potential need for additional housing in the village and potential reducing the size of the village in the longer term. The plan does not identify where these additional pitches will be placed and the chart in (C) does not add up to the 54 identified in para 7.16.2. The location of any additional plots needs to recognise the impact upon the surrounding areas and should be made in close consultation with local residents.	The Policies Map which accompanies the Local Plan shows the location of site GT003 at Daneshill. Nottinghamshire County Council - the Local Education Authority - are a statutory consultee for the Local Plan and have identified no concerns with site GT003 in relation to education. Para 7.16.2 identifies that there are currently 54 residential pitches in the District. There is a need for 40 pitches by 2037 to meet the needs of the gypsy and traveller community. Policy ST29 makes provision for new pitches to meet the identified need for the first 10 years of the plan (29 pitches). Policy ST29 also provides criteria against which any application for gypsy and traveller accommodation will be assessed. This will provide for the rest of the need.
REF293	The Wildlife Trust	This policy requires a section that states: The site would not lead to the loss, or adverse impact on landscape character and value, heritage assets and their settings, nature conservation or biodiversity sites; The four steps of the mitigation hierarchy should be applied — avoid, minimize, restore and offset are appropriate in this instance.	Policy ST32, ST34, ST35, ST36, ST37 and Policy 38 ensure that the impact of new development on landscape character, heritage and biodiversity is appropriately managed. This applies to gypsy and traveller accommodation. However for completion reference to biodiversity and heritage assets will be added to Policy ST29.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE	
ST30 - Houses in Multiple Occupation				
1177309	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	While HMOs should be encouraged where they fulfil a genuine need, I think we need to consider how they are managed and regulated across the district in future so that they don't become a problem, as some councils have reported across the country.	Policy 30 provides the framework to manage the level of HMO's in the District. In Worksop an Article 4 Direction has been made for the Central Area to protect the housing mix, character of the area and the local environment.	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE	
ST31 Agricultural and Forestry Workers Dwellings				
1196559	Resident	Essential to maintain a base for the Agricultural Industry that we must support. Care must be taken that such development is allowed for the property then to be declared 'redundant' to the Agricultural business and sold on the open market.	Policy ST31 ensures that occupancy conditions will be used to ensure the dwelling remains in use by rural workers. Removal of occupancy conditions will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances where the criteria in the policy are met.	
REF310	P&DG	Policy ST31's wording of "Agricultural and Forestry Workers Dwelling" is restrictive in its title and should be amended to "Development in the Countryside", similar to as tested on Examination in nearby Bolsover District, which would reflect a slightly more comprehensive approach to development in Bassetlaw. The policy could include a more prescriptive set of circumstances in which development would be supported. For instance, the Bolsover Draft Local Plan, due to be scheduled for adoption at Full Council on 4th March 2020, cites one or more of the following: • Involve a change of use or the re-use of vacant, derelict or previously developed land • Are necessary for the efficient or viable operation of agriculture, horticulture, forestry and other appropriate land-based business, including the diversification of activities on an existing farm unit • Are small scale employment uses related to farming, forestry, recreation, or tourism • Secure the retention and/or enhancement of a community facility • Secure the retention and/or enhancement of a vacant or redundant building that makes a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the area and can be converted without complete or substantial reconstruction • Are in accordance with a made Neighbourhood Development Plan • The buildings of exceptional quality of innovative design • In all cases, where development is considered acceptable it will have to respect the form, scale and landscape character, through careful location, design and materials. This would result in combining Policy ST31 and Policy ST11 to form a much more concise and methodical Policy relating to all development in the countryside including those in the smallest settlements in the hierarchy that may have potential for modest growth of the rural economy, limited housing and improvements to the tourist offer locally as desired by other policies in the plan. The new combined Policy would complement ST12, particularly part e which relates to tourism related development which seeks to bring underused or neglected heritage assets back into economic use, it would be compliant with paragraph 83 of the NPPF.	It is considered that Policy ST2 Rural Bassetlaw, Policy ST11 Rural Economic Growth, Policy ST12 Visitor Economy together with Policy 31 comprehensively address all matters relating to the rural area as identified by National Policy.	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE	
ST32 Design Quality				
REF047	Sport England	Ensure that Active Design is considered as part of the development process. In addition Strategic Objectives 8 and 9 would be supported and implemented by the use of Active Design.	Reference to Active Design has been added to Policy ST32 and is also referenced in the Policy ST39 Promoting Healthy, Active lifestyles.	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST32 Design Quality			
1191455	Resident	<p>Given the need to reduce carbon emissions, the Local Plan should mandate that all dwellings in new developments in the Plan should be carbon neutral and be built with solar panels & heat exchangers (for cheaper than retrofitting them). Also all new dwellings should have electric car charging ports built in to encourage the move away from the internal combustion engine. Similarly, any commercial development should also have solar panels and at least 50% of the parking should have electric charging points</p>	<p>National planning practice guidance states that Local Plans can set energy performance standards for new housing or the adaptation of buildings to provide dwellings, that are higher than the building regulations, but only up to the equivalent of Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes and are not restricted or limited in setting energy performance standards above the building regulations for non-housing developments, as long as it can be demonstrated that it is financially viable to do so. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment shows that it is not financially viable to require energy performance standards for dwellings higher than the Building Regulations. But Policy ST45 requires non residential development to meet the appropriate BREEAM standard. All new development will have appropriate infrastructure built in to ensure connectivity for electric vehicles can be achieved. Electric vehicle parking requirements are set in the Nottinghamshire Parking Standards.</p>
REF136	A and D Architecture	<p>Policy ST32 should be modified to ensure that development managers do not discriminate against proposals for Park Home static caravan developments on spurious design grounds simply because static caravans are factory-built standardised products and site layouts do not necessarily conform to traditional urban design principles suited to traditional town plans and mainstream housing layouts. It is not possible to generate an inclusive form of words and therefore a specific sub-section 8 should be added as follows: " 8 Park Home static caravan sites. The Council recognises that Park Home static caravan sites are a unique and established modern form of development that meets the needs of a group in the community and depends for viability on flexible layouts populated by factory-built dwellings and that the character and design quality of Park Home static caravan site layouts of a single storey are uniquely and sufficiently controlled by model standards published by central government and local authority license conditions. Therefore, Council recognises that it would be inappropriate to seek to control the design of Park Home static caravans and/or their arrangement on Park Home static caravan sites by imposing design rules suited to mainstream housing design and mainstream housing layouts and derived from traditional urban and/or architectural models in SPG document s."</p>	<p>Policy ST32 applies equally to all forms of new development, and is suitably flexible to ensure that proposals for static caravan sites for example will be judged on their own merits. Planning processes and licensing are separate procedures requiring compliance with different legislation and guidance. Gaining planning permission does not necessarily guarantee you a licence and vice versa. It is therefore appropriate for all new development including static caravan sites to address the criteria within Policy ST32.</p>
REF182	DHA Planning	<p>This is another policy where we support the aims and objectives. Indeed, as the Council's employment site assessments paper recognises, the existing units at EIP are of a very good quality. The policy could be improved for the sake of clarity. As worded, policy ST32 does not differentiate between residential and other forms of development. Section 3 of the policy is concerned with architectural quality and materials, with 3(b) requiring developments to "take inspiration from the positive local architectural features and materials in their designs and produce a development with reference to local architectural or material merit and distinctiveness." This may be appropriate for smaller scale buildings in an urban setting, for example, but is less practical for very large-scale industrial buildings such as those at EIP. This could be remedied by adding the words "where appropriate" at the start</p>	<p>Policy ST32 amended as requested.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST32 Design Quality			
		of 3(b). Furthermore, section 6 (Private Amenity Space) is clearly aimed at residential developments, yet as worded would currently apply to all developments. 6(a) should be reworded to state: "New residential development should provide an appropriate standard of private amenity space..."	
1196060	Resident	BDC and planning dose not have a good record for the design or quality of developments. the Rampton treswell road development is neither good design nor in keeping with the local vernacular. BDC approved this development despite local objections. hows to say this will happen again and again.	Policy ST32 requires new development to reflect local distinctiveness, architectural quality and materials. Once adopted the Council will have an up to date Local Plan, based on up to date national policy and local evidence. All new development will therefore need to be in accordance with the Local Plan including Policy ST32.
REF198	Consultant	This policy is to be welcomed. However, it states all the issues that the Council would want to see but does not relate or refer to a design guide that the Council have or will have. Instead it would appear that any scheme will be a subjective view taken by an Officer. A design guide would be of enormous help to applicants giving them some guidance, particularly in sensitive areas.	Policy ST32 refers to a Design Quality SPD, which will be produced on adoption of the Local Plan. This will apply District wide. Neighbourhood Plans may also contain policies relating to design which should be used to guide design in that parish/location.
REF201	Severn Trent	Generally supportive of the principles behind policy ST32, but note that whilst there is a statement about permeable surfacing, there is no further mention of the need to follow the Drainage Hierarchy, or implement well designed SuDS that incorporate water quality, biodiversity and amenity benefits as well as water quantity. Hope that policies relating to design requirements would highlight the need to design water efficient properties. Some example wording can be found under the Bassetlaw Garden Village Section of this response.	Policy ST47 details the Council's requirement for well designed SuDS being incorporated and implemented in new development, as requested. Policy ST46 further details issues regarding water quality as well.
1196694	Resident	7.2.3 – whatever the design of the development, this is not a sustainable development – the ability of future generations to meet their own needs for health and wellbeing, enjoyment of nature, landscape and the natural environment will be compromised.	Noted. Thank you for your response.
REF270	Barton Willmore	Agree with the Local Plan's approach to design in general and consider that it reflects the provisions of the NPPF. Consider that the Council's policy objective should be amended to seek to achieve the highest 'practicable' standards of achievable design. It is necessary to see the design of new housing in the context of all sustainable planning aims including, for example, provision of physical and community infrastructure and affordable homes. Decision makers should be afforded the flexibility to focus on design to the extent that it does not undermine the ability of the Local Plan to achieve those other aims.	The Whole Plan Viability Assessment states that in general the requirements of Policy ST32 can be secured alongside all other policy requirements as part of a financially viable Local Plan.
REF273	Anglian Water	Policy ST32 as drafted cross refers to the water efficiency requirements outlined in Policy ST45 of the Local Plan. The phrase used is 'nationally recognised environmental standards' which does not appear elsewhere in the plan. It would be helpful to make it clear that residential development proposals will be expected to meet the optional requirement of 110 litres/per person/per day (as a minimum) and that development proposals are to incorporate water re-uses wherever possible.	Noted. Policy ST32 will be amended to refer to nationally recognised standards in Policy ST45. The phrase will be explained in the context of that policy.
1197091	William Davis	Overall the aims of the policy are supported as they are consistent with national policy (NPPF paragraphs 124 and 127). However, consideration should be given to any conflict with the new national design code and any viability issues potentially arising from more onerous requirements.	Policy ST32 will make be amended to ensure new development reflects the principles of the National Design Code. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment states that in general the requirements of Policy ST32 can be secured alongside all other policy requirements as part of a financially viable Local Plan.
REF293	The Wildlife Trust	Landscaping a) New development should provide a positive hard and natural landscaping scheme, including boundary treatments that complement the development and respect the surrounding context, particularly where a development site is adjoining surrounding countryside; b) Trees or hedgerows must be appropriate to the size of the site and consider their proximity to new buildings. Advocate additional wording that stipulates a high proportion of species used in landscaping schemes should be native and ideally, of local provenance.	Noted. Policy ST32 has been amended accordingly.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST32 Design Quality			
REF327	Scrooby Parish	This is welcomed but must be reinforced and aggressively enacted. All too often designs are accepted that do not meld into local character or current build quality.	Policy ST32 requires new development to reflect local distinctiveness, architectural quality and materials. Once adopted the Council will have an up to date Local Plan, based on up to date national policy and local evidence. All new development will therefore need to be in accordance with the Local Plan including Policy ST32.
REF347	NJL Consulting	Caddick are striving to deliver a high quality employment led development on the site and this will, where feasible, include quality design. However certain forms of development have fixed design and layout requirements. The policy, as currently drafted, is too inflexible and sets onerous requirements which could frustrate the very objective the policy is seeking to deliver. The policy should be amended to include an introduction that 'the design of each development will be considered on its merits, reflecting the nature of the scheme and individual site requirements', that way the policy can remain sound.	Paragraph 8.1.6 states that each scheme will be judged on its merits, this would apply to employment development. Policy ST32 will be amended to clarify that architectural style and detailing should be appropriate to the type of development.
REF401	East Markham Parish Council	EMPC endorses this policy and asks for it to be enforced. Recent development in our village has failed to meet points 1a, 3a, b, c and 7 and has concerns about future enforcement.	Policy ST32 requires new development to reflect local distinctiveness, architectural quality and materials. Once adopted the Council will have an up to date Local Plan, based on up to date national policy and local evidence. All new development will therefore need to be in accordance with the Local Plan including Policy ST32.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST34-Landscape Character			
1177432	Resident	The idea of Green Gaps is fully supported. These are necessary in order to protect the character of settlements and to prevent urban sprawl into the countryside. The Green Gap on the south side of Ordsall (GG7) is particularly welcomed as development in this area would have a big visual impact when entering Retford from the south (from London Road / Ollerton Road). This land is elevated and is particularly visible.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF093	Resident	Overall the policy reads very well. The supporting text (8.3.8-8.3.14) is helpfully clear that the approach is landscape-led and is not a coalescence policy. In other Plans these different approaches can sometimes become blurred. In a broader sense I would suggest that the proposed Green Gaps are a fundamental part of the Plan's approach to sustainable development. However, Policy ST34 is rather separate from the earlier set-piece strategic policies in the Plan. Planning Inspectors are nervous about such policies where they conclude (rightly or wrongly) that green gaps have been designed to prevent development taking place or limiting its scale (see the Hart Local Plan in Hampshire). In your case I suggest that it would do no harm to dovetail the proposed Green Gaps into the wider strategy. This would run with your summary point 3 in paragraph 4.6 of the Green Gap study. The resulting message would be: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• BDC has an overall strategy;• BDC has planned for strategic and local growth;• That growth will be sustainable;• In this context the Plan has identified Green Gaps;• The Green Gaps protect the landscape setting of the settlements concerned; and• The settlements affected have sufficient environmental capacity to allow them to grow elsewhere without impacting on the green gaps. Paragraph 8.3.13 will probably assist with your case at examination. The Council will be able to demonstrate that the policy intends that some development could take place without affecting the character of the landscape (but see below).	An addendum report has been produced to respond to the comments received during consultation. This paper further explains the rationale for the Green Gap and their purpose - including how they intend to be managed through a revised Policy.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST34-Landscape	Character		
REF093	Resident	<p>Would there be merit in having the Green Gaps as a separate policy? - I raise this as I am unclear whether or not parts A and B of the policy would apply to the identified Green Gaps. The policy (after the list of the Green Gaps) requires that development has a positive effect on the openness, appearance and functionality of the landscape quality of the Green Gaps concerned. I can see that paragraphs 8.3.13/14 provide some clarity on what may be acceptable. However, the approach in these paragraphs raise the following matters:</p> <p>Firstly, as drafted the policy requires a positive impact on landscape character to be achieved by proposed development. The more traditional policy approach is to ensure that any harm from development is not unacceptable. This will be a matter of local judgement and choice. In the event that you stick with the policy as drafted, I would imagine that you may be challenged either by a landowner or the Inspector about how this ambition would be managed/achieved. Secondly if the ambition of the policy is to support agricultural and other open rural uses in the identified Green Gaps (8.3.13/14) should the policy comment as such? In the event that you stick with the policy as drafted I would imagine that you may be challenged by either by a landowner or the Inspector about the relationship between a generally-worded policy on the one hand and the supporting text which potentially restricts development in a Green Gap to agriculture and other rural activities on the other hand. Thirdly the policy may need to define how it intends to address the 'adjoining the Green Gaps' issue. Some of the Gaps are extensive in scale and as such there will be significant tracts of land which are adjacent to the designated area. If not clarified the issue has the ability to be a DM officer's nightmare and a lawyer's playground in equal measure.</p>	Agreed. There is now a separate policy within the Local Plan specifically for the Green Gaps. This policy provides a criteria for applications.
REF115	Canal and River Trust	<p>We welcome the aspirations of this section which should help to ensure that consideration is given towards the design of new development and the creation of new positive spaces. We do believe that it is essential that the document provides guidance and certainty to developers and decision makers over how waterfront spaces should be incorporated into new development. Waterfront areas feature unique characteristics as a setting for development and form key areas in Worksop and Retford for leisure, recreation and tourism. There are specific needs to ensure that development integrates positively with waterways, ensuring that development is designed to improve access to, along and from the waterway; and ensuring development optimises natural surveillance of the waterway.</p> <p>As such, we wish to highlight as an example of good practice, policy SP31 within the Rotherham Sites and Policies Document, adopted in June 2018. This states that: "Subject to satisfying other relevant planning policy, development adjacent to canals will be expected to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Be of a high-quality design that integrates the canal into the development proposal in a way that treats the waterway as an area of usable space; b. Integrate the waterway, towing path and canal environment into the public realm in terms of the design and management of the development; c. Improve access to, along and from the waterway and improve the environmental quality of the waterway corridor; d. Optimise views of water and generate natural surveillance of water space through the siting, configuration and orientation of buildings, recognising that appropriate boundary treatment and access issues may differ between the towing path and offside of the canal; and e. Improve the amenity of the canal. Development that would have an adverse impact on the amenity of the canal by virtue of noise, odour or visual impact will not be supported." The existing policies in the draft Local Plan do not directly address requirements for waterside design and we believe that it is necessary for either Policy ST32: Design Quality or ST34: Landscape Character to be expanded to include a section addressing requirements for waterfront development. Although section 8.4 refers to general policies to consider Multi-Functional Green and Blue Infrastructure, this section does not directly address considerations for designs relating to built development and its impact on the local landscape. As a result, we do believe that policy text directly relating to waterfront development should be provided within either section 8.1 or 8.3 to make the plan effective. 	Thank you for your comments. Waterfront development, regeneration and design are specific issues related to particular places. The Local Plan does cover this either for proposed sites or design led planning policies.
1195486	Gamston with Eaton and West Drayton Parish Council	Policy ST34 refers to a map showing green gaps we have been unable to find it as it mentions one between Retford South and Eaton. Could Bassetlaw forward a copy to us?	Noted. Thank you for your comment.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST34-Landscape	Character		
REF194	Clarborough and Welham Parish Council	<p>It is pleased to see that the Policy to maintain the separation between existing villages is to remain. Being a Parish in which there are two villages the Parish Council feels that it important that this separation continues in order to identify the two communities within the Parish. It allows the two communities to continue their existing independent character.</p>	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF201	Severn Trent	<p>Severn Trent are supportive of the inclusion of bullet point 3, as it highlights the need to protect Watercourses, watercourses form a vital part of the natural water system. The culverting or removal of watercourses can make it difficult to drain developments resulting in flows being connected to the sewerage system.</p>	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF249	Pegasus Group	<p>Policy ST34 of the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan states: The Policy is accompanied by supporting text concerning 'Green Gaps' at paragraphs 8.3.8 to 8.3.14. The Green Gaps are illustrated on the Draft Policies Map. This indicates that Green Gaps are collectively proposed to extend to the south of Oldcotes, around most of Langold and around Carlton in Lindrick. It is noted that part of the proposed site lies within the Green Gaps area of GG2: Oldcotes-Langold-Carlton in Lindrick.</p> <p>5.3 Each of the evidence base documents which are referred to in the Draft Policy are discussed further below: Landscape Character Assessment – Bassetlaw, Nottinghamshire, August 2009</p> <p>5.4 This Landscape Character Assessment was identified directly in the text of Policy ST34 as one of the documents which have informed the creation of the policy (albeit the Policy text appears to erroneously refer to this as the 'Landscape Capacity Assessment').</p> <p>5.5 The site lies within the Magnesian Limestone Ridge regional character area and specifically the landscape character parcel of ML03: Langold, which is identified as having a 'very good' landscape condition and a 'moderate' landscape sensitivity, which equates to the policy of: 'Conserve'.</p> <p>5.6 Despite the results of the Landscape Character Assessment, part of the site has already been deemed acceptable for housing, as confirmed by the planning application 15/01605/OUT. It is therefore considered that there is no reason why the evidence set out in the Landscape Character Assessment would preclude further development in the wider site area and no specific evidence to suggest that this area would need to form part of the Green Gaps, in order for them to serve their primary function. In conclusion, the Green Gap area to the north of Langold should be amended to exclude the full area of the extended site proposals. This would not detrimentally impact on the openness, appearance and functionality of the landscape quality of the Green Gap and specifically the Green Gap would continue to deliver its primary purpose of preventing coalescence between Langold and Oldcotes. This would not then prevent the development proposals, along with their proposed landscape mitigation, from being able to deliver future sustainable development which was compliant with Policy ST34.</p>	The Green Gap to the north of Langold does exclude the two sites that have existing planning permission. It does however include the remaining open land between the development site and the village of Oldcotes. The reasoning and justification for including this area is identified within the Green Gap Study.
REF270	Barton Willmore	<p>We acknowledge the requirement for development proposals to demonstrate how they have regard to landscape character areas, and we support the inclusion of mitigation measures. However we strongly object to Local Plan's emerging approach to identifying "Green Gaps". The Local Plan and Policies Map identifies these 'Green Gaps' as existing between settlements and around settlement fringes, some of which are protected such as Conservation Areas. Our Client's land is proposed to be designated as a Green Gap GG8 (Retford West) within Policy ST34 and Local Plan Proposals Map. Three proposed Green Gaps for Retford (GG6, GG7 and GG8) enclose the entire southern, eastern and western boundary of the designated Main Town, which seeks to essentially safeguard the entire area to the south of Retford from development. Notwithstanding our Client's clear case as to the appropriateness of land to the south of Retford as a location to meet the future development needs of the town, we object to the designation of a Green Gap in this location as a matter of principle. We consider that the Green Gap policy is not justified, serves no meaningful planning policy purpose and seeks to add an undue level of protection to land on the basis that it is not the Council's current preference for development. The Council's justification for the above policy approach is set out within the evidence base for the Draft Local Plan within the 'Green Gap Study'. The Study has been prepared to safeguard areas of "important landscape" in sensitive locations and as a reaction to development pressure within the district (Section 5). It is our Client's position that the document does not justify the allocation of the Green Gaps. Paragraph 5.2 of the document simply states "it is certain that similar pressures will continue over the next 20 years" indicating that there has been substantial development in recent years and "in some cases" settlements extending into the countryside. We note that, to cater for the growing needs of the District and to facilitate a 'step change', development of greenfield land will be necessary over the plan period and it is not sustainable to prevent development on land that is well-suited for development and located on the urban fringe of</p>	<p>There is a clear justification for Green Gap policies (or similar), based on planning practice and guidance. Examples can be drawn from several Local Plans and Neighbourhood Plans (see Section 3) The matter is, therefore not one of principle but more about whether the extent of any given Green Gap is justified and how the flexibility within a redrafted Green Gap policy would allow for appropriate development to occur. The landscape to the South of Retford is distinctive comprising north-south running ridge or plateau, with extensive views in all directions and the slopes and bottom of the River Idle valley. It provides a countryside setting, with access opportunities, for the Retford housing areas of; Ordsall, South Retford, Thrumpton & White Houses and it is a rural setting for the village of Eaton. Whilst it may be justifiable to examine the details of the Green Gap where it adjoins the built up area and/or to consider if well planned and landscaped residential development may be appropriate, there is no justification for the removal of Green Gap 8 in its entirety.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST34-Landscape	Character	<p>settlements such as Retford without the risk of merging with any settlements to the south or surrounding area. Whilst there is planning merit in maintain distinctiveness and local characteristics of settlements, the Green Gap study provides no meaningful evidence to demonstrate that protection of land to south of Retford is important to maintaining its character or distinctiveness. There is nothing significant or distinctive regarding the area to the south of Retford and its relationship with surrounding villages which are physically and visually removed from Retford. We consider that the Council's proposed Green Gap designation to the south and west of Retford should be deleted from the Local Plan.</p>	
REF275	Consultant	<p>The necessity to have requirements to protect the area of landscape character, and how developers have regards for these areas is clearly understood and supported. We do, however, strongly oppose the emerging approach presented in the Local Plan to identify Green Gaps and its current use in the Local Plan. These are identified in the policies maps as areas between the settlements and around settlement fringes, some of these areas are already classified as conservation areas. There are three Green Gap areas proposed around Retford, on the southern, eastern and western boundaries (GG6, GG7, GG8). This is seeming in place to restrict development in this area on the outskirts of Retford. Regardless of our clients appropriate, and previously identified, land suitable of meeting the need of the town, we also object to this policy due to its lack of substantial justification, serving no meaningful planning purpose and an over the top protection from future development. The current layout of policy combined with the Flood Risks in channels development of Retford in an unnatural, uncharacteristic and unsustainable manner. These restrictions will have major impacts of Retford, the town centre and the villages that rely upon it. There is no evidence to suggest the area of land south of Retford is important to retain the character of the town. We believe that the green gap designation to the south and west of Retford should be removed from this Local Plan</p>	<p>The landscape to the South of Retford is distinctive comprising north-south running ridge or plateau, with extensive views in all directions and the slopes and bottom of the River Idle valley. It provides a countryside setting, with access opportunities, for the Retford housing areas of; Ordsall, South Retford, Thrumpton & White Houses and it is a rural setting for the village of Eaton. Whilst is may be justifiable to examine the details of the Green Gap where it adjoins the built up area and/or to consider if well planned and landscaped residential development may be appropriate, there is no justification for the removal of Green Gap 8 in its entirety.</p>
REF280	Avant Homes and Wyndthorpe Developments.	<p>From review of the background evidence, it is clear that the Council's intended function of the Green Gaps are to set clear, long term, defensible and recognisable boundaries using readily recognisable features such as roads, streams, belts of trees or woodland edges, footpaths/tracks, canals and railway lines. At face value, it would appear that such a prohibitive methodology shares similarities with the function of the Green Belt. The extent of the Green Gaps are taken from the 2009 Landscape Character Assessment which had broadly characterised areas. In some cases, the landscape has changed due to development which may have affected the classification and shape of these broad areas which would resultantly implicate that the extent of the selected Green Gaps would change alongside this. An updated landscape character assessment along with a more accurate Green Gap Report assessing individual sites on their merit would be welcomed and is encouraged to provide a robust evidence base for such a restrictive policy. Indeed the relevance of this exercise is further justified by virtue of the approved planning application in relation to land off Doncaster Road (ref 18/01148/FUL).</p> <p>A flaw of the Green Gaps Report is that the Council's preferred allocations have been excluded from the assessment and further scrutiny, implying that their environmental suitability for development has already been pre-determined. The rejection of the preferred allocations from the assessment should therefore deem the assessment as incomplete and biased in determining the extent of the proposed Green Gaps. The Green Gaps proposed will define the spatial plan for duration of the plan period and can therefore be seen as a 'long-term' prohibitive policy which will have a detrimental impact on the flexibility of maintaining a deliverable 5 year housing land supply and changing economic circumstances. The extent of the coverage of the Green Gap proposed is significant in scale, wrapping around major urban areas and constraining the majority of growth within the edge of the defined boundary in what can be considered sustainable and viable locations for residential growth. Although it is noted that the Green Gaps have left directions for growth for some urban areas¹, the sustainability and viability of the remaining unrestricted land has not been factored in to the plan's flexibility to deliver housing, resulting in potential future supply issues for Bassetlaw if the preferred allocated sites are deemed unsuitable or are subsequently un-deliverable over the plan period.</p>	<p>It is intended that, whilst they would be open to review in future Bassetlaw Local Plans (or any successor documents), Green Gaps should have robust and easily recognisable boundaries. To achieve this, applying the principles for drawing Green Belt boundaries is quite reasonable. However, this does not state or imply any intent that Green Gaps are a backdoor way of introducing Green Belt into Bassetlaw. This is made explicit in the wording of the proposed new, separate, Green Gap policy and its explanation in Section 6 of the Green Gap Study. The 2009 assessment remains pertinent in conjunction with the more recent NE Natural Character Areas. The Green Gaps have been defined based on the emerging policy context, recognising existing commitments and emerging allocations for new housing and employment around settlements. As noted above, should preferred/allocated sites fail to come forward within the plan period, those sites and their relationship with Green Gaps can be considered in a future review(s) of the Local Plan.</p>
REF280 (LAA)	Avant Homes and Wyndthorpe Developments.	<p>Carlton-in-Lindrick adopted their latest revision of the neighbourhood plan in February 2019, within this, policies or importance are implemented within this plan which has had influence within the Green Gap Report, and the also informing the Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan has allocated two large sites for future growth within the area; Land East of Doncaster Road, and Firbeck Colliery. The land East of Doncaster Road is currently being developed by Avant Homes after obtaining planning permission for 151 dwellings (18/01148/FUL). Firbeck Colliery is proposed for 407 dwellings and is pending a planning decision. Through the determination of the associated planning application, this site was deemed suitable for development in respect of both environmental and technical constraints. Policy 10 identifies locations of important views from Doncaster Road</p>	<p>The Green Gaps have been defined based on the emerging policy context, recognising existing commitments and emerging allocations for new housing and employment around settlements. As noted above, should preferred/allocated sites fail to come forward within the plan period, those sites and their relationship with Green Gaps can be considered in a future review(s) of the Local Plan.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST34-Landscape	Character		
		<p>highlighting 6 views east, of which these areas have been included within the designated Green Gap in the Draft Local Plan. The purpose of this policy is to show no support towards developments which will negatively impact the views into their respective areas. As one of the views (view 6) is directed at the recently approved development it can be considered that the views do not implicate that no residential development shall be placed however is there to promote to "conserve, protect and/ or otherwise enhance the views for the benefit of the communities, for leisure, recreation use, and of provision as a haven for wildlife." A design should therefore be adaptive to benefit these sought for qualities.</p>	
REF281	Notts Campaign to Protect Rural England	<p>We welcome this policy, especially "B. All developments of 10 or more dwellings and non residential development of 1000sqm or more floorspace, will be supported subject to the provision of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Measures to facilitate and encourage safe access by cycle and foot; 2. Protection of, connection to, and extension of where practicable, existing pedestrian, cycle and equestrian routes as part of a convenient, safe and attractive network for users; 3. Public transport enhancement where justified, including measures to encourage public transport use" <p>The recognition in 3. that measures to encourage public transport use will (often) be needed is welcome. Rigorous assessments independent of applicants and developers will, however, be necessary to ensure that the "where justified" condition in 3. is not used as a reason not to provide public transport alternatives.</p>	<p>Noted. Thank you for your comment.</p>
REF282	National Trust	<p>While National Trust generally supports Policy ST34 we believe that it should be more aspirational. We suggest that proposals should be required to have specific regard to national and local Landscape Character Assessments, rather than only those assessments intended to inform the local plan (currently listed in Part A). It would also be beneficial if the aspiration of supporting the Sherwood Forest Restoration Plan referred to at 10.1.11 was incorporated into this policy. It is not clear how Green Gaps have been identified as the associated report only includes an assessment of the areas already suggested. Consequently, it is unclear why a Green Gap should not be established between Worksop and the A1 where the risk of linear urban sprawl is clearly at its most marked. It is notable that while this area to the east of Worksop has not been assessed by the Green Gaps Report, the report specifically refers to 'settlements extending into the countryside with the potential for them to merge in the future... erosion of local landscape character between settlements some of which is locally valued and has historic value. Examples of this include... Worksop (E). The (commercial) development of Manton Wood with major HQs and warehouses; ... [and] The A1 junctions, services and associated development (Blyth, Morton...)', p15. With a proposed Garden Village to be sited between Worksop and Retford, the Draft Local Plan is promoting an extended area of urban sprawl stretching from Worksop to within 2.5km of Retford, which conflicts with its own Green Gap Report. We suggest that the proposed Green Gaps ought to be revisited with additional areas being identified on the basis of how well they meet a range of criteria.</p>	<p>Additional work has been undertaken to review the comments on the Green Gaps and identify policy revisions. The review concluded that there will be no change to the boundaries of the proposed Green Gaps, but there will be a separate policy in the updated version of the Local Plan. This will provide more local detail for development within and adjoining green gaps.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST34-Landscape	Character		
1197091	William Davis	<p>Whilst there are no objections to Part A and B of Policy ST34 there are significant concerns regarding Part C on Green Gaps, specifically GG4: Worksop West – Shireoaks and Rhodesia. A review by a suitably qualified and experienced landscape architect (see attached) has identified that this policy is not consistent with national policy nor justified by the evidence (namely the Site Allocations: Landscape Study (November 2019) and Green Gaps Report (November 2019)) as required by the tests of soundness. The Green Gaps Report justifies the inclusion of the green gap element of Policy ST34 with reference to paragraphs 170 and 171 of the NPPF. Of relevance these set out three matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • protecting and enhancing valued landscapes; • recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside; and • allocate land with least environmental or amenity value. <p>No robust evidence has been provided which follows the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Edition 3 (GLVIA) Box 5.1 to justify the identification of GG4 as a ‘valued landscape’ worthy of protection and enhancement. Regarding intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, this is an emotive and subjective matter which can only be judged against the value of the landscape. Again, the landscape study fails to meet the full criteria for defining value. Finally, the allocation of land of least environmental or amenity value; value has not been considered in line with the accepted guidance of GLVIA3. As such the Green Gap policy is not consistent with national policy. The Green Gap Report also references Planning Guidance on the Natural Environment stating it supports Green Gaps. The quote provided from the guidance does not at any point mention Green Gaps. The only place where there may be implied support for the Green Gap policy in Plans can also include policies to avoid adverse impacts on landscapes and to set out necessary mitigation measures, such as appropriate design principles and visual screening. Excluding land by the Green Gap map based blanket ‘no development’ policy does not accord with the subtler requirement of the guidance seeking appropriate design principles and visual screening. In fact mitigation is practically addressed in full by Policy ST34.B allowing the use of clauses 1 – 6 when assessing and informing/guiding all new developments. There are also a number of concerns with the supporting evidence to the policy. The attached review sets these out in detail but in summary these are:</p> <p>Site Allocations: Landscape Study (November 2019):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not a landscape character assessment and does not meet evidence required by the NPPF • lack of methodology • document does not identify the author(s) nor their qualifications • weak descriptions and incorrect statements in the findings table • the Views and Landscape Features map for 14H, do not identify the locations of the photographs making it difficult to locate the viewpoints on the ground. • We are not told what lens or camera is used so the images do not meet GLVIA3 guidance. 	<p>This is overstated, it is not prescribed that GLVIA3 is used in all studies. Indeed, the approach to defining Green Gaps was intended to be broadly based, including: Use of the existing evidence base (e.g. the relevant NCAs and the 2009 Study).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recognising recent commitments and potential allocations in the Local Plan. - Taking account of Neighbourhood Plans. - Information from recent site visits. <p>The extent to which the approach to Green Gaps reflects National Guidance and good practice is, therefore, a matter of opinion. There is no compelling argument that not using a methodology such as GLVIA3 renders the proposed policy unsound. The Local Plan is positively prepared, and the Green Gaps policy is part of a wider approach/appropriate strategy to enable sustainable development, consistent with national policy. With reference to the NPPF, it is not necessary for a landscape to be designated for it to be “valued.” The definition of Green Gaps will not prevent the overall development requirement from being met. The Green Gap policy is not about allocating sites, therefore, there is no need to specifically consider whether an area of land has the “least environmental or amenity value.” For some of the intended functions of a Green gap, the current quality of the land may not be an overriding consideration. At a more strategic level, the definition of Green Gaps is part of a wider approach to achieving sustainable development, focusing on brownfield land, new villages and the regeneration of former power station and mining sites. It is not correct to say that the Green Gap policy is intended to prevent all development. The proposed separate Green Gap policy (see Section 6) is explicit that if development reflects local landscape and character it may be acceptable within or adjoining a Green Gap</p>
REF295	dmc20eighteen	<p>The policy is to be found at Section 8.3 on page 119 of the Draft Local Plan. It recognises at 8.3.1 and 8.3.2 that the diverse landscapes of Bassetlaw have been influenced by human activity and that this activity leads to changes in landscape character. It is reasonable to say that this will continue to be so and that policy should guide such change and not seek to block or prevent change.</p> <p>At Para 8.3.4 the text correctly states that The National Planning Policy Framework advises that a landscape character assessment (LCA) should inform policy making and planning decisions. It goes on to reference the LCA prepared in 2009 for the district. In reviewing the Landscape Study 2019 the author will question whether this document is in fact a landscape character assessment and if not whether it offers robust evidence to underpin the policy and in particular the green gap proposals therein. The policy text refers to Figure 26 on page 120. Unfortunately the figure does not identify the character areas nor the settlement names which for the reader, particular the general public, makes it difficult to locate not only areas of land but also towns and villages that would assist with orientation.</p> <p>At 8.3.5 on page 120, the text makes reference to sensitivity. This subject is covered in the 2009 LCA where it finds the landscape, which falls in the policy zone MLPZ11 (14H in the Landscape Study), to be only of moderate sensitivity. This fact is not mentioned neither in the 2019 Landscape Study nor in the 2019 Green Gap Report nor considered in either of their conclusions.</p>	<p>This is overstated, it is not prescribed that GLVIA3 is used in all studies. Indeed, the approach to defining Green Gaps was intended to be broadly based, including: Use of the existing evidence base (e.g. the relevant NCAs and the 2009 Study).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recognising recent commitments and potential allocations in the Local Plan. - Taking account of Neighbourhood Plans. - Information from recent site visits. <p>The extent to which the approach to Green Gaps reflects National Guidance and good practice is, therefore, a matter of opinion.</p> <p>There is no compelling argument that not using a methodology such as GLVIA3 renders the proposed policy unsound. The Local Plan is positively prepared, and the</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST34-Landscape	Character		
		<p>Such moderate sensitivity increases the landscapes capacity for change even when considered against other factors such as condition and value.</p> <p>8.3.6 continues to underpin the importance of the 2009 LCA and indeed states that a 2019 review confirms the principles of the 2009 assessment remains sound. It is important therefore to look at these principles and findings of the 2009 LCA. This will be done in the review of the Landscape Study that follows. The supporting text of the policy goes on to reference the green gaps proposal in the policy. At 8.3.8 it states that important undeveloped areas of land exist between settlements and around settlement fringes. It goes onto state at 8.3.9 that the gaps between settlements also help give the sense of leaving one place and arriving at another. The text however does not state the role of the land around the fringes of settlements. It would help the reader if the local plan included, in the supporting text of the policy, a statement on the role of the fringes of settlements in the green gap proposals. At 8.3.11 the text helpfully sets out the guidance for Green Gaps in terms of openness, appearance and function. What is noted is that the term used is guidance and not recommendations in the Green Gaps Report. It can be inferred that the report is therefore seen by the local plan as merely offering advice or information aimed at resolving issues affecting land between settlements or around settlement fringes. By dint of such a statement it is reasonable to imply that other robust assessment such as that provided by applicants could equally inform and guide the policy on green gaps or new development therein. The Para. 8.3.11 goes on to acknowledge that green gaps have a capacity to accommodate development. As such it is reasonable to say that the policy does not exclude appropriate development from green gaps. At 8.3.12 overleaf it suggests that significant development could adversely affect openness, appearance, functionality and therefore quality of these landscapes. Two issues arise from this statement, firstly what level of significance is acceptable? In GLVIA3 significance is measured from major to low or negligible. Secondly, it is important to recognise that all development has significance; it is the measure or scale of that significance that is important to the impact on landscape or its visual qualities. For instance a development could be acceptable if its significance is found to be limited especially if it retains key elements of openness (say, as part of proposed open space), improves or retains appearance (adds to woodland or hedgerow cover) and allows the landscape to function in whatever role is considered appropriate whether as it was previously or as it could be in the future. This returns to the opening paragraphs of the policy where it accepts that the Bassetlaw landscape has changed and was influenced by human activity and given the inevitable progress of the economy, society and places the landscape will continue to be influenced and changed. actually states that Green Gaps do not prevent development taking place. It sets out examples of possible appropriate forms of development, such as agricultural buildings and rural uses, but does not restrict appropriate development to those uses. This therefore should not exclude open space or landscaping that could be demonstrated would sit comfortably within the open character, role and function of the Green Gap. And in Para. 8.3.14 it indicates that if evidence is presented that shows new development is well sited, well designed and landscaped the policy would not prevent such development taking place. Policy ST34.A There are various anomalies in the titles of the evidence documents as stated in the paragraph where evidence documents are referred to. After enquiries of the local plan team at Bassetlaw DC were made, it was confirmed that "In terms of the reference in part A of Policy ST34 this is referring to the Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment 2009 and the more recent Landscape Study in relation to the potential development sites undertaken in Nov 2019". The enquiry confirmed that "the references should be made clearer in any revision to the Local Plan". These anomalies in matters of evidence undermine the policy and place inaccurate and confusing source information in front of the public and also the Secretary of State when examining the soundness of the plan. What the enquiry does now confirm is that the 2009 LCA remains pertinent evidence to the policy.</p> <p>Policy ST34.B</p> <p>The requirements for "testing" a development as set out in 1 - 6 are most commendable and underpinned by national policy. As such they must be the means, the process, by which new development whether in Green Gaps or outside, could be found to be appropriate as set out in Para's 8.3.13 and 8.3.14 previously. It therefore falls upon the proposer or applicant to meet the test to show that development is indeed acceptable.</p> <p>Policy ST34.C</p> <p>The Green Gap policy is noted and will be commented upon in detail in the following review of the Green Gaps Report 2019. However, the final policy paragraph (unnumbered) is somewhat at odds with the supporting text to the policy as it now becomes more restrictive. It now seeks a positive impact on landscape qualities whereas at 8.3.13 development must show it sits comfortably within the qualities of the landscape of the Green Gap the latter being, a more benign perhaps neutral requirement on the development. As has been stated, all development has an effect; it is the scale of significance that is the test, the final</p>	<p>Green Gaps policy is part of a wider approach/appropriate strategy to enable sustainable development, consistent with national policy. With reference to the NPPF, it is not necessary for a landscape to be designated for it to be "valued." The definition of Green Gaps will not prevent the overall development requirement from being met.</p> <p>The Green Gap policy is not about allocating sites, therefore, there is no need to specifically consider whether an area of land has the "least environmental or amenity value." For some of the intended functions of a Green gap, the current quality of the land may not be an overriding consideration.</p> <p>At a more strategic level, the definition of Green Gaps is part of a wider approach to achieving sustainable development, focusing on brownfield land, new villages and the regeneration of former power station and mining sites. It is not correct to say that the Green Gap policy is intended to prevent all development. The proposed separate Green Gap policy is explicit that if development reflects local landscape and character it may be acceptable within or adjoining a Green Gap</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST34-Landscape	Character		
		paragraph of the policy does not allow the significance to be measured. This anomaly between policy and supporting text should be addressed to avoid confusion.	
REF300	Natural England	Natural England welcomes this policy and particularly the references to the National Character Areas (NCAs) and the links to green infrastructure.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF301	Freeths	The Green Gap allocation in this location would not serve to prevent the coalescence of towns and villages. Given the existing and proposed developments and the existing and proposed infrastructure in this area, the allocation as a Green Gap between Carlton Road Ashes Park Avenue would inhibit the potential to maximise the development potential and infrastructure benefits of linking the proposed distributor road (ST51) with Ashes Park Avenue. The comprehensive development of this area would also allow for a strong defensible urban boundary that would enhance the green corridor along Worksop's northern fringe, defined by the strong mature vegetation, woodland blocks and prominent ridge line.	The identification of this green gap has been supported by an independent report on local landscape quality and the historic environment towards the north of Worksop. There are significant landscape and heritage assets or existing designations that would limit and further manage development in this location.
REF304	Pegasus	<p>5.1 Policy ST34 of the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan states:</p> <p>A. Proposals for development should be informed by, and be sympathetic to, the special qualities and features of the District's landscapes as identified in the Bassetlaw Landscape Capacity Assessment [*], Bassetlaw Site Allocations Assessment 2019 [**] and Bassetlaw Green Gaps Report 2019, or successor.</p> <p>B. Development proposals will be expected to demonstrate that their location, scale, form, design and materials will protect and enhance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The special qualities and features of the landscape in that locality; 2. The visual relationship and environment around settlements and their landscape settings; 3. Distinctive landscape elements including but not limited to watercourses, woodland, trees, hedgerows and field boundaries, and their function as ecological corridors; 4. Visually sensitive skylines, river corridors and significant views towards key landscapes and heritage features; 5. The green infrastructure network supporting health, wellbeing and social interaction. 6. Habitat connectivity. <p>C. Green Gaps, as shown on the Policies Map, are designated between:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. GG1: Bircotes - Bawtry 2. GG2: Oldcotes-Langold-Carlton in Lindrick 3. GG3: Carlton in Lindrick – Worksop North 4. GG4: Worksop West – Shireoaks and Rhodesia 5. GG5: Clarborough – Welham 6. GG6: Retford East 7. GG7: Retford South – Eaton 8. GG8: Retford West <p>Development of undeveloped land and intensification of developed land in and adjoining the Green Gaps will only be supported where it does, either individually or cumulatively, with other existing or proposed development have a positive impact on the openness, appearance and functionality of their landscape quality.'</p> <p>NB</p> <p>* It is understood that this should state 'Landscape Character Assessment, 2009'</p> <p>** It is understood that this should state 'Bassetlaw Local Plan Site Allocations: Landscape Study 2019'</p> <p>5.2 The Policy is accompanied by supporting text concerning 'Green Gaps' at paragraphs 8.3.8 to 8.3.14. The Green Gaps are illustrated on the Draft Policies Map. This indicates that Green Gaps are collectively proposed to extend around the full extent of the eastern, southern and western boundaries of Retford. It also illustrates the boundaries between the 8 Green Gaps, with the 'Retford West' area extending around westwards from a boundary defined by Ollerton Road. Our clients site lies within this area of the Green Gaps</p> <p>5.3 However, there are inconsistencies between the Green Gaps are illustrated on the Draft Policies Map and the findings of the evidence base which was used to aid with their identification. Specifically, it is understood that there was no evidence in the supporting documents referenced in the Draft Policy to justify the extent of Green Gaps which have subsequently been identified</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST34-Landscape	Character		
		on the Policies Map. In particular this concerns the area to the south of Retford in which our client's site is located. 5.4 Each of the evidence base documents which are referred to in the Draft Policy are discussed further below:	
1197220	Resident	Green gaps between settlements have been stated as being very important to the identity of a settlement. The development of Peaks Hill farm opposite Freshfields will completely destroy this identity. As you approach Worksop along the A60 the rural feel gained from the fields and woodland would be lost forever. This amenity view is important to peoples mental health. This development will be visible from the public rights of way in Carlton in Lindrick and completely erode this sense of space and well being.	The identification of this green gap has been supported by an independent report on local landscape quality and the historic environment towards the north of Worksop. There are significant landscape and heritage assets or existing designations that would limit and further manage development in this location.
REF327	Scooby Parish	Is welcomed	Noted. Thank you for your comments
REF377	Resident	The other strategy we support is the allocation of a green buffer around the settlement of Retford to maintain its unique geography and minimise the growth of Retford into the countryside (ST34). Our only reservation is with the Bassetlaw Green Gaps report 2019. The settlements close to the west (Babworth), south (Eaton), and east (Little Gringley and Welham) are to be separated from the settlement edge of Retford by green gaps, but the green gap separating Clarborough Parish from Retford is inadequate (it leaves out a large part of Clarborough Parish extending towards Retford), and there is no green gap to separate Retford from Tiln. Clarborough (St John's Drive) is only one mile from Retford (Bigsby Road) at closest, but the proposed Clarborough and Welham green gap covers less than half the distance (approx. 600 yards). Tiln is only one mile from Retford (Linden Homes development on Tiln Lane) at closest. The land extending north-west from Bolham Manor towards Tiln and north-east from Bolham Manor via Bolham Hall and Moorgate Farm (Grade 2 Listed) towards Bolham Cottage Farm provides an attractive landscape of wooded hills, hedgerows and grassland and forms a barrier between Retford and Tiln. The land immediately north-east of Retford and sloping downhill from Bolham Manor eastwards as far as the Chesterfield Canal (SSSI) anmd the proposed Clarborough and Welham green gap is attractive farmland comprising a western area of open arable fields (with excellent long distance views from the proposed Clarborough and Welham green gap towards Moorgate Farm and Bolham Hall visible on the skyline), and an eastern area of grass fields and hedgerows. Indeed, the Bassetlaw green gaps report 2019 acknowledges the attractive nature of the low-lying land to the west of Chesterfield Canal between Retford and Clarborough but outside the proposed Clarborough and Welham Green gap. We hope that Bassetlaw DC will expand the proposed green gaps into the above land areas immediately outside Retford to protect the separation between Retford and Tiln and Clarborough, and to avoid expansion of Retford into open countryside, otherwise a large part of the open countryside within Clarborough Parish and between that village and Retford, as well as a smaller area within the administrative boundary of Retford will not be included in a green gap.	The identification of this green gap has been supported by an independent report on local landscape quality and the historic environment towards the north of Retford. There are significant landscape and heritage assets or existing designations that would limit and further manage development in this location. A review of these has taken place following consultation in January and there remains no reason to expand the Green Gap to the north of Retford. This has been based on previous landscape character work at a local and District level. The revised Local Plan however does now include a separate policy for Green Gaps which helps to clarify their intent.
REF466	Resident	I fully support the green gaps designated on the plan. Its essential that development is balanced and housing isn't allowed to sprawl all over the countryside. I fully support the local plan, it has been well considered.	Noted. Thank you for your comments
REF467	Resident	I fully support the green gap designated area around our town. Retford, so that housing development doesn't sprawl over the countryside.	Noted. Thank you for your comments

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST35 Green and Blue Infrastructure			
1189777	Resident	Delighted to see that the Chesterfield Canal and Cuckoo Way are recognised as green corridors.	Support noted. Thank you for your comments.
REF054	Resident	would be nice to have a map.	All Green and Blue Infrastructure corridors can be found on the published Policies Map on the Council's website at : www.bassetlaw.gov.uk
REF115	Canal and River Trust	Welcome the specific reference given to 'Blue Infrastructure' in this section, which would make it clearer to decision makers that this section refers to watercourses and canals as well as other areas of green space. Welcome the text of Policy ST35, which should help to ensure that future development takes account of the unique biodiversity and function of waterway corridors in the district.	Support noted. Supporting text has been amended to define blue infrastructure.
REF136	A and D Architecture	Policy ST35 should be modified to omit reference to buffer zones of specific dimension . Specific dimensions are a crude instrument of policy which might distort the relevance of material considerations like topography and planting and historic character. The paragraph "All new development within a 30m value of the corridor" should be deleted and replaced with: "All new development should respect the settings of major and minor green corridors and will be supported provided it conserves and enhances the function, setting, biodiversity, landscape and recreational value of the corridor;"	Policy ST35 reflects the principles of Paragraph 171 of the NPPF which requires Local Plans to take a strategic approach to maintaining and enhancing networks of habitats and green infrastructure and paragraph 174 which seeks 'To protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity by: a) Identify, map and safeguard ... wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them". The identification of green corridors and buffer zones ensures these networks can continue to be maintained and enhanced over the plan period. However, Policy ST35 will be amended to ensure the minimum width is applied on a site by site basis to reflect the functionality of the corridor in that location.
REF187	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	8.5.10 The Council will ensure development within or adjoining the Habitat Network maintains the integrity and continuity of the network and protects the biodiversity value of the land affected. New development within and adjacent to the Habitat Network should consider opportunities to enhance and expand its functionality and biodiversity particularly for the four main habitat networks: woodland, heathland and acid grassland, other grassland and wetland. Proposals that lead to fragmentation will be resisted. Trees and woodland 8.5.11 Bassetlaw benefits from extensive tree cover, including veteran trees and woodland. Trees provide many benefits, such as producing oxygen, capturing and storing carbon, removing pollutants from the air and slowing storm water run-off. On that basis, Policy ST36 protects quality trees which are not protected by statutory designation and resists development which threatens them. Through the Council Plan3, tree planting is part of the Council's commitment to carbon offsetting. New community woodlands will be secured through Policy ST45.	Support noted. Please see new policy in amended Local Plan that addresses concerns regarding carbon offsetting and tree canopy cover.
REF201	Severn Trent	Severn Trent are supportive of the principles outlined within policy ST35, and agree that the protection, creation and enhancement of blue green corridors is vital for sustainable development and creating a natural sense of place that is linked into the surrounding Landscape. Note that this approach assist with the development of good SuDS, design and returning water to the natural water system.	Support noted, thank you for your comments.
REF283	Resident	123 8.4 Add minor green corridor between Fledborough and River Trent to A2 list.	Response was submitted without the indication of said minor green corridor and we were unable to identify which one was indicated.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST35 Green and Blue Infrastructure			
REF293	The Wildlife Trust	<p>This policy states: 'All new development within a 30m buffer zone of the centre line of a major green corridor and within a 15m buffer zone of the centre line of a minor green corridor should, through good design, seek to conserve and enhance the function, setting, biodiversity, landscape, access and recreational value of the corridor.' Much of the work been done on corridor width/ continuity relates to individual species or entire taxonomic groups (e.g. passerine birds, butterflies, bats etc) with a mix of international and UK-based studies. Do not think it is possible to get a general 'one-size fits all' figure. Dawson, (1994) states: "corridors should be preserved, enhanced and provided, where this can be cost-effective, as they do permit certain species to thrive where they otherwise would not; Corridors should be as wide and continuous as possible; their habitat should match the requirements of the target species.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quadrat Scotland (2002) – the model is explained in appendix 1. For connectedness, to be defined as 'high' (on scale high, medium, low), the corridor needs to be at least 50m wide for more than 50% of the corridor • 50m buffers recommended for developments in Local Plan in Wakefield Darlington to protect local wildlife sites and / or river corridors etc (this is of course slightly different to what is being proposed). • It could be argued that 50m width would allow a buffer to function as a 'multi-purpose network', as defined in NECR 180, so that it could include attributes that are valuable to people, i.e. biodiversity alongside amenity, footpaths, cycleways, sustainable drainage, microclimate improvement, heritage etc <p>The above research supports the following principles in relation to green corridors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The wider the better o Whilst a broad band of similar habitat may facilitate the movement of some species, each species has its own habitat requirements. Argue that a minimum 50m buffer is required along all green corridors so that grassland, woodland and wetland (ditches/ ponds) can be included. 	<p>Policy ST35 reflects the principles of Paragraph 171 of the NPPF which requires Local Plans to take a strategic approach to maintaining and enhancing networks of habitats and green infrastructure and paragraph 174 which seeks 'To protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity by: a) Identify, map and safeguard ... wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them". The identification of green corridors and buffer zones ensures these networks can continue to be maintained and enhanced over the plan period. However, Policy ST35 will be amended to ensure the minimum width is applied on a site by site basis to reflect the functionality of the corridor in that location.</p>
REF299	Gladmans	<p>Policy ST35 seeks to protect, and where appropriate, improve and extend green and blue infrastructure as identified through the policy and the policies map. As indicated on the policies map, land at the former Bevercotes Colliery overlaps with a minor green corridor and the policy requires development proposals through good design, to conserve and enhance the function, setting, biodiversity, landscape, access and recreational value of the corridor. As has been demonstrated through ongoing engagement and previous representation to the Local Plan process, the proposed mixed-use development at Bevercotes Colliery has the ability to be developed in a manner that is clearly reflective of its locality with the distinctive natural elements of its surroundings woven into the fabric of the scheme. Major areas of open space including a country park can be incorporated into the scheme to conserve and enhance the local Green Infrastructure network and in doing so secure wider regenerative benefits.</p>	<p>Bassetlaw District's 2020 Sustainability Appraisal Report has found that the site contains significant Local Wildlife Sites (Bevercotes Colliery Site and Lawn Cover and Fox Covert, West Drayton). The site is also located entirely within a 5km buffer around the Sherwood Forest Important Bird Area. Furthermore, the Sherwood Forest ppSPA and the HRA has identified that this site could support ppSPA birds. As such, a significant negative effect is likely if the site is developed. Development of such site would go against the principles set out in ST35.</p>
REF300	Natural England	<p>Natural England supports this policy which adopts a landscape-scale approach to green and blue infrastructure, using and managing land and natural capital for what it is best suited to. The identification of main and minor green corridors within the policy wording is welcome. This approach will allow for an enhanced and extended GI network across the District. Note that other policies have been referenced which demonstrates the wider range of multifunctional benefits that a strong GI network can have.</p>	<p>Support noted, thank you for your comments.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST36 -	Biodiversity And Geodiversity		
REF115	Canal and River Trust	The Chesterfield Canal does benefit from a designation as an SSSI within the District. Welcome consideration given towards the protection of SSSI habitats within policy ST36, which should help ensure that consideration is given towards the protection of such habitats. Opportunities exist for new development to provide for net improvements to biodiversity in line with the aims of paragraph 170 (part d) of the NPPF, and part E of policy ST36 could assist in ensuring these aims are met.	Support noted and welcome.
REF187	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	8.5.10 The Council will ensure development within or adjoining the Habitat Network maintains the integrity and continuity of the network and protects the biodiversity value of the land affected. New development within and adjacent to the Habitat Network should consider opportunities to enhance and expand its functionality and biodiversity particularly for the four main habitat networks: woodland, heathland and acid grassland, other grassland and wetland. Proposals that lead to fragmentation will be resisted. Trees and woodland 8.5.11 Bassetlaw benefits from extensive tree cover, including veteran trees and woodland. Trees provide many benefits, such as producing oxygen, capturing and storing carbon, removing pollutants from the air and slowing storm water run-off. On that basis, Policy ST36 protects quality trees which are not protected by statutory designation and resists development which threatens them. Through the Council Plan3, tree planting is part of the Council's commitment to carbon offsetting. New community woodlands will be secured through Policy ST45.	Noted, thank you for your comments.
REF201	Severn Trent	Severn Trent are generally supportive of the principles behind policy ST36, however given the importance of the underlying Geology and Hydrogeology for providing water for drinking, it is felt that a statement should be added highlighting the need to protect groundwater resources: Any new development must demonstrate that development: · will not result in adverse impacts on the quality of waterbodies, groundwater and surface water, · will not prevent waterbodies or groundwater from achieving a good status in the future · contributes positively to the environment and ecology Where development has the potential to directly or indirectly pollute groundwater then a groundwater risk assessment will be needed to support a planning application.	Protecting water quality for drinking is an important issue for the Local Plan particularly given the District's underlying geology. But it is considered these issues would be more appropriately addressed by Policy ST48: Water Quality.
REF248	Fred Walter & Sons Ltd	Reviewed the 'Policies Maps' and note that there are proposals to further extend the extensive Local Wildlife Site ('LWS') designation, covered by Policy ST36, onto our land. Have not been directly consulted about this and can find no clear justification in the Draft 2020 Plan or evidence base as to why this is deemed necessary. It is our view that the proposed extensions are somewhat arbitrary given the status of the land they affect. 'Policies Map Comparison' attached which shows an extract from the adopted 2011 map and an extract from the draft 2020 map. Annotated the 2020 map extract to show the areas of our land that are affected by the LWS extension. These areas are ringed in orange and numbered 1-4; most of the land comprises commercial agricultural land that forms a vital part of our business and a smaller part is essentially an extension of garden. None of the areas are considered to have a degree of agricultural value that justifies the LWS designation. Specific comments on each area (1-4) are provided below: 1. Known as 'Silt Ponds', this was a silt settling area, which are proposing to return to arable rotation in approximately two years. The nature of the rotation and commercial use of the land means that ecological value is somewhat diminished. 2. This is a small park and fishing lake in front of my home, which is regularly used by my family. The size of the park and nature of the fishing lake means that do not see why any significant ecological value has been attributed and why is included in the LWS. 3. Known as 'Belmore Grassland', this area comprises an agricultural field of approximately 10.5 ha is currently used for grazing. It is intensively farmed and offers limited biodiversity value. Planning permission for development of a solar farm (Ref: 13/01126/FUL) lapsed in December 2016. The ecological assessment that accompanied the planning application concluded that the land is "...a pasture field of negligible ecological value...The species composition is not considered to be of significant ecological value e.g., not classified as local or UK Biodiversity Action Plan habitat." 4. This approximately 11.8 hectare piece of land is currently in arable rotation and, similarly to Belmore Grassland, is intensively farmed. The nature of the farming operation means that ecological value is limited. The extension of the LWS onto the above areas could adversely affect the future commercial productivity of land that forms a valuable part of our farming operation. Given the current focus on carbon reduction and renewable energy, may revisit the solar farm proposal, the stringent requirements of Policy ST36 could be an unnecessary risk to development. Request that the proposed boundaries on the draft 2020 map are amended to remove the additional pieces of land, reinstating the boundaries established by the 2011 map.	Notts Biological & Geological Records Centre try to keep up to date with changes to land use and the boundary has been changed regularly. This site has undergone considerable restoration of former gravel pits and silt lagoons to improved grassland and arable. These areas were mapped as wetland habitats at the time and have in many cases since been restored, while areas been expanded to include new areas of wetland habitat. The boundary has been changed to reflect the representation made. Area 1. the area of improved grassland has been removed from the boundary. Areas 2. and 3. removed. Area 4. This is a lake and part of 5/3470 Til North and Conservation Lake designated for bird interest. It does not include any arable land as shown on OS Mastermap and recent aerial photos.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST36 -	Biodiversity And Geodiversity		
REF252	IDP Planning	<p>Policy ST36 seeks to prevent harm to biodiversity and geodiversity from direct impacts such as land take. Indicates the Council will seek to protect and enhance the biodiversity and geodiversity of Bassetlaw, for International Sites, National Designations, Local Designations and Locally Important Ecological Features. Criterion E relates to 'Biodiversity Net Gain': "All new development of 50 dwellings or more should make provision for at least 10% new biodiversity gain preferably on site, or where it can be demonstrated that for design reasons this is not practicable, off site through a financial contribution". Support the general thrust of Policy ST36 in seeking to provide protection to designated biodiversity and geodiversity sites and recognise the important role that biodiversity and geodiversity play in delivering sustainable development. Object to criterion (E) of the emerging policy. Do not agree it is appropriate to set a 10% requirement for net biodiversity gain. It is recognised the Draft Environment Bill (2019) proposes the mandatory requirement for net biodiversity gains in development, whilst the NPPF (2019) also references biodiversity net gain, with para 174 noting plans should protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity by pursuing opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. It is unclear how the proposed 10% net biodiversity gain has been reached. The NPPF does not necessitate a percentage requirement for net biodiversity gain and the proposal to do so appears to be at odds with the NPPF in setting an arbitrary figure with little justification of how this figure has been reached and no flexibility in recognition of where this may be unachievable on certain sites. The 10% net gain requirement goes significantly beyond the requirement in both the Draft Environment Bill and the NPPF and sets an onerous requirement for development. The Draft Plan sets out that this requirement has been considered as part of the Bassetlaw Whole Plan Viability Assessment, a review of the Assessment it is unclear where the requirement for 10% net biodiversity gains has been factored into development costs. The NPPF requires that local plans are aspirational but 'deliverable' (para 16) and that to be 'sound' they are effective and justified, providing an appropriate strategy which is based on proportionate evidence (para 35). Unclear whether Policy ST36 is justified or viable - of the view that it proposes an onerous and arbitrary approach which offers little flexibility for consideration of site characteristics or viability, whereas the provision of an element of net gain would still be in accordance with the NPPF. Not of the view that Policy ST36 is deliverable, particularly given viability considerations for many new development. Reference to 10% net biodiversity requirement should be removed from Policy ST36 which should be amended to reflect the wording of the NPPF to provide flexibility to ensure that development is deliverable. Suggest the following wording: "All new development of 50 dwellings or more should seek to promote opportunities for securing net biodiversity gains preferably on site, or where it can be demonstrated that for design reasons this is not practicable, off site through a financial contribution".</p>	<p>Policy ST36 is in line with the latest update to the forthcoming Environment Bill which requires development to deliver a mandatory 10% net gain in biodiversity. It is expected that the bill will become legislation before the Local Plan is adopted. So that the Local Plan is not out of date Policy ST36 will continue to include the requirement. The policy requirements have been taken into account in the viability assessment but as measures can be incorporated through good design and other Local Plan requirements it is not considered that this will add such a significant cost to development to adversely affect viability.</p>
1196824	Resident	Please think about adding as many wildflower areas as possible, and also keep in mind that drainage will be needed to help alleviate flood water	Comments noted.
REF273	Anglian Water	Anglian Water is generally supportive of the principle of development proposals providing biodiversity net gain. The policy as drafted says this would apply to residential developments of 50 dwellings or more only. However the Environment Bill refers to all development requiring planning permission and is not limited to residential developments. Policy ST36 should be amended for consistency with the provisions of Environment Bill.	Policy ST36 will be amended to reflect the principles of the updated draft Environment Bill, and will refer to all development.
1197036	Woodland Trust	Support the strong protection given to ancient woodland in this policy although would prefer to see the wording used as in Para175c of the NPPF; rather than saying "usually be protected", say "protected other than in wholly exceptional circumstances." Like to see ancient or veteran trees given the same level of protection, which again would be in line with the NPPF.	To be found sound, it is important that the Local Plan aligns with national policy. As such the Local Plan will ensure the provisions of Para 175c and other requirements for trees are appropriately reflected.
REF282	National Trust	National Trust supports Policy ST36 Biodiversity and Geodiversity. There may need to be a slight adjustment in relation to ancient woodland which may not be considered a national/statutory designation, but is nevertheless classed as irreplaceable and should be highlighted as of major importance.	To be found sound, it is important that the Local Plan aligns with national policy. As such the Local Plan will ensure the provisions of Para 175c and other requirements for trees are appropriately reflected.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST36 -	Biodiversity And Geodiversity		
REF285	Home Builders Federation	<p>Policy ST36 Bullet Point (E), all new development of 50 dwellings or more should make provision for at least 10% net biodiversity gain preferably on site, or where it can be demonstrated that for design reasons this is not practicable, off site through a financial contribution. The Government's Environment Bill requires a mandatory 10% biodiversity gain from development. The Council should not deviate from Government proposals. Before the pre-submission Local Plan consultation, Policy ST36 should be modified to align with Government proposals. The Council's viability evidence set out in the Bassetlaw Interim Whole Plan & Community Infrastructure Levy dated August 2018 does not include any costs for Policy ST36. The DEFRA Impact Statement estimated an average cost of £19,000 per hectare to achieve 10% biodiversity gain. Before the pre-submission Local Plan consultation, the Council should undertake further viability work.</p>	<p>Policy ST36 will reflect the principles of the updated draft Environment Bill or any subsequent relevant legislation relating to biodiversity net gain, and will refer to all development. Policy ST36 has been viability tested - this is set out in the 2019 Whole Plan Viability Assessment (which is the most up to date assessment of viability and not the 2018 document) - which shows that 10% net gain can be achieved on sites of 50 or more units as part of a deliverable scheme. However, the Whole Plan Viability Assessment will be updated prior to Publication to ensure all development requirements are deliverable.</p>
1197091	William Davis	<p>Policy ST36 Bullet Point (E), all new development of 50 dwellings or more should make provision for at least 10% net biodiversity gain preferably on site, or where it can be demonstrated that for design reasons this is not practicable, off site through a financial contribution. The Government's Environment Bill requires a mandatory 10% biodiversity gain from development. The Council should not deviate from Government proposals. Before the presubmission Local Plan consultation, Policy ST36 should be modified to align with Government proposals. The Council's viability evidence set out in the Bassetlaw Interim Whole Plan & Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Viability Assessment August 2018 does not include any costs for Policy ST36. DEFRA Impact Statement estimated an average cost of £19,000 per hectare to achieve 10% biodiversity gain. Before the pre-submission Local Plan consultation, the Council should undertake further viability work.</p>	<p>Policy ST36 will reflect the principles of the updated draft Environment Bill or any subsequent relevant legislation relating to biodiversity net gain, and will refer to all development. Policy ST36 has been viability tested - this is set out in the 2019 Whole Plan Viability Assessment (which is the most up to date assessment of viability and not the 2018 document) - which shows that 10% net gain can be achieved on sites of 50 or more units as part of a deliverable scheme. However, the Whole Plan Viability Assessment will be updated prior to Publication to ensure all development requirements are deliverable.</p>
REF293	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	<p>Section 8.5.14 states: 'Biodiversity net gain aims to leave the District's biodiversity assets in a better state than currently exists. All development in Bassetlaw will be encouraged to deliver measurable improvements for biodiversity by creating or enhancing habitats through development.' and, Section 8.5.15 states: "Reflecting the emerging principles of the draft Environment Bill 2019, developments of 50 or more dwellings will be expected to secure a 10% net gain in biodiversity." Welcome that BDC are leading by example by setting a target of 10% net gain in biodiversity for developments of 50 or more dwellings. This indicates real intent and shows BDC in a positive light. Wish to see BDC establish an even more ambitious target of 20% in order to deliver greater habitat creation and climate change resilience in the face of a climate and biodiversity crisis.</p>	<p>Policy ST36 will reflect the principles of the updated draft Environment Bill or any subsequent relevant legislation relating to biodiversity net gain, and will refer to all development. Using 'at least' means that should a development wish to provide for more than the 10% requirement it will be supported by policy. The 2019 Whole Plan Viability Assessment shows that 10% net gain is the maximum level that can be achieved as part of a viable development in the District, when other policy requirements are taken into account.</p>
REF299	Gladmans	<p>5.5.1 Whilst acknowledging the good intentions of Policy ST36, submit criterion E requires further modification prior to pre-submission. Concerned that Policy ST36(E) as drafted deviates from the Government's Environment Bill which requires a mandatory 10% biodiversity gain from development. Policy ST36 should therefore be modified to align with Government proposals.</p>	<p>Policy ST36 will reflect the principles of the updated draft Environment Bill or any subsequent relevant legislation relating to biodiversity net gain, which requires all development to deliver a mandatory 10% net gain in biodiversity.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST36 -	Biodiversity And Geodiversity		
REF300	Natural England	<p>Support this policy which comprehensively covers the protection of designated sites, species and ecological and biodiversity interest across the District. 8.5.4. The Sherwood ppSPA has not yet reached the stage of a "candidate site" which is why it is termed a possible potential SPA. 8.5.9. Welcome the paragraphs on the Bassetlaw Habitat Network and the reference to the Nottinghamshire Biodiversity Opportunity Maps. Suggest this section should refer to the Nature Recovery Network which is a major commitment in the government's 25 Year Environment Plan and is intended to expand and connect habitats to address wildlife decline and provide wider environmental benefits both for nature and people. 8.5.11. The commitment to tree planning in this paragraph is welcome though it should be ensured that the right tree species are planted in the most appropriate locations for maximum benefit to biodiversity. 8.5.14. The paragraphs covering Biodiversity Net Gain are welcome. Acknowledge that the 10% net gain development of 50 or more houses reflects the emerging principles within the Environment Bill, however net gain is likely to be relevant to all development that requires planning permission. 8.5.16. Note the use of the new Defra metric 2.0 has been included which is advocated by Natural England. Welcome the intention to provide a Greening Bassetlaw SPD and would welcome the opportunity to work in partnership with this document. 8.5.7. Would also be happy to work proactively with the Council, stakeholders and developers to ensure Biodiversity Net Gain is achieved. 8.5.18. The inclusion of this paragraph on Ecosystem Service is welcome but suggest that natural flood management should be specifically mentioned. Have the following detailed points on Policy ST36: B – The Sherwood ppSPA has not yet reached the stage of a "candidate site" which is why it is termed a possible potential SPA. D(a) – The mitigation hierarchy should be applied to all sites not just local designations. E – Biodiversity Net Gain we understand will apply to all development. D(b) – With mandatory net gain being introduced this sentence should ensure net gain is achieved (i.e. no net loss is no longer acceptable).</p>	Comments made in relation to the supporting text and Policy ST36 are noted. Changes will be made accordingly and will reflect the principles of the update draft Environment Bill or any subsequent relevant legislation relating to biodiversity net gain relating to biodiversity net gain, which requires all development to deliver a mandatory 10% net gain in biodiversity. The Council would welcome the opportunity to work with Natural England on the Greening Bassetlaw SPD and the approach to biodiversity net gain.
1197222	Resident	The construction of the Peaks Hill site will mean the destruction of some woodland which will contradict the councils policy on biodiversity ,air quality and climate change	Policy 15 seeks to retain woodland and trees on site. But inevitably there will need to be the selected loss of some trees to ensure the site can be appropriately planned. The loss of any trees, woodland or hedgerows will need to be replaced on site as part of the development. There will also be a requirement for 10% biodiversity net gain to be secured on site. Together this should reinforce the approach to biodiversity, air quality and climate change advocated elsewhere in the Local Plan.
REF346	Doncaster Council	Paragraph 8.5.2 states that the NPPF seeks net gains in biodiversity where possible. It is considered that this not in line with the NPPF (para 170 including point d). This needs strengthening by removing the phrase 'where possible'. Paragraph 8.5.15 and Policy ST36 point E states a threshold of 50 dwellings before applications will be expected to deliver a 10% net gain in biodiversity. This is a very high threshold, as sites of 49 dwellings could easily result in very significant losses in biodiversity. This threshold should be lowered substantially. The reference to dwellings does not allow for potentially significant impacts on biodiversity from other types of development which could equally be damaging to biodiversity. The scope of how net gain principles will be applied to other types of development should be explained.	Policy ST36 will reflect the principles of the updated draft Environment Bill or any subsequent relevant legislation relating to biodiversity net gain, and will refer to a 10% requirement from all development. Paragraph 8.5.2 will be amended to reflect comments made.
REF346	Doncaster Council	Section D should be strengthened by removing the reference to 'no net loss'. The NPPF is clear in its requirement for a net gain in biodiversity and at present the policy contradicts this.	Policy ST36 will reflect the principles of the updated draft Environment Bill or any subsequent relevant legislation relating to biodiversity net gain. As such reference to 'no net loss' will be deleted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST37 and ST38	Conservation and Heritage Assets		
1197023	Resident	Bassetlaw Council are completely untrustworthy in term of environment and heritage protection. I am disgusted that Jo White purports to support the green agenda. She along with other councillors have allowed mass destruction of trees and protected species in Mr Straws Conservation Area. It is derisory to claim any green credentials. Habitat regulations are already in place they are ignored. The proposed commitment to woodland cannot be achieved without a radical rethink of housing at Peaks Hill and by adhetement to National Laws.	Heritage relates to the built environment and to the historic significance of man-made landscapes. Any applications relating to the loss of trees and impacts on wildlife are carefully considered to ensure loss/impacts is consistent with national legislation and planning policy.
1197036	Woodland Trust	If ancient/veteran trees and the need to give them strong protection are not included in Policy ST36, as we suggested, then they could be included here under heritage assets. They need to be in one or other of the policies, as they are irreplaceable natural habitats.	Heritage relates to the built environment and to the historic significance of man-made landscapes. Trees and woodland will be covered by a new policy in the next version of the Local Plan.
REF282	National Trust	National Trust supports Policy ST37 Conservation and Enhancement of the Historic Environment.	Support noted and welcome.
REF282	National Trust	Part A.2. states that a proposal should 'use materials, building technique(s) and detailing that reflect the local vernacular'. Suggest that this needs to be adjusted to recognise that some modern details and finishes, such as glazing panels, may work well if used carefully within a historic context. Suggest that Part 6 should refer to 'significant views' rather than all views. Part D more or less reiterates the wording of the NPPF and may therefore need to be excluded from the Local Plan policy. Suggest that Part C.3. should be extended slightly to say that a non-designated asset can only be lost if it 'has no viable use now or in the foreseeable future'.	a) Designated, Part A.2. - Wording amended to reflect the approach suggested. b) Designated, Part A.6. Policy wording amended accordingly. c) Acknowledge this is repetition of national policy and will be deleted. d) Part C.3. Policy wording amended to reflect comments made.
1197221	Resident	Wigthorpe and South Carlton are designated conservation areas meaning that they have historical significance. The proposed development HS1 erodes their sense of rural historic landscapes.	Peaks Hill Farm is a considerable distance from the Carlton in Lindrick Conservation Area, of which both South Carlton and Wigthorpe are within. With regard to development east of the woodland at Peaks Hill, this would be well screened from the A60 behind the existing trees. Therefore, it will have no impact on the setting of Broom Farm and Peaks Hill Farm. A memorial relating to the Wellington Bomber crash in the area in May 1944 will be required. With regard to the area of land between the A60 and the woodland, this site does form part of the countryside setting to Peaks Hill Farm, a non-designated heritage asset. In addition, it forms part of the wider setting to Broom Farm (grade II listed). This open countryside setting is an important part of this setting, and large scale development across this part of the site would likely cause harm to that setting. Development be limited to the land east of the trees. Any road through this part of the site should be constructed as close to the edge of the woodland as possible and with as small a gap in the woodland as possible, to help minimise the visual impact.
REF327	Scrooby Parish	Whilst this covers relatively large assets, the smaller rural environments have many areas / buildings of equal if not more historic significance. These must be afforded the protection of Policy ST37	Policy ST37 does relate to the heritage assets of all scales and types, not just the larger ones.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST37 and ST38	Conservation and Heritage Assets		
REF346	Doncaster Council	<p>Doncaster Council fully supports Policies ST37 & ST38. Policy ST37 is in keeping with the significance led approach of the NPPF and particularly the requirement in part 2 that proposals affecting heritage assets or their setting be informed by a proportionate heritage statement. Policy ST38 distinguishes between the treatment of designated and undesignated heritage assets as required in the NPPF.</p>	Acknowledged and agreed
REF347	NJL Consulting	<p>Caddick are concerned that ST37 and ST38, as currently drafted, set an overly onerous requirement on applicants where heritage and historical matters are relevant. The statutory approach to heritage, conservation and historic environments is set in the 'Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990'. The National Planning Policy Framework provides further policy requirements for heritage matters. However, ST38 goes significantly beyond the established statutory and national policy principles yet there is no evidence to support the proposed policy. For example, Part A(6), in the context of designated heritage assets, requires proposals ensure "... views away from, through, and towards, the heritage asset are preserved or enhanced...'. This is an entirely different approach to that taken in recent decisions regarding the setting of listed buildings and conservation assets. ST38 then applies different criteria to non-designated heritage assets. It is considered that a number of these criteria go unnecessarily beyond statutory and national policy requirements. At this stage there is no evidence to support the council's position and the policy should be revised. As such the policies are unsound.</p>	<p>With regard to the preservation of views and setting, there is clear legislation, policy, guidance and caselaw on this. Setting (to which views are a key contributor) is often an important part of the significance of a heritage asset - legislation, NPPF, the PPG and Historic England guidance (especially Good Practice Advice Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets, Dec 2017) clearly set out how this should be assessed and interpreted. The new Policy ST38, which includes reference to views towards, through and from assets, is very much compliant with national policy and guidance. The distinction between designated and non-designated heritage assets as set out in ST38 is fully compliant with the policies in the NPPF. The ST38 requirements set out for applications affecting non-designated heritage assets merely express a sensible interpretation of the 'balanced view' approach (NPPF Paragraph 197), which will give greater certainty for both developers and the Council. ST38 does not in any way give non-designated heritage assets greater weight than the NPPF does.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST39 - Promoting Healthy,	Active Lifestyles		
REF030	North Leverton Parish Council	Has BDC considered the risk to the wellbeing of the populous of the district with regard to access to adequate local health facilities? Both Retford & Worksop hospitals are suffering from chronic staff shortages and are unable to offer full time cover in several key departments. The above situations should be recognised and addressed in any final version of the BDC plan	Provision of health facilities does not fall under the jurisdiction of the Council. NHS Bassetlaw CCG are responsible for health care provision in the District. The CCG have been involved in the preparation of the Local Plan and have confirmed that subject to new development making provision for new or improved health facilities the Plan is appropriate. Such infrastructure will be secured through Policy ST52. Through Duty to Cooperate BDC will continue to engage the CCG to ensure the provision is fit for purpose. Further details will be set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
REF047	Sport England	Support policy ST39. Should point 3 have a reference to the playing pitch strategy? Link to section 9.4, Ensure that Active Design is considered as part of the development process. In addition Strategic Objectives 8 and 9 would be supported and implemented by the use of Active Design.	Policy amended to include a reference to Active Design and the existing Play Pitch Strategy.
REF115	Canal and River Trust	Our towpaths provide public access to the Green Infrastructure network, which can promote active lifestyles and benefits to wellbeing. The Trust believe that access to our waterways can provide multiple economic, social and environmental benefits to local communities, which has been supported by the findings by our towpath surveys (Kanter TNS, 2017). Welcome the aspirations of the Local Plan, set out in paragraph 9.1.4 to ensure that facilities and infrastructure exist to give everyone the opportunity to live in a healthy place. This would include access to the blue infrastructure network of the Chesterfield Canal. Welcome the consideration in parts B (1) and B (5) of the policy, to increase opportunities for access to leisure facilities and for walking and cycling. Our network can play an important part in ensuring that future (and existing) residents can benefit from access to such facilities, which could assist in promoting healthy lifestyles. Wish to highlight that significant new developments in the vicinity of the canal network place extra liabilities and burdens upon the waterway infrastructure and it is essential that appropriate contributions are secured from developers, where necessary, in order to mitigate the impact of new development on the Trust's assets. Examples could include the need for towpath improvements to accommodate the needs of new development to prevent excessive erosion of the path, that could otherwise render it impassable to users. Would welcome additional reference within the supporting text to the potential need for contributions to support improvements to existing leisure resources to accommodate any future demands.	Policy amended to include towpaths and waterways.
1194992	Resident	Need to be more facilities in rural areas eg Tuxord and East Markham	Comments noted. This can be achieved through Neighbourhood Plans.
REF136	A and D Architecture	10) Policy ST39 BS should be modified to safeguard the health and safety of pedestrians against inappropriate cycle speeds on multi-use footway/cycleways as follows: "B 5 "increasing opportunities for walking, cycling and encouraging more sustainable transport choices whilst safeguarding pedestrian users of multi-use footway/cycleways by the incorporation of barriers and other means to calm cyclist speeds."	This point is more appropriately covered by the Transport section.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST39 - Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles			
1195884	Resident	Whilst better health care is an essential part for any community, the systematic reduction of services at Bassetlaw Hospital by the management at D.R.I, and overstretched surgeries we have at the present is a major problem. Need Bassetlaw to be better equipped and staffed and stop being run down	Provision of health facilities does not fall under the jurisdiction of the Council. NHS Bassetlaw CCG are responsible for health care provision in the District. The CCG have been involved in the preparation of the Local Plan and have confirmed that subject to new development making provision for new or improved health facilities the Plan is appropriate. Such infrastructure will be secured through Policy ST52. Through Duty to Cooperate BDC will continue to engage the CCG to ensure the provision is fit for purpose. Further details will be set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
REF187	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Quotes the entirety of Policy ST39. This sets out why Sandhills could be retained and improved as open Green Space area. Along with the following extracts from our guidelines, the other other options offered to avoid building houses on Sandhills can be seen to supported within these Policies.	Sandhills is no longer being considered as a housing allocation in this Local Plan. It will be protected as a publicly accessible open space.
REF272	NHS Bassetlaw CCG	The plan refers to "working in partnership with the health authorities to maintain and where practicable improve access to the full range of health services for residents" – it is likely that this extent of development would impact on primary, community and secondary care services. For secondary care this will have an impact particularly on the Bassetlaw Hospital where we are already seeing increases in urgent and emergency care attendance levels. There is already an increasing pressure on estates for delivery of primary care services. Encourage the view that we need to collaborate more as local public sector organisations to make best use of our collective estate and promote improved access to appropriate services. Would be helpful to understand if there are any proposals/developments that include increase in residential care home/specialist housing as this will clearly need to be profiled against increasing health needs. This is pertinent given the existing projections for increases in population over 65 and aged over 80 year (43.1% increase in over 65's and 83% of over 80's) over the plan period- and any additionality resulting from the developments in this regard. The Plan identifies: The SHMA Update15 identifies the need for specialist housing for older people, which projected forward is 64 dwellings per annum or 1273 units for the plan period. There is also a requirement for the delivery of 335 wheelchair accessible dwellings or 18 dwellings per annum by 2037. The SHMA Update15 need (projected forward) identifies 663 care home units over the plan period Residential, Nursing and Close Care Homes. In order to fully understand the implications of the Plan would therefore ask for further detail in relation to specific expectations and locations of such specialist housing as well as the likely demographic characteristics of new housing stock. Welcome support from BDC in the development of a standard formula or approach to support our shared understanding of the correlation between demographic characteristics and demand on health services. Primary Medical Services and Community health provision is vital to ensure services are provided close to home, primary care is increasingly working across primary care network footprints to deliver more services in the community, population increases inevitably increase the number of people registered at a GP practice that requires additional GPs and space from which to deliver services. There is already considerable pressure on this space. Keen to ensure any new housing scheme took full consideration of the impact on demand for services. Given the development plans in some of the more rural locations it is vital that infrastructure is in place to support delivery of health services and would welcome plans for connectivity and Wi-Fi/connectivity to enable remote health care management in some circumstances. It is important in respect to ill health prevention and wellness promotion that support residents who are lonely or socially isolated (whatever age) to remain as connected as possible to supportive networks which may often be through digital channels of communication. Where there are wider	Policy ST28 details the plan's requirements for specialist housing and thus the requirement of care homes as well. The policy details a requirement on schemes of 50 or more dwellings to provide at least 20% accessible and adaptable dwellings. The policy goes on to detail that proposals which would result in the loss of specialist accommodation will not be supported unless it can be demonstrated that there is no longer a need for such accommodation in the District, or alternative provision is being made available locally through replacement or new facilities. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment 2020 updates the need for older people. The Local Plan includes numerous strategic housing sites. The majority of these will contribute towards the supply of further specialist housing in the District. The scale of these strategic development sites will also enable further funding to health care provision in the District as well. Discussions will continue with the CCG to ensure that there is a clear understanding of the location of specialist housing, as well as agreeing an approach to securing developer contributions from new development for primary and hospital facilities.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST39 - Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles			
		developments in more rural locations consideration needs to be given to the provision of pharmaceutical services and would welcome consultation with local pharmacy providers as part of individual consultation on developments in the area. Health services and facilities do appear in the plan as both 'infrastructure' and 'community facilities' depending on the section. Would the Plan benefit from providing some clarity on the definitions of this? Examples of this are sections 2.3 and 5.4.23.	
1197036	Woodland Trust	Access to woodland has been shown to promote active lifestyles and improve both mental and physical health. Would like to see woodland included as one of the types of open space that the plan seeks to promote for their health benefits.	Please see policy amended to include woodlands.
REF283	Resident	ST39 133 9.1.4 Needs clear link to active travel modes and infrastructure provision to facilitate everyday trips (as ST49 page 154 11.1.2 bullet point 3) to deliver Strategic Objectives 9 & 13 and to accord with illustrations on page 132. Not just a step-change, but also a pedal-change!	Policy ST50 makes clear reference to the provision of active travel modes. Please see the policy amended to refer to this section.
REF285	Home Builders Federation	Policy ST39 requires all schemes of 50 or more dwellings to submit a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) as part of the planning application. The general expectations of the 2019 NPPF is that planning will promote healthy communities. The NPPG (ID53-004-20140306) confirms that a HIA can serve a useful purpose at planning application stage and consultation with the Director of Public Health as part of the process can establish whether a HIA would be a useful tool for understanding the potential impacts upon wellbeing that development proposals will have on existing health services and facilities. The requirement for a HIA for all schemes of 50 or more dwellings without any specific evidence that an individual scheme is likely to have a significant impact upon the health and wellbeing of the local population is not justified by reference to the NPPG. Any requirement for a HIA Screening Report and / or a full HIA should be based on a proportionate level of detail in relation the scale and type of development proposed. It is suggested that HIA Screening Report should only be required for applications for large strategic residential developments. If a significant adverse impact on health and wellbeing is identified only then should a full HIA be required, which sets out measures to substantially mitigate the impact. Before the pre-submission Local Plan consultation, Policy ST39 should be modified.	The Council support Nottinghamshire County Councils' Spatial Planning and Health Framework 2019-2022 which includes a Rapid Health Impact Assessment Matrix. The purpose of this Matrix is to 'quickly ensure that the health impacts of a development proposal are identified, and appropriate action is taken to address negative impacts and maximise benefits'. Policy ST39 has been amended to clarify developments of 50 or more to submit the required Rapid Health Impact Assessment Matrix.
1197091	William Davis	This policy requires schemes of more than 50 dwellings to submit a Health Impact Assessment (HIA). HIAs can be complicated and costly to prepare and are not likely to be proportionate for most types of development. It is understood that Bassetlaw have signed up to Nottinghamshire County Councils' Spatial Planning and Health Framework which includes a Rapid Health Impact Assessment Matrix. This is considered to be a more proportionate way to assess the health impacts of development and Policy ST39 should be amended to refer specifically to the Matrix.	Please see policy amended to require the Rapid Health Impact Assessment Matrix for ST39 as suggested.
REF300	Natural England	Natural England welcomes the reference in this policy to access to open space and opportunities for walking and cycling.	Support welcome and noted.
REF331	Worksop College (C/O Teakwood Partners)	Policy ST39 notes the council will, where practicable, improve access to a full range of health services for residents; improve the quantity of sports facilities; and encourage the co-location of facilities so that sports facilities can be located in close proximity to other facilities for education. BDC places an emphasis on creating healthy lifestyles. The aspirations of Worksop College in delivering a new athletics track, accessible to the local community, will help BDC meet this aim. As such, Worksop College are supportive of this policy and its emphasis on supporting applications which help deliver healthy lifestyles.	Support noted, thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST40-Protection	and Enhancement	of Community Facilities	
1189264	Resident	Have many of these been closing down over the last few years?	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan Baseline will have a detailed breakdown of the available community facilities in the District and the future provision that will be needed in the District.
1190067	Resident	This policy will not protect allotment sites being reclaimed by the council and use for new build dwellings on site HS7 page 91 .	Site HS7 has been taken out of the Local Plan. The provision of allotments identified in Retford can be found in the Open Space Needs Assessment 2020. Furthermore, Policy ST41 references all open space requirements/future provision in the District as well.
REF003	Rhubarb Farm	Rhubarb Farm CIC is a horticultural social enterprise (non-profit) located on a 2 acre site in Nether Langwith, owned by the Langwith Society. Sometime prior to 2009, a speculative planning application was submitted for a housing development on this land, by an applicant who did not own the land. This application was rejected by Bassetlaw Planning Department. While Rhubarb Farm welcomes the Policy that in small rural settlements new housing of up to 10% of the housing stock of that settlement will be considered, Rhubarb Farm wishes to raise concern in case a future application would be submitted on the site which the Farm occupies. Rhubarb Farm falls within the Local Plan's Policy ST40: Protection and Enhancement of Community Facilities, for the following reasons, and therefore the Farm would wish the Planning Authority to take these into consideration:- 1. Rhubarb Farm is unique in Bassetlaw district for its work supporting people with a wide range of multiple and complex needs. We take a lot of people from Bassetlaw, in particular long term unemployed, people with mental ill health, recovering substance misusers and ex-offenders, and we support them to turn their lives around. We have a good reputation for our work. 2. Rhubarb Farm is recognised by Bassetlaw District Council for its impact and effectiveness, and has been receiving grant-funding from the Council for some years, including a current Food Project. In addition, Nottinghamshire County Council also grant-aids Rhubarb Farm, as do national funders like the Big Lottery. 3. Rhubarb Farm provides local employment and currently employs 21 people. This is contributing economically to the local economy. 4. In the near future, Rhubarb Farm plans to submit an application for the construction of a strawbale building as office, training rooms, rental space, café, kitchen and composting toilets. This will enhance our offer of support and employment, could contribution to the visitor economy, and be of significant interest in Bassetlaw District because a strawbale building is a unique heritage construction and has very strong environmental credentials.	It is important that planning applications are considered on balance, taking into account the merits of the proposal including any loss of existing facilities. As such the provisions of ST40 would apply.
REF047	Sport England	Policy ST40 should the ref to community facilities advise that sports facilities are specifically covered in St42	The Local Plan states that the user should ensure all relevant policies are taken into consideration when considering a proposal. It is clear from the contents that there is a specific policy for sports facilities.
1193104	Resident	Cannot emphasise enough the contribution that the Sandhills is already making to these policies Designating it as a Local Open Space would protect the legacy of these policies for future generations	Thank you for your comments. Sandhills is no longer a housing allocation in the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan. It will be protected as open space.
REF218	Central Lincolnshire	Note the repeated sections B and C in policy ST40.	Please see policy amended based on comments.
1196860	Sheffield City Council	In particular ST40 is supported.	Support noted, thank you for your comments.
REF327	Scrooby Parish	Good to see being promoted the use of Village Halls, etc., as shops, PO's, etc. However, that must not always be if the Village Hall stops being used, it is equally positive if they are used as both together.	Support noted, thank you for your comments.
REF331	Worksop College (C/O Teakwood Partners)	Policy ST40 supports proposals which deliver new community facilities, including where they are located adjacent to an existing settlement, meet a need for the use, and are accessible for all members of the community. This policy also supports Worksop College's aspirations in delivering an athletics track, which would meet the requirements for new community facilities. As such, Worksop College are supportive of this policy.	Support noted, thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST40-Protection and Enhancement of Community Facilities			
REF387	Resident	Upgrade for Retford fire and ambulance facilities within Retford 24/7 as it use to be. Retford Hospital to be upgraded for re-use as Hospital and small accident department as it use to be when Retford was half the size.	Provision of fire and ambulance facilities does not fall under the jurisdiction of the Council. The Local Plan would provide the framework should either service wish to upgrade. The Council will continue to work with Bassetlaw CCG in the preparation of the Local Plan. An approach to securing developer contributions to improve primary and hospital care as a result of new development has been agreed. Further details will be set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
REF428	Resident	Could someone explain what as a Council you seem to have no common policy with the provision of children's play areas. Why have you as an authority failed to deliver a plan in time. Do you intend to make sure the next plan will be delivered before the old one expires. Policy ST40 Community Facilities There are no community facilities to the South East of Retford Town Centre, why?	The children's play area provision is covered under Policy ST41 whereby 0.14 ha of children play space per 1000 children will be the requirement District-wide. These figures have come forward from our Open Space Needs Assessment. The Council is producing a Local Plan in accordance with national legislation and national policy, and will have a Local Plan in place by December 2023, as required by the Government. New housing sites in Retford will make provision for new community facilities in Retford.
REF471	NHS Property Services Ltd (NHSPS)	Policy ST40 B. The supporting text makes reference to the NPPF and the importance of protecting and maintaining community facilities. NHSPS supports the principle of maintaining and improving community facilities within the borough. Whilst NPPF Paragraph 92c states that planning policies and decisions should 'guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services', the overarching objective of this same paragraph is to ensure the delivery of facilities and services of the community. Paragraph 93b also states 'planning policies and decision should...take into account and support the delivery of local strategies to improve health, social and cultural well-being for all sections of the community' Where health centres and other medical facilities are included in this definition of community facilities, believe the wording of any future policies should allow for the loss within the context of estate regeneration. NHSPS works with local commissioners to establish the needs within the local area and how this can be maximised and efficiently used within the estate. This can include the redevelopment of surplus properties for other uses (often residential) to release capital to be recycled back into the system. Policies that prevent the loss or change of use of 'community facilities' and include healthcare facilities within this definition can prevent or delay required investment in alternative facilities and work against the aim of providing essential healthcare services for the community. It is important to note that there are separate, rigorous testing and approval processes employed by the NHS to ensure the right facilities are in the right place at the right time. The policy is overly restrictive and would not provide a sufficiently flexible and positive policy basis for the delivery of NHS facilities. The policy and supporting text do not recognise estate rationalisation programs carried out by public service providers. NHS estate reviews are aimed at improving the provision of healthcare services by increasing efficiencies, including through the disposal or development of unneeded and underutilised properties. NHSPS recognises the need to guard against the loss of important community facilities. It is considered that the policy risks having a negative effective on the NHS and Council to deliver services locally. Community infrastructure policies where NHS facilities are included in the definition, often prevent or delay required investment in new/improved services and facilities, especially those which require substantial periods of marketing. In some cases, other funding streams that are needed to pay for new facilities (in addition to the receipt from the land) can be lost over time or simply because development opportunities fall through as a result of delay. Where NHS commissioners can demonstrate that healthcare facilities are no longer required for the provision of services, there should be an acceptance that such sites are suitable for housing, or other viable uses. Concerns with this proposed policy can be very easily be addressed to ensure policy ST40 does not inadvertently impose further evidential requirements or marketing periods on the NHS beyond its own internal processes.	Thank you for your comments. It is considered that policy ST40 is flexible enough for the rationalisation of NHS assets.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST40-Protection and Enhancement of Community Facilities			
REF471	NHS Property Services Ltd (NHSPS)	<p>Proposed Amendments in blue: Proposals to change the use or redevelop existing community facilities will only be supported if: 1. It can be demonstrated that there is no longer an existing community need for the facility and the building or the site is not needed for an alternative community use as confirmed by service providers and; or 2. It can be demonstrated that the current use is not viable and marketing evidence is provided which demonstrates the premises has been marketed for its lawful use for sustained minimum period of 12 months; and or 3. the loss is part of a wider public service transformation plan which requires investment in modern, fit for purpose infrastructure and facilities to meet future population needs or to sustain and improve services. The service provided by the facility is met by alternative provision that exists within reasonable proximity: what is deemed as reasonable proximity will depend on the nature of the facility and its associated catchment area; and or it involves the provision of an equivalent or better replacement community facility either on site or within that settlement or locality which meets the needs of the local community. In the case of proposals where the loss of the use would form part of a wider public estate rationalisation program, evidence of such a program would be sufficient as a form of evidence that the site is surplus to requirements and as such would not be required to submit marketing information.</p> <p>NHSPS's proposed amendments to Bassetlaw's Plan would ensure that ST40 is justified, effective and consistent with national policy. Further to this, the inclusion of conjunctive words (or) will ensure that Part 3. will operate independently from the rest of the policy, meaning that policy as a whole, will be targeted and effective.</p>	Thank you for your comments. It is considered that policy ST40 is flexible enough for the rationalisation of NHS assets.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	Officer Response
ST41-Delivering Quality, Accessible Open Space			
1190067	Resident	This proposal will reduce access for allotment holders. Policy 21 is at odds with ST41; Site HS7 is a quality space used well and productively within walking distance of residents.	Due to further research and consultation responses, the Leafield Allotment site has been removed from the draft Bassetlaw Local Plan and is not included anymore.
1193104	Resident	Designating Sandhills as a Local Green space will contribute to this	Thank you for your response. Sandhills has been removed as an allocation site from the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan.
REF187	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	The representation chose to support and is in favour of delivering quality open space.	Thank you for filling out the yes and no questions on the feedback form.
1197036	Woodland Trust	We support the use of access standards to determine need for additional greenspace of various kinds. We would like you to consider using the Woodland Trust's Access to Woodland Standard: this aspires that everyone should have a small wood of two hectares within 500m of their home and a larger wood of at least 20ha within 4km.	Our standards have been set up based on quantitative data collected by Officers. You can view all surveyed sites in the Bassetlaw Open Space Assessment 2020. Unfortunately, available community woodland sites have not been assessed separately in this report. They have been included in the Semi/Natural classification. As many strategic sites are requiring a provision of community woodland, this could be something that is changed in the update report to 2020 assessment. Please see policy amended as requested. ST35 also makes reference to green infrastructure provision and expected standards.
REF300	Natural England	Access to open green space is supported by Natural England. We refer to our own Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards which may be of interest. http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/65021	Support noted and welcome, thank you for your comments. Please refer to the Bassetlaw Open Space Assessment 2020 for our assessment methodology which is in line with Natural England guidelines.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	Officer Response
ST41-Delivering	Quality,	Accessible Open Space	
REF486	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>Tennis in Bassetlaw</p> <p>I was surprised to see a specific reference in this high-level strategic plan to North Wheatley's tennis club and its need to expand. I wish the club well – as an ex member, but, it seems odd to mention them, as, with the exception of the Welbeck Club, there is an absence of the same in Worksop, Harworth and the surrounding areas.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments please see ammended changes. As part of the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan evidence base, currently a Built Facilities Study is taking place to assess exact provision of sport facilities and usage within the District. The findings of the study will inform any future policy decisions and requirements for expansion of facilities/provision.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST42- Promoting	Sport and Physical	Activity	
REF004	Rhubarb Farm	Rhubarb Farm also requires protection within ST42: Promoting Sport and Physical Activity	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF047	Sports England	Sport England supports section 9.4 in particular policy ST42 however should the hierarchy reflect the priorities in the action plan of the PPS?	Noted, thank you for your comments.
REF047	Sport England	Para 9.4.9. Ensure that Active Design is considered as part of the development process.	Use of Active Design in the development process is essential to promote healthy place-making. Active Design is therefore referenced in Policy ST39. It would also be appropriate to make reference in Policy ST32: Design Quality.
REF282	National Trust	The adopted Core Strategy Policy DM9 Part D includes similar provisions in relation to sports pitch protection, but provides the flexibility that exceptions may be made if a contribution towards new or improved facilities elsewhere would be preferable. We request that this flexibility is incorporated into new Local Plan Policy ST42.	The Core Strategy Policy DM9 Part D includes similar provisions in relation to sports pitch protection, but provides the flexibility that exceptions may be made if a contribution towards new or improved facilities elsewhere would be preferable. We request that this flexibility is incorporated into new Local Plan Policy ST42.
REF331	Worksop College (C/O Teakwood Partners)	<p>The Policy acknowledges that new outdoor sports facilities to help achieve the target set out in the Bassetlaw Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS) 2019 will be provided according to a hierarchy, including school, college and sports clubs' sites. In assessing the need for a new athletics track, the PPS states 'there is a case for the improvement of quality of provision in order to increase the capacity available for Workshop Harriers'. The PPS notes that Worksop Harriers have aspirations to create a floodlit synthetic track and accompanying ancillary facilities within BDC. The PPS makes some recommendations, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exploring the case for the potential development of a synthetic track facility within the District. • Support Worksop Harriers with any plans to increase membership and community engagement. <p>Worksop Harriers are dedicated to providing a new synthetic 8 lane running track and athletics facility. As well as being in use by Worksop Harriers, the facility would be available to the local community and Worksop College. The provision of a new athletics facility at Worksop College will therefore meet the aims of the PPS, and thus Policy ST2. The principle of the policy is therefore supported, but as above, a more flexible policy approach is required elsewhere within the BLP to secure this aspiration.</p>	Worksop Harriers have aspirations to create a floodlit synthetic track and accompanying ancillary facilities within BDC (Ranby site of WC)
REF387	Resident	More provision for Retford and area for sports centre upgrade and promoting more sports areas within Retford.	Noted, thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST45-Climate Change Mitigation and Adaption			
1189264	Resident	If you wanted to address climate change you wouldn't be aiming to build a load of new houses, regardless of how supposedly sustainable they are. Neither would you trying to increase the volume of traffic in the area.	The Local Plan has to provide a balance in delivering more homes and jobs, whilst also protecting and enhancing the environment of the District. The Local Plan also encourages the use of renewable energy, encourages public transport, tree planting and protects local wildlife.
1189633	Resident	I do not think it is possible to agree to this crucial aim and support your housing allocation plan. They are in direct conflict.	The Local Plan has to provide a balance in delivering more homes and jobs, whilst also protecting and enhancing the environment of the District. The Local Plan also encourages the use of renewable energy, encourages public transport, tree planting and protects local wildlife.
1189633	Resident	You appear to have a policy in place which does not make sense. In ST45 you state that you need to develop housing in: -locations which minimise the need to travel and maximise the ability to make trips by sustainable modes of transport. -You want to see higher densities of development in the most accessible sites. This does not match with policy ST2, which recommends adding 20% to the housing stock in rural settlements. As a resident of one of these settlements, and a committed environmentalist, confirm that it is impossible to commute from the village in a non wet/muddy way unless you have a private vehicle. Our public transport provision is not fit for purpose. It is also incorrect to assume that just providing EV points for new housing will solve this issue. We all know the total number of private car journeys needs to reduce, even if they are made by EV, and also that the majority of people are unable to afford EVs. I am worried that this lack of alignment between ST2 and ST45 is an indication that BDC are just paying lip service to our current climate and biodiversity emergencies. Your policy regarding offsetting development by tree planting also demonstrates a woeful misunderstanding of the value of established ecosystems. Please reconsider - you should be placing housing in towns, whether these be in existing location or new town developments - not adding to our climate issues by placing housing in completely unsuitable areas. Whilst I support any effort to improve in this area, in my opinion you need to revisit this area of the plan. Your proposals are weak and unambitious and fail to reflect the severity of the situation in which we find ourselves.	The majority of housing growth is being allocated to the main settlements where there is the supporting services and facilities. However, Bassetlaw is a largely rural District and many of our communities are small and have few services. In some of these locations there is a need for accommodation and employment and the Local Plan is providing a strategy that will support a proportionate level of growth subject to its size and level of existing services. Communities across the District are also developing Neighbourhood Plans to manage their growth in a way that will benefit them. The Local Plan also supports the Government's climate change agenda by promoting sites for renewable energy development, protects the environment such as those areas around existing towns, protects public spaces, encourages tree planting and promotes the use of sustainable construction and renewable energy technologies on new developments.
REF005	Rhubarb Farm	In addition, Rhubarb Farm is playing a small part in addressing climate change, as per Section 10.1: Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation: The Farm's current composting toilet (funded jointly by Nottinghamshire County Council and Four Winds Energy Co-operative) saves approx 86,000 litres of water a year, based on Farm users, staff and visitors), so is making a small contribution to climate change measures. For all the above reasons, Rhubarb Farm wishes to ask the Planning Authority to give cognisance to the value of the work of Rhubarb Farm at Nether Langwith, and ensure that our work is supported and enabled in the future through the work of the Planning Authority.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST45-Climate	Change Mitigation and Adaption		
REF043 (INCLUDES PDF)	Director, Advance Further Energy Ltd	<p>In general, I would say that the aims of the plan are commendable, but I strongly feel that small changes are needed to the plan to maximise the chances of achieving the environmental and economic aims. I also think that The Council could use its powers to better effect to achieve the aims. The response outlined in this document is intended to provide changes which I hope would help The Council to (a) achieve the aims set out above (b) do so in a way which sets a leading example to other districts in Nottinghamshire and across the UK and (c) utilise mechanisms available to The Council to affect change. Specific recommendations with respect to the plan are outlined below. You may wish to incorporate these into existing or new policy measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The plan has a focus on new housing developments and on the sustainability of those projects. That is commendable given the significant embedded carbon emissions associated with new homes. However, given the large existing housing stock in Bassetlaw, and the long term emission reductions possible within these properties, it would be beneficial to residents to see measures to reduce carbon and improve the environmental performance of existing homes. Measures to do so may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Expanding green village proposals to encourage tree planting within existing communities in Bassetlaw. Education programmes surrounding retrofitting to improve insulation in existing properties – a measure which has significant impact on carbon emissions due to the high use of gas and oil for heating in the district as well as impacts on energy poverty in social and non-social housing stocks. o Incorporating tree planting schemes in residential areas which will improve the amenity of existing communities, offset carbon emissions and provide an opportunity for residents and businesses to help steer tree planting in Bassetlaw. - The UK Committee on Climate Change has stated clearly that new homes need to meet highest standards today in order to meet carbon targets. Without achieving the highest standards today, homes will need to be retrofitted at great cost to councils AND residents. I would also highlight how the building of a new home is the most economic time to implement standards and to minimise carbon emissions from first occupancy. The plan does not enforce the highest standards on new developments. As such, I would want to broaden the remit of planning to ensure homes are only built where they achieve the highest energy standards and that the council utilise the new (as of January 2020) national standard for solar generation and energy storage on new homes – which I helped to draft - There is growing interest in low carbon energy and decarbonisation which includes new technology, new business and new research. This presents an opportunity for Bassetlaw and the Local Plan – especially when we consider that through power stations and mining that we are historically an energy based economy. As such, I would recommend the following to attract and grow these activities within the District o Specific planning areas within the district allocated to businesses associated with sustainability. This should not just be limited to electricity generation with a policy remit extended to low carbon heat and transport. It may also extend to the manufacture products associated with sustainability. I note that a significant proportion of Bassetlaw jobs are in the manufacturing sector and as such, we should be encouraging further manufacturing which takes advantage of local skills and of wider sustainability opportunities. o The creation of a low carbon energy manufacturing park on the former power station sites/expansion of the existing zoning to encourage manufacturing. To achieve low carbon generation, enforce solar generation on all roofs, rather than allocating land parcels for exclusive use of solar assets. Zone D is reserved for solar generation assets here which at best could power around 20,000 homes. I would highlight that the closure of Cottam and High Marnham has resulted in the loss of electricity generation which could power around 7 million homes. Expanding Zone B to encompass a larger area of zone D could achieve the same aim and: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have a much larger impact on international decarbonisation through creating low carbon products- Link to wider investments such as manufacturing of batteries which are key strategic areas for the UK economy and electric vehicle sectors - Take advantage of strong electricity grid infrastructure existing on site which are necessary for manufacturing and often a high cost burden on developers - Incorporate low carbon energy generation (such as rooftop solar) as outlined in the policy i.e. achieving a similar electricity generation and gain multiple uses from the land. - Create jobs and wealth in the area which align to how the Bassetlaw economy is structured. - Potentially attract outside impact/environmental funding to support developments. 	<p>The Local Plan is providing a balance between the need for development and the protection of the environment. In addition, the plan has to be deliverable in terms of what the policies are intending to deliver. Although the Plan is providing a strong emphasis on renewable energy and low carbon technology it also needs to be mindful about the added costs to development in an area that traditionally has low viability rates. The environment is a key objective in the Local Plan and the Council believes proposed environmental policies strike the most appropriate balance in protecting and enhancing the natural environment, promoting sustainable development and enabling development to occur in the most efficient, clean and sustainable way. The Local Plan is also promoting biodiversity net gain through the creation of new community woodlands and allocating a large former power station site for the energy and low carbon technology sectors to promote clean energy and provide a step change within the low economy. This will be detailed in a Local Development Order for the site in close consultation with key stakeholders and education settings.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST45-Climate	Change Mitigation and Adaption		
REF043	Director, Advance Further Energy Ltd	<p>There is no direct comment relating to measures to extract energy from sewage treatment works in the District. I note that these have a carbon benefit through reduced methane production and also through producing low carbon electricity which can be dispatched when the grid needs it. I note that 10.2.9 states energy from waste is a county matter. However, I would question whether local planning mechanisms can be used to encourage energy from waste and encourage them to do so if possible. I would encourage how the local plan can facilitate or encourage energy from waste within the District in support of low carbon energy generation, low carbon heat or sustainability objectives.</p> <p>Seven Trent water already promote this and tangible projects in our district could impact our decarbonisation/sustainability</p>	This is a commercial activity and will be down to the individual water authority to consider.
REF043	Director, Advance Further Energy Ltd	<p>Policy ST45 does encourage tree planting and mentions the Sherwood Forest Reforestation Project. However, the tree planting remit could be expanded to improve tree cover within other areas – specifically in urban areas – with benefits such as: - Improved air quality - Improved environments for residents - Better visual environment - Designation of Bassettlaw as a “Forest District” - More scope for finding areas for tree planting if areas cannot be found in the existing replanting scheme - Links to other schemes such as Tree planting with the Mayflower Pilgrim commemorations. Although air quality is mentioned, there are limited air quality monitoring stations online such as DEFRA online map3 Installation of air quality monitoring in urban areas to permit reporting and evidence based assessment of air quality in The District. Key areas include: - Traffic junctions where there is extensive idling of engines - Outside schools and areas where air quality has disproportionate impacts on children. - Areas where air quality should be high such as in parks and conservation areas. The District should seek these through EA and DEFRA programmes</p>	The Local Plan is striving for better design of new developments which should include appropriate levels of open space and other methods to help our urban areas adapt to the threat and challenges of climate change. This includes improving air quality through the use of more sustainable materials, renewable energy technology and tree planting.
REF043	Director, Advance Further Energy Ltd	<p>Although the plan places a minimum number of EV charging, it could extend further by specifying the types or rate of charging. The policy risks allowing developers to install slow charge units which would: - Potentially not encourage EV ownership as they do little more than a standard 3 pin plug - Expose the district to significant retrofitting costs to improve charging rates and infrastructure I would specifically expect ST45 to include either: - Minimum charging rates for EVs in alignment with national standards. Specifically, I would recommend “Fast Chargers” which can fully charge in 3-4 hours and are most common across the UK. - Require 3 phase as opposed to single phase connections at all new dwellings. This is commonplace in Europe and recently recommended by Western Power Distribution/Renewable Energy Association in response to EV5s.</p>	The Local Plan is supporting the Government's agenda to be a zero carbon economy by 2050. However, the plan period is until 2037 and the measures included in the plan provide the necessary step-change and framework for the district to adapt appropriately towards a low carbon economy with the aim to meet the Government's 2050 target.
REF043	Director, Advance Further Energy Ltd	<p>10.2.1 This statement does not reflect the latest Net Zero target from Government Update this statement to include the latest “net zero carbon” objectives. 10.2.5 It is not correct that wind/solar need to be located close to the source of power. This statement is actually quite misleading. Perhaps you mean “close to the source of consumption”? Regardless, the advantage of wind/solar is that they generate electricity which can be transmitted over the electricity network to a point of consumption. It is possible and viable to wheel electricity over the power network and there are numerous examples where this is commercially viable. As such, proximity is not necessarily a technical or indeed commercial advantage.</p>	Thank you for your comment. Amendments have been made to the supporting text.
1191455	Resident	<p>Given the need to reduce carbon emissions, the Local Plan should mandate that all dwellings in new developments in the Plan should be carbon neutral and be built with solar panels & heat exchangers (for cheaper than retrofitting them). Also all new dwellings should have electric car charging ports built in to encourage the move away from the internal combustion engine. Similarly, any commercial development should also have solar panels and at least 50% of the parking should have electric charging points</p>	A new development proposed will be subject to other environmental policies in the Local Plan. In addition, the Plan supports the use of sustainable construction materials and methods. The Plan also identifies a site for the location of renewable energy development to support the Government's aim for the UK to be a low carbon economy.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST45-Climate Change Mitigation and Adaption			
REF066	Resident	<p>These are mainly in respect of the 'innovative green agenda' of the plan. According to the UN IPCC the planet is facing catastrophic and irreversible climate and ecological breakdown unless drastic changes are made within the next 10 years and starting NOW. These changes need to be at an international, national and local level. It is in this context that your plans must be viewed and judged. Whilst it is positive that it speaks of green issues and infrastructure, I feel strongly that it needs much more ambition, urgency, commitment, and creative detail in responding to the greatest crisis that mankind has ever faced! The plan repeatedly mentions the phrase 'low carbon' in respect of development (e.g. 4.1.5, 4.1.10, 4.2.12, 7.10.10) but surely we should be aiming for carbon neutral. The heating of homes is one of the biggest contributors to climate breakdown, so all future developments need to be as highly insulated and energy efficient as possible. Finally, whilst it is good to hear about the securing of new community woodlands, billions of trees will need to be planted nationwide to help offset carbon emissions, and it would be great to hear the details of ambitious local targets and sites that can make a really significant contribution to this.</p>	The Local Plan is supporting the Government's agenda to be a zero carbon economy by 2050. However, the plan period is until 2037 and the measures included in the plan provide the necessary step-change and framework for the district to adapt appropriately towards a low carbon economy with the aim to meet the Government's 2050 target.
REF066	Resident	<p>Section 10.2.3 speaks positively of the old power station sites' providing significant potential for renewable energy. However this is then undermined by talk of low carbon production and the need to balance this with the impact on landscape and ecology (10.2.5). More worryingly 10.2.2. talks of the Government block on onshore wind generation unless in an area suitable. There is no mention of any such areas and yet Bassetlaw is full of potential sites. If we are to stand any chance of avoiding catastrophic climate breakdown then there needs to be a massive increase in renewables and onshore wind is the most cost effective. Old power station and pit sites e.g. Bevercotes and Bircotes would seem ideal. I regularly pass the large turbines on the old Bilstonpit site and they are quiet and not unpleasant to look at. They are much less intrusive than the original power stations and mines. If we do not grasp these opportunities now then the science tells us that future generation will pay a terrible price. The impact on communities will be far, far greater than that of wind turbines and solar panels!!</p>	National Policy on onshore wind has changed over time. There are constraints on existing power station sites for large scale wind turbines such as the existing electricity grid and cables. High Marnham is being promoted for the energy and low carbon technology sectors and more detail will be provided through the development of a Local Development Order for the site.
1193104	Resident	<p>In addition to the 5 trees you intend to plant for each new house there are already 100 plus oak saplings thriving on the Sandhills plus other quicker growing natives like birch and elder. You already have a quick win towards your aspirations in this area. With most of the householders in Ordsall paving and tarmacacing their front gardens the Sandhills as it stands with its young forest will help to mitigate this, both as somewhere for the water to go and the flora and arbour to soak it up</p>	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF118	Lound Parish Council	<p>Many of the small rural areas identified in the Bassetlaw Spatial Assessment Background Assessment paper are listed as being without a 'Doctors' or a 'Shop' and will be wholly reliant on private transport to facilitate everyday necessities including employment. This is in direct conflict with ST45 1a and 1c: In addition, many of the Small Rural villages have recently experienced extreme weather conditions, some of which may be attributable to climate change. On many occasions, this has resulted in the temporary loss of public transport, resulting in isolation for some demographic groups for days, with no access to hospitals, groceries/convenience stores or physical social networks. As the Draft Local Plan covers a period of 20 years these considerations should be factored into the Plan especially in those areas that are susceptible to such conditions. ST45 Climate Change Mitigation and Adaption, does little to enforce its recommendations. The policy is a list of recommendations or encouragements that developers are likely to disregard due to their own cost implications. This policy should clearly define standards and requirements that must be met without exception and in conjunction with other policies. All planning proposals should clearly demonstrate that sustainability and climate change have been clearly addressed and all such issues mitigated to ensure that these problems are not compounded for future generations in SRS' thus leaving some residents without the means to support everyday requirements.</p>	A new development proposed will be subject to other environmental policies in the Local Plan. In addition, the Plan supports the use of sustainable construction materials and methods. The Plan also identifies a site for the location of renewable energy development to support the Government's aim for the UK to be a low carbon economy.
1195911	Asbury Planning Limited	<p>Criteria d) relating to providing electric vehicle parking in new residential schemes is too vague and the policy sub text does not set out what is expected within new residential developments in respect of domestic connections.</p>	The policy states that development need to provide the necessary infrastructure i.e. the provision of a capable socket or electricity point at the parking space/garage. It will then be

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST45-Climate Change Mitigation and Adaption			
			up to the householder to provide the electric point that can connect to the socket or electric provision provided.
REF198	Consultant	Policy ST45 page 145 The climate is something we can all do something, no matter how small, about. This policy, however, includes criteria that is not planning based including references to Building Control and also retrofitting of existing buildings. Laudable as these are, they are not planning issues. The promotion of carbon neutral development throughout the district would be greatly enhanced if there was a dedicated officer with the relevant qualifications that could engage in early discussions with applicants, agents and energy consultants so that the project has the correct starting basis.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF222	Notts CC - Public Health	It is recommended that the relevant policies mention the need to minimise risk of construction impacts on residents including dust, noise, vibration and odours. It is recommended that the Plan references to improve air quality rather than maintain air quality. As any improvement in air quality is positive for human health. It is recommended that the title of Policy ST45: Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation. be amended to include Improving Air Quality or Reducing Air Pollution whichever is relevant. In addition, that policy point 3h be amended. This is because air pollution and climate change are separate issues but with a similar primary cause – the burning of fossil fuels. For technical guidance see reference in the HIA included within appendix one.	A clearer reference for air quality and air pollution has been included within the revised text of the Policy. There remains reference to air quality in the supporting text to the policy.
1196560	Resident	Yet again, the proposed mega builds will have a damaging effect on the environment. Large new builds are not the way forward. This is already recognised in Europe. The proposed development at Cottam will have a substantial negative effect on wild life, on the existing community, on road use and the damaging effect from many extra cars being driven on small rural roads which are inadequate for them.	A new development proposed will be subject to other environmental policies in the Local Plan. In addition, the Plan support the use of sustainable construction materials and methods. The Plan also identifies a site for the location of renewable energy development to support the Governments aim for the UK to be a low carbon economy.
REF253	Fisher German	There is no evidence provided to justify the requirement for five trees per dwelling to be planted. The supporting text states that "The Council's Plan supports the Sherwood Forest Reforestation Project" however neither document discuss a requirement for five trees per dwelling to be planted. There is no justification for this policy requirement and as such it should be deleted. If evidence can be provided for a specified number of trees to be planted per dwelling, it is considered that an offsite contribution option should also be offered. This would ensure that the most efficient use of land is implemented on development sites and that tree planting across the District can be undertaken in a comprehensive and planned manner (similar to that of the National Forest).	Further supporting information is provided in relation to the various types of carbon off-setting schemes the local plan is encouraging. Tree planting is an important part of this and new developments should contribute physically towards climate change mitigation. Large scale developments will be expected to accommodate the trees on their sites, but there will also be the opportunity to contribute towards off-site new community woodlands.
REF255	Sheffield City Region	Importantly, the Draft Plan also set economic and housing ambitions within the broader challenge of climate change and the need to reduce carbon emissions as well as adapt to the effects of a changing climate. In November 2019 the MCA took the decision to declare a climate emergency. Since then we have undertaken work to develop our approach to responding to this and committed to reach 'net zero' carbon emissions by 2040. As such, I particularly welcome the Draft Plan's acknowledgement of these challenges and the ambition for Bassetlaw to transition to a low carbon district. In line with the MCAs commitment to net zero, I strongly support the development of renewable and decentralised and low carbon energy at High Marnham (Policy ST7) as well as the approach set out in Section 10 on Climate Change Mitigation and Adaption . I also note that the principles of low carbon design and energy efficiency are also reflected in other policies, particularly Policy ST32 on design, which is to be welcomed. Overall, it will be important for the Draft Plan to continue to develop these aspects so that it is in a position to reflect the net zero carbon commitment announced by Government.	Noted. Thank you for your comments.
REF270	Barton Willmore	Object to the imposition of a tighter Building Regulations standard for water consumption than required nationally. There is no evidence within the Local Plan to suggest that Bassetlaw experiences water management conditions that present challenges in excess of those experienced nationally and, therefore, what evidence there is for requiring that development goes beyond national standards.	Information and advice on water consumption and standards in relation to this policy have been provided by the water authorities.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST45-Climate	Change Mitigation and Adaption		
REF273	Anglian Water	<p>Policy ST45 refers to developments being required to minimise water consumption by meeting the optional requirement of 110 litres/per person/per day. Anglian Water and the Environment Advice has issued advice to local planning authorities (copy attached) stating that there is evidence to demonstrate a need for optional water efficiency standard to be applied in the Anglian Water supply area. As such we fully support the inclusion of this standard in the policy. The standard is intended to apply to residential development proposals rather than other types of developments. As such we would suggest the wording of Policy ST45 be amended for clarity as follows: ' 3. e) Promoting water efficiency.....by residential development proposals meeting the tighter Building Regulations optional requirement of 110 litres per person/per day/Opportunities for a more holistic and integrated approach to water management should form part of the plan, to encourage multi-functional water management assets which support other community objectives. This approach combines different elements of water management (e.g. combining SuDS with a water re-use system to both manage runoff and provide an alternative non-potable water supply) together with town planning and design (e.g. integrating the planted SuDS features throughout a development to contribute to 'greener' streetscapes). Fully support the reference made to development proposals incorporating water re-use measures wherever possible to reduce demand on existing water supply.</p>	<p>Noted. A change to part 3 of the policy has now been reflected in the revised Policy.</p>
1197036	Woodland Trust	<p>Strongly support the policies on tree planting in new development outlined in para2 of this policy. Setting targets in this way is an excellent means of securing developer contributions towards new tree planting, which will both absorb carbon and enable adaptation to climate change through shading in summer and flood alleviation in winter months. We also support the reference in the supporting text to creating new community woods as part of larger new housing development. We would like to see the policy improved by also mentioning the need to protect existing trees and woods, to preserve the climate benefits that they already deliver. Also, we would like to see the Council do an audit of its own land holding and those of partners to look for further opportunities for tree planting and woodland creation (eg in parks or on underused areas of open space).</p>	<p>Noted. Thank you fo your comment. The Council will produce a "green audit" where it will look at how the Council can become more low carbon and introduce additional renewable energy technology on its assets and explore the opportunities for new tree planting.</p>
REF282	National Trust	<p>National Trust supports Policy ST45 Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation. If Part 2 of the policy relates to onsite provision of 5 trees per dwelling and/or a contribution towards woodland planting elsewhere then it may be helpful if this was made explicit in the policy or supporting text.</p>	<p>Noted. Thank you for your comment. The policy does support off-site provision on the identified newly designated "community woodlands" identified across the District.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST45-Climate	Change Mitigation and Adaption		
REF285	Home Builders Federation	<p>Policy ST45 requires all new residential developments with off-road parking to ensure that infrastructure provided is capable of connection for electric vehicle charging. (This requirement is also repeated in Policy ST50 – Promoting Sustainable Transport). The HBF is supportive of encouragement for the use of electric and hybrid vehicles via a national standardised approach implemented through the Building Regulations to ensure a consistent approach to future proofing the housing stock. Recently the Department for Transport held (ended on 7th October 2019) a consultation on Electric Vehicle Charging in Residential & Non-Residential Buildings. This consultation set out the Government's preferred option to introduce a new functional requirement under Schedule 1 to the Building Regulations 2010, which is expected to come into force in the first half of 2020. The inclusion of EVCP requirements within the Building Regulations 2010 will introduce a standardised consistent approach to EVCP in new buildings across the country. The requirements proposed apply to car parking spaces in or adjacent to buildings and the intention is for there to be one charge point per dwelling rather than per parking space. It is proposed that EVCPs must be at least Mode 3 or equivalent with a minimum power rating output of 7kW (expected increases in battery sizes and technology developments may make charge points less than 7 kW obsolete for future car models, 7 kW is considered a sufficiently future-proofed standard for home charging) fitted with a universal socket to charge all types of electric vehicle currently on the market and meet relevant safety requirements. All charge points installed under the Building Regulations should be un-tethered and the location must comply with the Equality Act 2010 and the accessibility requirements set out in the Building Regulations Part M. The Government has estimated installation of such charging points add on an additional cost of approximately £976. The Council's viability evidence is set out in Bassetlaw Interim Whole Plan & Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Viability Assessment by NCS Nationwide CIL Services dated August 2018. This assessment excludes any costs associated with the provision of EVCPs. Before the pre-submission Local Plan consultation, the Council should undertake further viability work to fully test the cumulative impacts of all policy compliant requirements. The Government has also recognised the possible impact on housing supply, where the requirements are not technically feasible. The Government's consultation proposed introducing exemptions for such developments. The costs of installing the cables and the charge point hardware will vary considerably based on site-specific conditions in relation to the local grid. The introduction of EVCPs in new buildings will impact on the electricity demand from these buildings especially for multi-dwelling buildings. A requirement for large numbers of EVCPs will require a larger connection to the development and will introduce a power supply requirement, which may otherwise not be needed. The level of upgrade needed is dependent on the capacity available in the local network resulting in additional costs in relation to charge point instalment. The Government recognises that the cost of installing charge points will be higher in areas where significant electrical capacity reinforcements are needed. In certain cases, the need to install charge points could necessitate significant grid upgrades which will be costly for the developer. Some costs would also fall on the distribution network operator. Any potential negative impact on housing supply should be mitigated with an appropriate exemption from the charge point installation requirement based on the grid connection cost. The consultation proposes that the threshold for the exemption is set at £3,600. In the instances when this cost is exceptionally high, and likely to make developments unviable, it is the Government's view that the EVCP requirements should not apply and only the minimum Energy Performance of Buildings Directive requirements should be applied. The Council has not recognised the technical feasibility and viability impacts as identified by the Government. It is the HBF's opinion that the Council should not be getting ahead of Government proposals for Building Regulations. Before the pre-submission Local Plan consultation, the requirement for EVCPs should be deleted from Policies ST45 and ST50. Policy ST45 also requires new developments to minimise water consumption by meeting the Building Regulations optional requirement of 110 litres per person per day. If the Council wishes to adopt the optional standard for water efficiency of 110 litres per person per day then the Council should justify doing so by applying the criteria set out in the NPPG (ID 56-013-20150327 to 56-017-20150327). The Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) dated 25th March 2015 confirmed that "the optional</p>	Connection for residential and commercial electric vehicle standards are set out within the supporting documents to the Local Plan and are recommendations from Nottinghamshire County Council's residential and commercial parking standards.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST45-Climate	Change Mitigation and Adaption	<p>new national technical standards should only be required through any new Local Plan policies if they address a clearly evidenced need, and where their impact on viability has been considered, in accordance with the NPPG". The NPPG refers to "helping to use natural resources prudently ... to adopt proactive strategies to ... take full account of water supply and demand considerations ... whether a tighter water efficiency requirement for new homes is justified to help manage demand" however the Housing Standards Review was explicit that reduced water consumption was solely applicable to water stressed areas. The Council's own evidence states that areas in Bassetlaw covered by Severn Trent Water are not classed as water stressed. Bassetlaw District is only partially in the area covered by Anglian Water classed as an area of serious water stress. Under current Building Regulations, all new dwellings achieve a mandatory level of water efficiency of 125 litres per day per person, which is a higher standard than that achieved by much of the existing housing stock. This mandatory standard represents an effective demand management measure. Before the pre-submission Local Plan consultation, this requirement should be deleted from Policy ST45.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST45-Climate	Change Mitigation and Adaption		
1197091	William Davis	<p>Overall the aims of the policy are supported as they are consistent with national policy (NPPG paragraphs 148 and 149) as they support appropriate measures to ensure the future resilience of communities and support the transition to a low carbon future. As with other policies, consideration will need to be given to the potential impact on viability of higher policy requirements. Clarification is sought regarding Part 1d of the Policy as it is unclear exactly what would be required of developers. It is considered the use and implementation of Electric Vehicle Charging Points (EVCP) is complex as the notion is relatively new. As such, there are several differing charging sockets and no standardised format is currently available. Therefore, any charging point installed on a dwelling by a developer may not suit the purchaser's or end user's vehicle, or beyond this, even become obsolete as advancements within this field continue. As Government funding is available for homeowners to install EVCP within any given dwelling it is considered an appropriate option that enables choice for the end user for the developer to install a suitable feed and spur to the point of charging, allowing the homeowner to purchase the required EVCP socket. Moreover, it must be noted that until technology has suitably advanced EVCPs are not achievable on all dwellings.</p> <p>Homes with frontage parking would represent safety hazards should cables be fed from dwellings across car parking spaces. This is of particular concern when the dwelling built is to meet Part M4(2) or (3) standards. Therefore, until such time as a viable solution to this issue has been established any emerging Policy should allow for flexibility for developers to install EVCP "where suitable"; or alternatively the policy seek provision of a dedicated electric spur to be conveniently located for future EVCP provision by the occupier. In addition to this, the installation of charging point hardware will have implications on the local electricity network. Government recognises that the cost of installing EVCP will be higher in areas where significant capacity reinforcements are required. In certain areas grid upgrades may be required which will place viability burdens upon the developer. Any impacts these costs may have on housing supply should be mitigated through EVCP exemption so as not to affect the delivery of homes. The Department of Transport (DfT) undertook a consultation on EVCP (ending 7th October 2019.) This set out the Government's intentions to standardise EVCP within the building regulations. This is expected to come into force in 2020, therefore any Local Policy shift in advancement of this may immediately become out-dated and considered unfeasible or unviable. Therefore, in order to be effective and meet the test of soundness, it is proposed that part 1d of the Policy be amended to read "requiring that all new residential developments that are providing off-road parking ensure that a suitable feed and spur to an appropriate location for a charging point are provided". The requirement for five trees to be provided per dwelling is not supported. This requirement is considered to be overly rigid and not justified by the evidence. It is noted that the Council Plan aims to encourage tree planting and seek to rejuvenate the Sherwood Forest area although no specific project is referred to. It is unclear how this requirement will be delivered, join up with the requirement for biodiversity net gain or whether it will meet the tests for obligations. As such it is proposed that the wording of the Part 2 of the policy be amended to; "The provision of trees onsite will be supported where feasible and consistent with landscape character and context of the site. Where offsite net gains are being provided under the Government's biodiversity net gain scheme, support will be given to schemes which increase the number of trees and extant of woodland in Sherwood Forest." An SPD on biodiversity net gains, green infrastructure or design and landscaping could potentially be used to provide further guidance on tree planting.</p>	<p>Connection for residential and commercial electric vehicle standards are set out within the supporting documents to the Local Plan and are recommendations from Nottinghamshire County Council's residential and commercial parking standards.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST45-Climate	Change Mitigation and Adaption		
REF299 (LAA) Bevercotes	Gladmans	<p>Policy ST45(A) requires that all new residential developments that are providing off-road parking ensure infrastructure are capable of providing connection for electric vehicle charging. 5.6.2 Before requiring electric vehicle charging points in residential development through planning policies, the Council should engage with the main energy suppliers to determine the network capacity to accommodate any adverse impacts if all dwellings were to install a charging facility. If recharging demand became excessive, there may be constraints to increasing the electric loading in an area because of the limited size and capacity of existing cables, and new substation infrastructure may be necessary. Furthermore, such costs should be included in the Council's viability testing otherwise there may be an adverse impact on housing delivery.</p> <p>The requirement for all new residential developments to provide infrastructure capable of connection for electric vehicle charging is repeated in Policy ST50. The Framework is clear that policies should avoid unnecessary duplication¹¹ and in this regard the duplication of a policy requirement should be removed from the Plan. Policy ST45 also requires new developments to minimise water consumption by meeting the Building regulations optional requirement of 110 litres per day. Any such requirement should be justified having applied the criteria set out in the PPG¹².</p>	Noted. Thank you for your comments.
REF300 -	Natural England	<p>Natural England welcomes this policy and considers that it is a positive step to tackling climate change. Whilst we welcome the provision for planting 5 new trees per dwelling or 5 trees per 1000sq metres of non-residential we would emphasise that planting should result in the right trees in right places (as discussed above). Advise that other habitats e.g. wetlands, grassland and heathlands can also offer valuable sequestration. Tree planting must be carried out in a coordinated way to create valuable areas of woodland which should be part of the wider approach to the Nature Recovery Network. In addition you may want to consider areas which could be left to "re-wild" to allow natural regeneration of woodlands. Welcome section 3 of the policy wording which includes nature-based solutions to climate change.</p>	Agreed. We will continue to work with relevant partners to identify the best places and types of trees to support the local environment.
REF323	Emery Planning	<p>This Section of the Plan seeks to promote opportunities to improve energy efficiency and minimise CO₂ emissions. Policy ST45 seeks to secure the reduction of greenhouse gases in accordance with the provisions of the Climate Change Act 2008. Support the aims and objectives of this policy as well as, the recognition at Paragraph 10.2.3 of the significant potential for renewable energy and low carbon generation on site at High Marnham. This positive strategy, to be delivered through Policy ST46 (and ST7), supports the NPPF emphasis to promote energy from renewable and low carbon sources, with policies designed to maximise the development of low carbon energy. The Former High Marnham Power Station site provides an excellent opportunity to positively and actively meet the aims of this Section of the Plan with its accessibility to the national Grid connection and critically, potential for reuse of excess power, heat and hot water from J G Pears Low Marnham CHP. Again, this is supported at paragraph 151 of the NPPF which states Local Plans should "... identify opportunities for development to draw its energy supply from decentralised, renewable or low carbon energy supply systems and for collocating potential heat customers and suppliers." Pleased that this unique opportunity has been recognised and is being grasped by the LPA to realise the opportunity for sustainable reuse of this existing energy efficient site which already provides opportunities for decentralised energy.</p>	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF327	Scrooby Parish	<p>In Rural Villages the build / installation of equipment (Solar Panels, Wind Turbines, Water, Waste Water Treatments, etc.) should not be allowed to have a major detrimental effect on the nature and character of the village and its environs. Additionally, the efficient husbandry of the trees in and around rural settlements should not be blocked or mismanaged by any contra tree planning applications. Current</p>	Noted. Thank you for your comment.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST45-Climate Change Mitigation and Adaption			
		pruning and felling applications, all based on sound agricultural and wildlife reasoning, have been currently blocked or refused by the Tree Preservation Order procedures and rulings.	
1197287	Resident	It should be taken into account that each newhouse has a carbon footprint of up to 80 carbon tonnes.Instead of 5 trees per house a more realistic figure would be 50 bearing in mind that it takes many years for a tree to grow to a size to have a significant effect on carbon absorption. Once planted trees need to be properly maintained and monitored for five years.	The level of trees per property has also considered the viability of such an ask and the size of the land needed to accommodate the trees.
1197290	Resident	I support this policy. It could be more ambitious. We must improve insulation and efficiency in existing housing stock dramatically to meet the 2050 target. Focusing more on re-developing existing buildings would help with that.	Noted. Thank you for your comments.
REF428	Resident	Still allowing development on land that floods and increases risk to other homes as seen 'yet' again in the Grove Lane, Blackstope Lane, Braken Lane, Retford Beck situation.	Any new development proposed on land that is identified as being in a "flood zone" will need to justify why it needs to be developed in that location and what appropriate mitigation is required. This is identified within National Planning guidance and the revised flooding policies in the Local Plan.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST46- Renewable Energy Generation			
REF043	Director, Advance Further Energy Ltd	<p>10.1.4 The methods/regulations noted for assessing energy efficiency of buildings do not include standards specifically related to on-site generation and storage of electricity. The UK released a new standard for low carbon generation in February 2020 which outlines how to assess and safely install low carbon generation and storage. It should be noted that, when installed with a new build, solar electricity generation offers strong returns to home occupants, impacts energy poverty, has carbon savings (even when embedded carbon is considered), allows a home to supply power to the grid and allows a home to become increasingly electricity independent. Installing a new build removes key costs associated with sales, construction and roof access which can comprise more than 30% of the cost of solar. 1. Bassetlaw adopts MCS Standard 30121 to assess the benefits of low carbon energy generation on all new housing. This is to measure: a. Payback/ROI. b. Carbon saving. c. Energy poverty impacts. d. Energy independence.</p> <p>2. To enact this: a. All new homes are installed with solar generation which provides a minimum 50% electricity independence over the year against domestic electricity consumption. b. A developer must show how this meets minimum economic returns. Where they cannot meet this criteria, other developers are permitted to bid for the solar generation aspect of building where they can meet minimum economic hurdles. 3. Bassetlaw considers adopting the standard to perform an assessment of solar generation on existing homes and identifies price points where this makes economic sense to The Council.</p>	<p>The use of solar panels on dwellings or other structures will only be supported where they are appropriate to their setting i.e. character of the building and place. This is reflected in the revised Design policy.</p>
REF043	Director, Advance Further Energy Ltd	<p>The policy does not consider impact of renewable generation on energy poverty, energy independence or carbon saving. A new policy line is measured whereby:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o "renewable energy generation will be supported where it can be shown to have a demonstrable impact on local energy poverty/energy independence or an impact on national carbon savings" - To reflect that another beneficial measure of low carbon energy is on local consumption, line four should be changed to read: o "the proposal includes details of expected power generation based upon yield OR on local self-consumption of electricity"; - To encourage renewable energy on new housing; o "New developments will be supported where they include on site generation which provides a significant contribution to local energy needs – particularly through rooftop solar PV" 	<p>Noted. Thank you for your comments.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST46- Renewable Energy Generation			
1195350	Resident	At Marnham, (see p 56) you have identified an area shaded in blue (Development Zone C) for warehousing and open storage. The other side of the railway are properties in Fledborough, not shown on your map who will have full view of these and yet you say in this policy ST46 sect A this will not happen. A suggestion would be to put the solar panels you have earmarked for Development Zone D into this area and continue with the planting scheme at Higher Marnham. Also, at the time of writing this a large part of Development Zone C is under water.	The proposed allocation will now be managed through the development of a Local Development Order. This will enable more detail to be provided and it will set a legal framework for its delivery.
1197036	Woodland Trust	You could also mention in this policy the potential of sustainably grown and harvested wood used as a fuel to generate renewable energy.	Noted. Thank you for your comments.
REF282	National Trust	National Trust supports Policy ST46 Renewable Energy Generation.	Noted. Thank you for your comments.
REF327 -	Scrooby Parish	Good to see assessment is to be based on real yields and performances, not capacities which we all know are way above what you ever achieve. · However, large scale use of roof installed solar panels should not be allowed to detract the character of the rural settlement or its current buildings.	The use of solar panels on dwellings or other structures will only be supported where they are appropriate to their setting i.e. character of the building and place. This is reflected in the revised Design policy.
1197289	Resident	I support this policy. More of this would be great for Bassetlaw.	Noted. Thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST47-Flood Risk			
1177309	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Given recent flooding and the likelihood that this will continue to be a problem, I think there is a strong onus on the Council to look at all drainage-related activities across the district and ensure that drainage board coverage is adequate. This may not be the right mechanism to review this but I am conscious that some villages in the east of the district DON'T fall into an internal drainage board catchment area BUT will deliver more housing under the plan terms and ALREADY flood. All our drainage channels need proactive management in future, and we should be seeking to put relevant arrangements in place over the lifetime of this plan to enable this.	The Local Plan is supported by a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) that looks at the risk/threat of flooding across the District. The SFRA assesses how the potential growth, identified in the Local Plan, could affect, or be affected, by the risk of flooding. The Local Plan also includes a policy to manage flood risk across the District and development that is proposed in areas with a high-risk of flooding will also be subject to the legislation identified in the National Planning Policy Framework.
REF030	North Leverton Parish Council	There are several issues for the Parish of North Leverton and your proposed plan. Before any significant developments are allocated by BDC there should be proper consideration given as to how you propose to deal with the following significant risks that will only be made worse by the influx of more housing; The exiting foul & storm water drainage infrastructure is unable to cope with existing flows, especially during periods of prolonged heavy rain. Any increase in foul discharge or rainwater run-off from more hard paving/roof areas will only make a bad situation worse!	Any development within identified flood zones or is within an area of problematic surface water flooding will be subject to the existing and proposed national and local policy requirements of a sequential approach. Where schemes are acceptable, appropriate mitigation will be required and this will be agreed with the necessary flood authority.
1196060	Resident	Flood risk is it a good idea to build 1650 houses in zone 3 and zone 2? if it flood defenses are upgraded were will the displaced water go. up stream, down stream further inland putting the surrounding villages at risk.	Any development within identified flood zones or is within an area of problematic surface water flooding will be subject to the existing and proposed national and local policy requirements of a sequential approach. Where schemes are acceptable, appropriate mitigation will be required and this will be agreed with the necessary flood authority.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST47-Flood Risk			
REF198 (LAA)	Consultant	<p>Policy ST47 page 150 Much more work has to be done within this section. Once again it is the old policies trotted out that appear to view water as an enemy and run away from it rather than embracing it.</p> <p>Bassetlaw, Notts County Council and the Environment Agency have relevant technical officers and it should be incumbent upon this Council to ensure engagement by these 3 authorities with developers to look at innovative ways to address these issues. There should also be an event for authorities, other stakeholders and members of the general public to air their views in a way that may lead to some progress. History has a lot to teach us about flooding and how in the past it was contained and allowed and dealt with. It is incorrect to simply place the whole blame on development. There is a strong argument that agricultural practices in the last 10+ years have had an impact, in particular the increase in "no till" farming where the use of the plough has been reduced considerably.</p>	<p>Any development within identified flood zones or is within an area of problematic surface water flooding will be subject to the existing and proposed national and local policy requirements of a sequential approach. Where schemes are acceptable, appropriate mitigation will be required and this will be agreed with the necessary flood authority.</p>
REF201	Severn Trent	<p>Severn Trent are generally supportive of Policy ST47, in particular the inclusion of a statement to promote the use of SuDS, to manage surface water flows. As detailed above it is also key that surface water is directed to sustainable outfalls. Sewers are developed with a design capacity, this limited capacity can result in flooding where a storm exceeds the design criteria for the sewer. We therefore recommend that developers follow the drainage hierarchy, keeping flows out of the foul and combined sewers where possible.</p>	<p>Noted. Thank you for your comment.</p>
1196559	Resident	<p>All steps must be taken to avoid the risk of flooding from any new development by not permitting such development on land that has a flood risk.</p>	<p>Any development within identified flood zones or is within an area of problematic surface water flooding will be subject to the existing and proposed national and local policy requirements of a sequential approach. Where schemes are acceptable, appropriate mitigation will be required and this will be agreed with the necessary flood authority.</p>
1196560	Resident	<p>These proposals say one thing, but proposed developments say another. The site at Cottam is extremely close to the Trent and flooding area. It is also a contaminated site, and the gas station there will continue to operate for years ahead and new residents will be placed close to pylons and cabling, which may well affect their health. This risk has been recognised outside the UK and within it.</p>	<p>Any development within identified flood zones or is within an area of problematic surface water flooding will be subject to the existing and proposed national and local policy requirements of a sequential approach. Where schemes are acceptable, appropriate mitigation will be required and this will be agreed with the necessary flood authority.</p>
1196658	Resident	<p>our house was flooded in 2007 and had a narrow escape in November 2019 (porch and outbuildings only). The recent floods nationally indicate that not enough is being done with regard to new developments to reduce flood risks generally and we would be concerned that the plan pays insufficient attention to these issues;</p>	<p>Any development within identified flood zones or is within an area of problematic surface water flooding will be subject to the existing and proposed national and local policy requirements of a sequential approach. Where schemes are acceptable, appropriate mitigation will be required and this will be agreed with the necessary flood authority.</p>
REF258	Environment Agency	<p>We'd like to see the following text added to bullet point 2) under section A; 'where the exception test is not required, such as for change of use applications, the Flood Risk Assessment must still demonstrate that the development and future occupants will be safe from flood risk without increasing flood risk elsewhere'. We'd also recommend that you make an addition to part B, to state that 'in areas at risk of surface water flooding opportunities should be sought to reduce runoff rates to lower than greenfield rates'. Whilst we are mindful that responsibility for surface water management sits with the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), it's our opinion that this aspiration would help alleviate some of the existing surface water flooding problems in areas such as Retford and Worksop. If you have any questions about the comments made in our response please feel free to contact me using the details below.</p>	<p>Agreed. Thank you for your comment.</p>
1196860	Sheffield City Council	In particular policy ST47 is supported.	<p>Noted. Thank you for your comment</p>
1196914	Resident	with recent flooding flood risk and mitigation should be top priority	<p>Noted. Thank you for your comment</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST47-Flood Risk			
REF270 (LAA)	Barton Willmore	<p>We support the requirement of the above policy for an appropriate Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) where necessary.</p> <p>4.14 We object to the requirement at Part B for SUDs unless there is clear evidence that would be inappropriate. We consider that there should be a requirement only to provide a betterment in surface water run-off rates at development Sites. The Local Plan should not seek to dictate how that will best be achieved through a Drainage Strategy.</p>	The Council will be led by the advice and the requirements as identified by the appropriate flood authority and other water and drainage organisations.
REF273	Anglian Water	Anglian Water is generally supportive of the requirements of Policy ST47	Noted. Thank you for your comment
1197036	Woodland Trust	<p>We welcome the reference in part B of this policy to the role which green infrastructure can play in helping alleviate surface water flooding. You could mention that there is strong evidence to show that trees are particularly good at this: research at Manchester University showed a reduction of up to 60% in run off of rain onto hard surfaces where trees are present. It is believed that trees intercept rainfall and trap water temporarily in the tree canopy, thus slowing the speed at which the water reaches the ground and hence reducing the likelihood that drains will be overwhelmed. Trees planted upstream in appropriate locations can also slow down the rate of fluvial flooding (from rivers).</p>	The Council will be led by the advice and the requirements as identified by the appropriate flood authority and other water and drainage organisations.
REF282	National Trust	While National Trust generally supports Policy ST47 we feel that it could be more aspirational in promoting rural and urban land uses and developments (not just major developments) that will help to reduce flood risk in vulnerable areas such as towns and cities.	Any development within identified flood zones or is within an area of problematic surface water flooding will be subject to the existing and proposed national and local policy requirements of a sequential approach. Where schemes are acceptable, appropriate mitigation will be required and this will be agreed with the necessary flood authority.
REF300	Natural England	We welcome the inclusion of B6 regarding Sustainable Urban Drainage schemes resulting in biodiversity net gain.	Noted. Thank you for your comment

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST48-Protecting Water Quality			
REF201	Severn Trent	Severn Trent are generally supportive of the principles behind policy ST48. Especially the protection of ground water which has a significant impact on the water resource availability within Nottinghamshire. We are also supportive of the approach of water re-use, minimising consumption. See example wording and comments within our Protecting Groundwater Section of the response.	Thank you for your comments
REF273	Anglian Water	Anglian Water is generally supportive of the requirements of Policy ST48 in relation to safeguarding potable water sources from the potential risk of pollution arising from new development proposals. We also fully support the reference made to development proposals incorporating water re-use measures wherever possible to reduce demand on existing water supply.	Thank you for your comments
REF282	National Trust	National Trust supports Policy ST48 Water Quality.	Thank you for your comments
REF300	Natural England	Natural England welcomes this policy.	Thank you for your comments

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST49-Transport Infrastructure			
1180212	Resident	<p>At the moment it appears (I might be wrong) that attention to the development of adequate roads, public transport, town centre shops, schools and other public goods follow population and very significant housing growth. It seems to me that these public goods are required before significant housing development are begun. I therefore think it is very important for the Council to demonstrate to residents that required improvements are being addressed before intrusive housing developments begin. In Retofrd, for example, it would make sense to begin the North Road development as or after transport and all the other developments also begin to improve. As North Road provides many houses, it makes sense to allow that site to develop and not to build more houses in the town until adequate infrastructure is in place. At the moment I think it is very likely that many residents see housing development but no new employment, improvement to roads or transport or shops in the town centre.</p>	<p>When planning for new development, it is important that there is an understanding of the capacity of existing transport infrastructure and what impact, if any, new development will have. Bassetlaw District Council commissioned a series of Transport Assessments either at a District or local level to assess the impacts to transport infrastructure from the proposed growth in the emerging Local Plan. These are available on the Council's website. Where there are impacts, proposed mitigation is recommended. The proposed mitigation is then costed and forms part of a requirement to the affected site or strategic policy. This will enable new transport infrastructure to be delivered alongside the development identified in the Local Plan and contributing towards the delivery of sustainable development across the District.</p>
REF030	North Leverton Parish Council	<p>There is a recognised risk of traffic accidents/incidents at the village crossroads. A petition is to be presented to NCC in the very near future asking for them to review the situation and provide a safer junction for both road users and in particular for children going to and from school. Until this situation is resolved BDC should acknowledge the current risk and the increased risk as a consequence of increased housing both in the village of North Leverton and indeed surrounding villages.</p>	<p>When planning for new development, it is important that there is an understanding of the capacity of existing transport infrastructure and what impact, if any, new development will have. Bassetlaw District Council commissioned a series of Transport Assessments either at a District or local level to assess the impacts to transport infrastructure from the proposed growth in the emerging Local Plan. These are available on the Council's website. Where there are impacts, proposed mitigation is recommended. The proposed mitigation is then costed and forms part of a requirement to the affected site or strategic policy. This will enable new transport infrastructure to be delivered alongside the development identified in the Local Plan and contributing towards the delivery of sustainable development across the District.</p>
REF198 (LAA)	Resident	<p>Policy ST49 page 155 This section deals solely with projects for highway improvements. It does nothing to suggest there may be better forms of transport. It should because the next policy is all about sustainable transport. These 2 policies should be intertwined.</p>	<p>This should read in connection with other policies and evidence that forms the Local Plan.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST49-Transport	Infrastructure		
1196559	Resident	<p>None of the proposals give concrete evidence of what Road Improvements are to be made, or indeed insisted upon by the developers. All to often it seems that the resultant works are inadequate and Developers are not taken to task or controlled to ensure that sufficient heed is paid to local residents concerns over increased traffic on already inadequate roadways in a very poor state of disrepair.</p>	<p>When planning for new development, it is important that there is an understanding of the capacity of existing transport infrastructure and what impact, if any, new development will have. Bassetlaw District Council commissioned a series of Transport Assessments either at a District or local level to assess the impacts to transport infrastructure from the proposed growth in the emerging Local Plan. These are available on the Councils website. Where there are impacts, proposed mitigation is recommended. The proposed mitigation is then costed and forms part of a requirement to the affected site or strategic policy. This will enable to new transport infrastructure to be delivered alongside the development identified in the Local Plan and contributing towards the delivery of sustainable development across the District.</p>
REF282	National Trust	<p>National Trust has significant concerns about the scope and scale of proposed transport upgrades along the A57 corridor. These have potential not only for significant disruption associated with road works in the medium-long term, but also a major change in the character of the surrounding area as a result of the cumulative impact of major development, transport upgrades, traffic increased, congestion and pollution.</p>	<p>The A57 is constrained and the Council is working with Highways England and Nottinghamshire Council Council on an A57 Improvement Plan which will detail how this stretch of road can be improved in the future.</p>
1197223	Resident	<p>The link road from the A60 to the B6045 would dramatically increase vehicle traffic on already congested roads. The construction of a new road will undermine the councils stated commitment to woodland coverage with the associated significant benefits in terms of biodiversity and air quality.</p>	<p>When planning for new development, it is important that there is an understanding of the capacity of existing transport infrastructure and what impact, if any, new development will have. Bassetlaw District Council commissioned a series of Transport Assessments either at a District or local level to assess the impacts to transport infrastructure from the proposed growth in the emerging Local Plan. These are available on the Councils website. Where there are impacts, proposed mitigation is recommended. The proposed mitigation is then costed and forms part of a requirement to the affected site or strategic policy. This will enable to new transport infrastructure to be delivered alongside the development identified in the Local Plan and contributing towards the delivery of sustainable development across the District.</p>
REF327	Scrooby Parish	<p>Sections 11.1 and 11.2 Providing Transport Infrastructure to Promote Growth and Sustainable These sections need a reference to the extremely limited provision of public transport to and from rural locations, including a zero service at the weekend. The arbitrary nominal requirement to increase housing in the rural settlements without the commensurate public transport will only serve to drive the increased use of private, personal, vehicles, electric or not.</p>	<p>The Council promotes the use and improvement to public transport. The Council is working with transport providers to make sure the larger new development have the capacity to incorporate public transport services.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST49-Transport	Infrastructure		
REF333	Resident	<p>This submission OBJECTS to the draft LP's refusal to acknowledge the importance of the A631 and the relevance of links to South Yorkshire and Lincolnshire – other than in pictorial form at pg28. It must be demonstrated, in writing, with policies INCLUDING settlement hierarchy/allocations. This submission also contends that the Bassetlaw Local Plan will not be compliant with NPPF11 and the requirement to be "sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change", if new government directives reference electric cars are not acknowledged. Since the drafting of the subject document and the voting in of the new government, targets for the removal of all internally combusting engines have been brought forward to 2040, just three years after the lifespan of the proposed Local Plan. This is not "rapid change" and the draft Bassetlaw Local Plan must REFLECT the reality of sooner-than-anticipated electric car use through policies connected to settlement hierarchy and allocations. Limiting development in locations where electric car use will become the norm, is not credible.</p>	<p>When planning for new development, it is important that there is an understanding of the capacity of existing transport infrastructure and what impact, if any, new development will have. Bassetlaw District Council commissioned a series of Transport Assessments either at a District or local level to assess the impacts to transport infrastructure from the proposed growth in the emerging Local Plan. These are available on the Councils website. Where there are impacts, proposed mitigation is recommended. The proposed mitigation is then costed and forms part of a requirement to the affected site or strategic policy. This will enable to new transport infrastructure to be delivered alongside the development identified in the Local Plan and contributing towards the delivery of sustainable development across the District.</p>
1197287	Resident	<p>The provision of transport section is too focussed on extending road access. 10 out of 12 of the proposals are around increasing road use. This is not in line with plans to be carbon neutral by 2050, and indicates that the plan needs to be more focused on developing sites with existing or viable public transport systems.</p>	<p>The Council promotes the use and improvement to public transport. The Council is working with transport providers to make sure the larger new development have the capacity to incorporate public transport services.</p>
REF343	Gainsborough Town Council	<p>The principle comments related to transport and the need for the plan to address issues relating to congestion on The Flood Road. Members would also welcome proposals for an additional bridge over the Trent to reduce congestion and traffic problems on both sides of the River Trent.</p>	<p>When planning for new development, it is important that there is an understanding of the capacity of existing transport infrastructure and what impact, if any, new development will have. Bassetlaw District Council commissioned a series of Transport Assessments either at a District or local level to assess the impacts to transport infrastructure from the proposed growth in the emerging Local Plan. These are available on the Councils website. Where there are impacts, proposed mitigation is recommended. The proposed mitigation is then costed and forms part of a requirement to the affected site or strategic policy. This will enable to new transport infrastructure to be delivered alongside the development identified in the Local Plan and contributing towards the delivery of sustainable development across the District.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST49-Transport	Infrastructure		
REF346	Doncaster Council	<p>2. Growth at Harworth and the impact on the local highway network in Doncaster It is considered that that Policy ST49 – Transport Infrastructure should also include the required junction improvement/mitigation measures in Doncaster as well as Bassetlaw junctions listed. This would reflect the junctions listed in the White Young and Green Mitigation Strategy for Junctions. Para 8.4.1 of the Strategy states “This study identifies the nature and scale of highway improvements required at key junctions to mitigate the cumulative traffic effects of possible Local Plan development. It is beyond the scope of this study to identify all locations where improvements will be required and further assessment will be required as developments come forward through the planning process.” Para 8.4.3 states that, “The above mitigation measures (which include the Doncaster junctions) will assist in ensuring that existing transport infrastructure does not constrain plans for Local Plan development.”</p>	<p>When planning for new development, it is important that there is an understanding of the capacity of existing transport infrastructure and what impact, if any, new development will have. Bassetlaw District Council commissioned a series of Transport Assessments either at a District or local level to assess the impacts to transport infrastructure from the proposed growth in the emerging Local Plan. These are available on the Councils website. Where there are impacts, proposed mitigation is recommended. The proposed mitigation is then costed and forms part of a requirement to the affected site or strategic policy. This will enable to new transport infrastructure to be delivered alongside the development identified in the Local Plan and contributing towards the delivery of sustainable development across the District.</p>
REF346	Doncaster Council	<p>Paragraph 11.1.3 – Doncaster Council welcomes the commitment to work closely with neighbouring authorities to develop transport infrastructure to support delivery of the Local Plan. Paragraph 11.1.6 – Doncaster Council supports this paragraph which states that a Transport Assessment will be required to accompany a planning application. It further states that an Assessment should be agreed with the relevant authorities. Does this include neighbouring authorities? If so, it should be stated explicitly and should include Doncaster Council to reflect the duty to cooperate conversations and correspondence which have taken place regarding the Doncaster Local Plan. Paragraph 11.1.7 – this paragraph identifies a need to increase capacity along the A57 corridor. In light of the transport modelling results (undertaken by AMEC for the Bassetlaw Local Plan and part funded by Doncaster Council), this section (11.1) should also refer to A631 corridor.</p>	<p>When planning for new development, it is important that there is an understanding of the capacity of existing transport infrastructure and what impact, if any, new development will have. Bassetlaw District Council commissioned a series of Transport Assessments either at a District or local level to assess the impacts to transport infrastructure from the proposed growth in the emerging Local Plan. These are available on the Councils website. Where there are impacts, proposed mitigation is recommended. The proposed mitigation is then costed and forms part of a requirement to the affected site or strategic policy. This will enable to new transport infrastructure to be delivered alongside the development identified in the Local Plan and contributing towards the delivery of sustainable development across the District.</p>
REF347	NJL Consulting	<p>9.8 The overall ambitions of ST49 are supported where they improve access and accessibility in and around Bassetlaw. We also welcome the acceptance in ST49 that infrastructure delivery will require a co-ordinated approach which should not be left solely to individual developers. 9.9 As we outlined in the context of ST6, ST8 and SEM1, it is important that the policy does not place the full infrastructure burden on any one individual development as such an approach would be unreasonable and unviable. Similarly, development should not be unnecessarily held back through phasing if there is no infrastructure constraint. 9.10 ST49 should therefore be clear on these points.</p>	<p>Viability of new infrastructure for sites is factored into the deliverability of the Local Plan. In some cases infrastructure will require both private sector and public sector contributions where there is a benefit to the wider area and it secures the delivery of the scheme.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST49-Transport	Infrastructure		
REF361	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council and Notts CC	<p>The minor country roads serving the villages and Parishes throughout Bassetlaw but especially in the East were developed from horsetracks and agricultural traffic accesses. There is an abundance of dangerous corners and awkward junctions. A risk assessment has not been carried out as part of this draft plan, so the exact risk to the existing communities and proposed influxes has not been assessed. Just because it has not been tackled in this draft, does not mean the proposes of this scheme are not complicit in the deaths and injuries which follow. Over the years the proposal of the draft , and in particularly the 20% increase in planning permissions in rural areas with unsuitable dangerous roads, or at least more dangerous than the main road alternatives, could cause as many deaths on Bassetlaw roads as the Grenfell tower disaster. The injury and risk of death per mile and per person using these parish and rural minor roads is much greater than the A roads and other improved routes. Notts County Council is and has, spent considerable sums on road safety. The return per pound spent on reducing deaths and injuries, is so much greater on the Aroads where, for instance , many expensive speed monitoring camera schemes have been installed in the last few years. The cost to install these cash demanding schemes cannot be justified on the minor roads at present, even though many measures have been included by the CC on the minor roads , the safety cannot come near to the ideals aimed for on the busier A roads where more lives can be saved and accidents reduced per pound spent. Average speed cameras have been introduced on the Clarborough Bole road. The Markham Moor to Retford old Great North road. Retford to Barnby Moor and Grinley to Everton road. IT appears therefore that the Bassetlaw District Plan is ignoring safety to achieve building targets and jettisoning responsibility for the rural well being. If the populations proposed , and the industrial and commercial additions were restricted to the main towns and thus to the majority using improved main roads, many accidents, injuries and deaths could statistically and then into reality be prevented. The expensive technology improvements installed would then reap a double dividend, of existing users, and the influx expected to use the monitored and improved roads. Concentrate people on these monitored and improved roads, save lives.</p>	<p>When planning for new development, it is important that there is an understanding of the capacity of existing transport infrastructure and what impact, if any, new development will have. Bassetlaw District Council commissioned a series of Transport Assessments either at a District or local level to assess the impacts to transport infrastructure from the proposed growth in the emerging Local Plan. These are available on the Councils website. Where there are impacts, proposed mitigation is recommended. The proposed mitigation is then costed and forms part of a requirement to the affected site or strategic policy. This will enable new transport infrastructure to be delivered alongside the development identified in the Local Plan and contributing towards the delivery of sustainable development across the District.</p>
REF378		<p>I am concerned about bus services in town. Town is dead at 6pm. Some areas (Tiln lane) non extent. I am concerned about removal of allotments in Hallcroft and for people to use cars to travel to wherever you choose to send them. Retford travel by car in and around Retford in horrendous. Takes me sometimes 20 minutes to travel through town from one end to the other. I am also concerned where A1 traffic will be sent via Retford when there is an accident on the A1. Why are lorries sent via Tiln Lane to avoid low bridge before before Clarborough? Why not lower the road under the bridge? Tremendous long traffic on Tiln Lane via the local school. Some lorries would obviously fit under the bridge. I would like a better rail link to Nottingham, please.</p>	<p>The Council promotes the use and improvement to public transport. The Council is working with transport providers to make sure the larger new development have the capacity to incorporate public transport services.</p>
REF387	Resident	<p>Transport Infrastructure to be built upon for Retford Station and area behind station for repairs and infrastructure upgrade for main line with cross over of Sheffield/Lincoln line.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments</p>
REF401	East Markham Parish Council	<p>EMPC recognises the need for better transport infrastructure but would question BDC's ability to deliver. At the time of the plan, East Markham has plans for 59 houses in and around the Mark Lane / Beckland hill area with little evidence of any thought as to how to provide safe routes in and out of the village for residents.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST49-Transport Infrastructure			
REF428	Resident	<p>Why are you not considering and planning for improvements to help the flow of traffic in Retford? Improvements are necessary due to the large number of houses you have given permission to build in Retford. Rail Links More services are required on the main line. A service to Nottingham is needed from Retford. Policy ST49 Infrastructure Transport Why no planned improvements in Retford?</p>	<p>When planning for new development, it is important that there is an understanding of the capacity of existing transport infrastructure and what impact, if any, new development will have. Bassetlaw District Council commissioned a series of Transport Assessments either at a District or local level to assess the impacts to transport infrastructure from the proposed growth in the emerging Local Plan. These are available on the Councils website. Where there are impacts, proposed mitigation is recommended. The proposed mitigation is then costed and forms part of a requirement to the affected site or strategic policy. This will enable to new transport infrastructure to be delivered alongside the development identified in the Local Plan and contributing towards the delivery of sustainable development across the District.</p>
REF486	Councilor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>I welcome the extension to 'infrastructure' to include CCG needs. This is in keeping with the wishes of local people and now features much more frequently in objector's comments at Committee. Yet, it's unclear if this is an additional ask or whether it will be accommodated through cutting the cake slices even thinner. If it's the latter then I oppose that as the result will be to cut affordable housing funding.</p> <p>Five specific comments here:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed new rail station is a great idea and 'ask'. It will be a direct link to the proposed new station for the AMP in Sheffield – a 25 minute journey. 2. Cottam – If, as we expect, people look in Lincoln for work and leisure we could argue for a cycle way across the Trent. This would connect to the Lincoln –Gainsborough bus route and, for the hardy, Saxilby rail station. 3. Shireoaks station car park. There are about 1500 houses with permission within two miles of the station. Peaks Hill will bring another 750 and another 1000 due in Carlton and Langold. Making that station more attractive with a car park and in due course additional stopping trains would alleviate pressure in Worksop station and A57 traffic. 4. Rail connection in Harworth. The freight only line from Worksop to Doncaster via Dinnington, Maltby, Tickhill and Rossington could become a passenger service again. A Tickhill/Harworth parkway station would certainly gain the support of Doncaster and SCR ought to be interested in opening the other locations. 5. Traffic flows across Worksop. One benefit to the redevelopment of the current warehouse site on Canal Road is a reduction of heavy traffic in the vicinity. To that end should we have a policy that supports businesses to move to a 'better' location if it reduces traffic in an otherwise residential environment. If Peppers moved from Blyth Road that would reduce traffic along Thievesdale/Raymouth lanes and High Hoes road; if Flying Fridges moved from the centre of Shireoaks that would ease traffic in the village and over a busy level crossing. 	<p>When planning for new development, it is important that there is an understanding of the capacity of existing transport infrastructure and what impact, if any, new development will have. Bassetlaw District Council commissioned a series of Transport Assessments either at a District or local level to assess the impacts to transport infrastructure from the proposed growth in the emerging Local Plan. These are available on the Councils website. Where there are impacts, proposed mitigation is recommended. The proposed mitigation is then costed and forms part of a requirement to the affected site or strategic policy. This will enable to new transport infrastructure to be delivered alongside the development identified in the Local Plan and contributing towards the delivery of sustainable development across the District.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Sustainable Transport ST50-Promoting			
REF047	Sport England	Ensure that Active Design is considered as part of the development process. In addition Strategic Objectives 8 and 9 would be supported and implemented by the use of Active Design.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF136	A and D Architecture	12) Policy STSO should be modified to safeguard pedestrians against inappropriate cyclist speeds on shared networks by modifying the text of subsection B1 as follows "B 1 Measures to facilitate and encourage safe access by cycle and foot including measures to calm cycle speeds where these might otherwise endanger pedestrians"	The revised policy also includes a reference to "highway safety" which has also been raised by NCC.
1195060	Resident	Improved , affordable, frequent and well run public transport needs to be a key feature in any further housing development as key routes in and out of Retford are already under severe pressure and certain times in the day	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
1195216	Resident	Each new house built should have mandatory 2 off road car parking spaces	This will depend on how many bedrooms are proposed per dwellings as are the standards of Nottinghamshire County Council
1196005	Resident	Cycleways should, wherever possible, be provided in separate lanes to vehicular traffic in order to improve user safety and to encourage greater use of bicycles and e-bikes in and around Bassetlaw's urban areas. While there is obvious merit in providing recreational routes, a strong emphasis should be given to connecting residential areas to the town centre and areas of employment, along with connectivity between Worksop/Retford and their respective outlying settlements. The terrain in the district means that if the infrastructure is in place, cycling could be a far more viable mode of transport.	Noted. Thank you for your comment. Cycle and pedestrian infrastructure is an important contribution towards sustainable development. The Local Plan will support appropriate new cycle and pedestrian infrastructure within new development and linking to other areas such as town centres or regeneration sites.
REF198	Consultant	Policy ST50 page 157 With the exception of item 3, there is nothing other than lip service paid to the overwhelming issue/blight of the rural areas. That is the lack of a workable, sustainable and fit for purpose public transport system. There is no thought on how this can be achieved, just a hope that public transport enhancement can be achieved. As we all know, public transport is in the private sector and there is nothing developers can do about this. We live in a socialist led Council and have done for many years but there has never appeared to be the slightest hope that investment/subsidy by the Council, possibly Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist – February 2020 Page 7 partially through the ratepayers, could bring forward a public bus service that serves our rural areas as they need. With such a service in place the rural areas will once again begin to thrive and not become what they now are which is no go areas for younger couples/families who can only find work in the towns and outside the district. A well thought out local bus service using, wherever possible, buses that suit the route and occupancy levels would be a flagship for other areas and make rural living so much more affordable. It would open up the possibility of having better and larger employment opportunities district wide. It is for this Council to seize the initiative and promote rather than hope for such a system.	Bassetlaw is considered a rural District where 80% of it is open countryside. The level/options of public transport is limited and some communities have very few bus services. The Local Plan is supportive of improved public transport in the rural area and the redevelopment of large sites in this area will support the need/ viability for additional services being made or existing services being improved. The potential for a new train station in Bassetlaw is also of benefit as this could improve connectivity between the town and to neighboring places such as Sheffield.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Sustainable Transport			
REF222	Notts CC	A Rapid Health Impact Assessment (HIA) has been conducted using the Nottinghamshire Rapid Health Impact Assessment Matrix which is detailed in Appendix One. The HIA has highlighted 5 elements which will need to be considered as specific recommendations, these are outlined within the relevant section and again within appendix one. In relation to accessibility and active transport, it is recommended that the relevant polices set the requirement to ensure there are accessible buildings and places to enable access to people with mobility problems or a disability.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF272	NHS Bassetlaw CCG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In relation to transport we also appreciate the significant impact this can have to support people to remain active, in employment, promote community connectedness, support economic growth etc. We would encourage BDC to ensure there is extensive community transport links for all developments which are also compatible with environmental sustainability and limit air pollution. We would also encourage any new housing growth to be based on the concept of adaptability and fully incorporate the 'Internet of Things' so that all new housing offers flexible adaptation for residents as they transition throughout their life rather than creating additional demand for specialised housing in the future. 	The District Council has an active role in support community transport operations throughout the District. The Council also works closely with NCC and transport providers to make sure the services provided are the most effective and accessible to rural communities and those that need it.
REF281	Notts Campaign to Protect Rural England	We welcome this policy, especially "B. All developments of 10 or more dwellings and non residential development of 1000sqm or more floorspace, will be supported subject to the provision of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Measures to facilitate and encourage safe access by cycle and foot; - Protection of, connection to, and extension of where practicable, existing pedestrian, cycle and equestrian routes as part of a convenient, safe and attractive network for users; - Public transport enhancement where justified, including measures to encourage public transport use". The recognition in 3. that measures to encourage public transport use will (often) be needed is welcome. Rigorous assessments independent of applicants and developers will, however, be necessary to ensure that the "where justified" condition in 3. is not used as a reason not to provide public transport alternatives.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF283	Resident	ST50 156 11.2 Whilst recognising the need to prioritise walking and cycling infrastructure in the Main Towns and Large Rural Settlements, it omits potential links between them which could form components of longer-distance routes, eg. Retford – Sutton-cum-Lound; and Worksop – Carlton-in-Lindrick – Langold. The Context (3.19) has expanding the network as a priority.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
1197288	Resident	Developing a railway station at the Bassetlaw Garden Village is a brilliant plan. There must be careful thought given to make sure that train providers are incentivised to provide decent services to Bassetlaw stations. At the moment, for example there is an unworkable gap in trains between Doncaster and Retford at the end of the working day - no trains between 16.26 and 17.46. LNER say this is because they design schedules for cities like Doncaster, with millions of passengers, rather than the thousands from Retford. To make the Garden Village station work, train providers must be required to consider the needs of town commuters who need the trains to work. This is essential to this strategy working without increasing Bassetlaw's carbon debt.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF404	Resident	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Propose that the District Council presses for a continuation of the Robin Hood rail route (Worksop – Nottingham) as far as the growing town of Retford. Cycle routes in Retford cycle routes are not safe and have not been maintained or developed. Markings and covered tarmac defining the edges of roads as dedicated to cyclists peter out, have worn away, are 	The Local Plan supports the improvement to and creation of new sustainable transport modes over the plan period. The proposed new train station at the Garden Village provides sustainable transport infrastructure to accommodate and

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Sustainable Transport ST50-Promoting			
		<p>parked on and are unsafe and inadequate. There has been no action to extend any cycle routes to recent housing developments.</p> <p>3. Proposal to build a devastating development of zero energy housing we don't need any more devastating units that have been done for years. I propose that BDC takes a stand, shifts up a gear and insists that all new housing is built to zero energy efficiency we have ran out of time.</p> <p>4. No housing without infrastructure – radical upgrade of schools, public transport, cycles ways, public spaces, medical provision in advance of further population growth.</p>	<p>support the development of the site and reduce the traffic on the A1. It is important that the train station is delivered early on to encourage people to use the facility rather than their car. A new public transport hub will also be created to provide additional bus services to Retford and Worksop. The site, along with other large allocations will also need to provide green infrastructure and improved connectivity to other areas. This could be in the form of footpaths and cycleways.</p>
REF222	Councillor, Notts CC	<p>The plan does not incorporate any community safety policies and should reference issues such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan should prescribe the size of car park spaces which are large enough to use. • Car parking facilities should be designed to have CCTV installed in them as part of the design of a development. • Housing developments should be built with key safes and safes as part of the development process. 	<p>The size of car parking bays and their standard will be subject to the Nottinghamshire County Council parking standards and the advice from the Highways Department.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST51-Safeguarded Land			
1177432	Resident	The creation of a railway station in the new garden village is fully supported. Would make a significant difference to many people.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF222	Notts CC	Strategic Highways Can the policy include the need to safeguard links suitable for all traffic where a site abuts land likely to come forward for development or come forward for development in the future in order to safeguard connectivity.	Noted. A reference has been made to other forms of traffic i.e. cycle/footpaths.
REF484	North Notts and Lincs Community Rail Partnership	The existing, disused branch line from the South Yorkshire Joint Line and its former alignment along the edge of the industrial estate should be protected so that a future light rapid transit could connect the area with Doncaster.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST52 - Provision and Delivery of Infrastructure			
REF115	Canal and River Trust	<p>As explained previously, significant new developments in the vicinity of the canal network place extra liabilities and burdens upon the waterway infrastructure and it is therefore essential that appropriate contributions are secured from developers, where necessary, in order to mitigate the impact of new development on the Trust's assets. We welcome the account given in paragraph policy ST52 that developer contributions will be required to meet the infrastructure requirements of new development, which should account for the potential demands on the wider walking and cycling network in proximity to new development sites.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST52 - Provision and Delivery of Infrastructure			
REF116	Network Rail	<p>It is important that the policies within the Bassetlaw Local Plan reflect the aspirations of Network Rail and the wider rail industry as far as they are known at this stage, and that the plan provides suitable flexibility to support future growth of the railway for both passenger and freight services. The railway network is a vital element of the country's economy and a key component in the drive to deliver the Government's sustainable agenda. Passenger growth of 40% is predicted to 2030 and freight tonnage moved by rail is expected to double in the same period. In addition, Network Rail is a statutory undertaker responsible for maintaining, operating and developing the main railway network and its associated estate. Our aim is to protect and enhance the railway infrastructure; therefore any proposed development which is in close proximity to the railway line or could potentially affect Network Rail's specific land interests will also need to be carefully considered. In relation to the overall plan, we note the policies of the transport chapter and the references in particular to the provision of a new station at Bassetlaw Garden Village, on which we comment separately below. Two general points in relation to the transport policies concern the opportunities for third party enhancements to station facilities in particular (especially where the rail industry is not funded to provide as such, including step-free access at stations) and it is noted that such additional funding may be available through the Community Infrastructure Levy. As such the Policy ST52 is supported but we would ask for some additional comments such as the inclusion of Network Rail as a partner in paragraph 11.4.3, and reference to railways in paragraph 11.4.9 where it should make reference to the need for level crossing safety improvements in particular to be captured through an appropriate S106 mechanism. However we would appreciate further thought as regards the provision of policy wording surrounding level crossings. Network Rail is a statutory consultee for any planning applications proposing development likely to result in a material increase in the volume or a material change in the character of traffic using a level crossing over a railway (as the Rail Network Operators, set out in Schedule 4 (J) of the Development Management Procedure Order). It is important that policies within the plan acknowledge the need for the impact of new development to be assessed and mitigated, both on an individual site by site basis, as well as the cumulative impact of multiple site allocations and/or windfall sites brought forward in the plan period. Within the plan area, there are over 20 level crossings (both pedestrian and vehicular); although it is encouraging to note the commitment to look at the possibility of rationalisation at Bassetlaw Garden Village, the principle applies to development close to or affecting all our level crossings. As such we would advocate a slight change to Policy ST52 to emphasise that there may be some safety related works at crossings also required (this could be covered by a simple alteration to point B2 of ST52, viz. off site capacity and safety improvement works of infrastructure)</p>	Agreed. The Council is working closely with Network Rail through the development of the proposed Garden Village and the associated new Rail Station. The Council has produced technical notes with regard to the proposed Rail Station and understand that Network Rail have been part of its preparation. The Council will continue to closely engage with Network Rail and others through the preparation of the Local Plan.
REF222	Notts CC	<p>Part C. Where off site transport infrastructure is not named on a list of CIL funded schemes then infrastructure will need to be wholly funded by the developer and secured by planning condition i.e. rather collecting money.</p>	Thank you for your comments
REF299	Gladmans	<p>5.7.1 Gladman note the proposed approach towards infrastructure provision that is set out through Policy ST52. It is intended that the identified infrastructure set out in the Bassetlaw Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be provided through a combination of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), Developer Contributions, and appropriate funding assistance from Council's, central Government and funding partners. 5.7.2 The allocation of Bevercotes Colliery as an additional Priority Regeneration Area can provide the necessary mitigation 'across the board' and mitigation measures can be included as part of appropriate conditions or planning obligations associated with the redevelopment of the site where necessary.</p>	Thank you for your comments

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST52 - Provision	and Delivery of Infrastructure		
REF310	P&DG	Policy ST52 sets out the Council's draft Planning Obligations. Within the Draft Charging Schedule January 2020, it states that a draft charge of £25 per m ² for residential development. The NPPF states the importance of small and medium sites in meeting housing requirement of an area, however it is expected that small-to-medium housebuilders would operate on these smaller sites and it is these smaller developers which may be disproportionately effected by the implementation of a standard CIL charge on residential floorspace at the currently specified thresholds. We are also aware that the implementing a review mechanism within the Section 106 agreements is becoming more widespread within Local Plans. However, P&DG would suggest that this review process needs to be mutually operative to both the applicant and the local planning authority. Part F of Policy ST52 states that the "council will consider a review mechanism in a S106", however the wording of this implies the right to exercise this is for the local authority.	Agreed. Thank you for your comments.
REF346	Doncaster Council	This Policy states that "The Council will work with neighbouring Local Authorities and infrastructure partners to ensure that the growth over the plan period is supported by necessary infrastructure in a timely manner". This should also apply to Doncaster Council as agreed as part of the discussion regarding the Doncaster Local Plan Statement of Common Ground.	Agreed. Thank you for your comments.
REF401	East Markham Parish Council	Provision and delivery of infrastructure needs to be based around size of the housing in any given development rather than amount of housing. 10, 3 bed room houses fall within ST52 but 9, 5 bedroom houses do not. Yet the latter will have a bigger impact on the infrastructure of the village.	Thank you for your comments

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan November 2020 (November Consultation)

The following table includes the representations received during the consultation and the responses provided by the Council to address them. Where necessary, the Council's response identifies the changes which would be made for the following iteration of the Plan as a result of the submitted representations. The comments relating to the 9 policies in the Focussed Consultation document were responded to and published in June 2021.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
INTRODUCTION			
REF138	Resident	Paragraph 3.11 says that "Figure 5 below provides a summary of the population of the District, Nottinghamshire and England & Wales...", but unfortunately the table columns are labelled "Bassetlaw, East Midlands and Great Britain"!	Comments noted. Figure 5 will be amended accordingly.
REF026	Rampton and Woodbeck Parish Council	Potential threats to our (and other settlements') Neighbourhood Plan Those of us who worked on our own Parish's Neighbourhood Plan are concerned with a statement in section 1.12.5."Following adoption of this plan, as new planning policies are approved at national, local and neighbourhood plan level - the most recent policies always take precedence. If as a consequence of this Plan or new national policy being introduced part of a Neighbourhood Plan becomes out of date, the Council will support Parish Councils to revise their plans accordingly." This seems to imply that where a new higher tier of government plan is in contradiction to the approved Neighbourhood Plan then the Neighbourhood Plan will always be "trumped" by higher tier plans without recourse to discussion or mediation. What if the higher-level plan, say from the Government, is not evidence based but the Neighbourhood Plan is?	Developing neighbourhood plan policies that are supported by robust evidence is important, but so, too, is the need for such policies to be in general conformity with the strategies that sit above them. Indeed, this is one of the basic conditions that neighbourhood plans are assessed against as part of independent examination. That said, there are, inevitably, times when a degree of 'catching-up' is required, owing to the potential variance in when changes to strategies at different levels of the planning policy hierarchy are made. In the same way that neighbourhood plans are produced, the development or review of district and national level planning strategies include opportunities for public consultation before they are adopted. The 2020 consultation on the Planning White Paper is a good example. We actively encourage communities in the District to engage in these opportunities when they arise. In particular, communities that have produced a neighbourhood plan will have a heightened understanding of the implications of higher-order strategies on their own; this is valuable insight, and should be voiced.
REF040	Misterton Parish Council	Figure 3 Planning Officers should consider the inclusion of West Lindsey District Council and North-East Lincs Council. Although clearly not part of the North Derbyshire & Bassetlaw Housing Market Area, nevertheless Gainsborough (in West Lindsey) is the closest town to many of the villages in north-east Bassetlaw and will see extensive house-building. There is considerable movement for housing, employment, and shopping between north-east Bassetlaw and Gainsborough	The Council engages in Duty to Cooperate with West Lindsey District Council and North-East Lincs Council but neither sit within the Housing Market Area, the D2N2 LEP area or the Sheffield City Region Combined Authority area defined by the map.
REF040	Misterton Parish Council	para 3.4/3.5 It is worth noting that while agriculture may still be a significant presence in Bassetlaw, as a source of employment it has seen a decline. Mechanisation and changing patterns of land use mean that far fewer people are working 'on the land'. In Misterton, this, combined with the loss of heavy industry, means that there is very little local employment. With limited public transport, this forces people into their cars to seek employment further afield.	Comments noted.
1658674	D2N2	D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership does not normally comment on specific policies within local plans, but confirm our continued support for the overall strategic aims of the council and its plan. Pleased to have supported important local developments such as the redevelopment of Vesuvius Brickworks and the construction of the Harworth Access Road. Fully support Bassetlaw's ambition to be a modern and prosperous district. Our recent Economic Recovery and Growth Strategy commits us to securing connectivity-led growth to and for all parts of the D2N2 region, including key sites at High Marnham, Cottam, Apleyhead and the proposed Bassetlaw Garden Village. A robust and up-to-date planning framework is essential to making that happen.	Support noted and welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
INTRODUCTION			
1658674	D2N2	Context para 3.3 The impact of Covid-19 has led us to develop our new strategy to balance the immediate need to sustain and stabilise the region's economy with planning for longer term growth. As a result, our priority sectors for employment support in the short term include retail, hospitality, leisure and catering. There is clear alignment between the Bassetlaw Plan and the D2N2 strategy on longer term growth sectors and roles including low carbon engineering, construction and energy production and a move towards digital adoption in sectors such as logistics and retail.	Support noted and welcome.
1661414	Planning With People	para 5.1.27 refers to the windfall allowance of approx 100 dwellings per year are proposed for ST2 - but I can see no reference to this in ST2 or in ST1 - do you have an windfall allowance in fact?	Based on historical data the windfall allowance has been assessed as 100 dwellings per annum across the District. Windfall sites are expected to be a reliable source of housing supply during the plan period contributing 1200 homes. This is shown in the Trajectory.
1665972	Resident	3.23 Physical infrastructure, social infrastructure and green infrastructure first. not main retail shops really! I've been informed no infrastructure will be applied in a recent Zoom meeting. planning will create the problem then try to fix it. - In reference to Harworth	Planning permissions have secured the infrastructure necessary to mitigate adverse impacts on Harworth. Infrastructure is phased alongside development so not all infrastructure has been provided yet. The national retail chains are already in Harworth town centre.
REF146	Elkesley Neighbourhood Plan Group	4.14 'use of electric vehicles and alternative fuel vehicles'; there are many articles in the media and Government regarding this and considerable attention obviously needs to be given to it. The policies for the new developments have criteria outlined to address this but thought must be given to the existing localities and how they can resolve the problem they are likely to have in future years when electric vehicles out-number the internal combustion engine. Where communities have sizeable grass verges could these be converted to parking bays with charging points?	The Local Plan supports provision of electric vehicle infrastructure in new development.
REF169	Resident	para 3.19 Gives a more balanced account of the current situation of cycling infrastructure in the District and recognises that expanding the network and improving connectivity continues to be a priority.	Support noted and welcome
REF169	Resident	para 5.3.26 (line 3) Use of the word "bicycle" restricts inclusivity, so change to "cycle".	Change made accordingly
1666746	Resident	3.0 Context. The ambition of the Draft Plan is evident and welcome to an area in need of investment. Applaud the emphasis on creating new but urge BDC to make better use of what has fallen into disrepair or is unused. The description of assets does not detail current housing stock, current housing in build or completed. No mention of council rented dwellings features as context for future housing demand neither does the predicted after shock of Covid on the economy appear given the pandemic is nearing a year of consequences.	This sits outside the planning system and is a matter for housing services.
REF172	Elkesley Parish Council	Throughout the document, reference is made to 'new housing developments being of high quality, well designed, energy efficient and respectful of the setting' (4.11, ST2, D2). In general this statement is what should be expected of any development but, 'well-designed' and the accompanying 3 criteria can be very subjective. Could there be a situation where modern, energy efficient homes would not be of a similar style to the locality that could then prevent their development? Would like to see significant weighting being applied to the eco-credentials during the planning process. 4.14 'use of electric vehicles and alternative fuel vehicles'. The policies for new developments have criteria outlined to address this but we would like to see thought given to existing localities and how they can resolve the problem they are likely to have in future years when electric vehicles out-number the internal combustion engine. Where communities have sizeable grass verges could these be converted to parking bays with charging points?	Policy ST50 supports climate change mitigation and adaptation measures in design. Policy ST35 supports use of innovative design subject to the other provisions of the Plan. Each application is judged on its merits and a modern energy efficient home can be designed to complement local context.
REF197	Resident	3.10 p 163 8.8 a. the District has a number of town and rural churches which are listed buildings and of historic interest, some of which relate to the story of the Mayflower Pilgrims and their associated families. b. Retford and Worksop Railway Stations are both listed buildings and have links to the history and heritage of the area. c. The environments in front of the railway stations needs to be considered.	Reference to historic churches has been made to the introduction to the heritage section. The historic value of Worksop Railway station is recognised through the draft Worksop Central DPD, and the importance of Retford Railway

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
INTRODUCTION			
			Station acknowledged in the site allocation policy for Station Road.
REF197	Resident	(3.18) The A 631 road which goes through the north of Bassetlaw linking Gainsborough (and beyond the Louth) to Bawtry and the A1 could become a significant arterial road, but this would require planning consideration to resolving potential bottlenecks at Everton and Bawtry. This road could provide a viable road east for distribution companies based at Harworth and/or the A1 junction at Blyth. The plan refers to wanting to discourage people from working outside the District (3.7) – is this a bad thing – with more people working from home etc, does it matter where they earn their money? Is it not more important to encourage people to start up their businesses in Bassetlaw, especially businesses which are able to source local materials and export finished products? Retford has the potential to be an attractive location for people relocating from London, who may initially work from home and occasionally commute – the railway connection for work/social activities is a good one - they may also then start their own enterprises in Bassetlaw. Should Bassetlaw be promoting itself as a business friendly relocation opportunity?	The existing employment sites policy and employment outside designated areas or in rural areas is supportive of local business growth. The town centres policies also promote the growth of local business to enhance the viability of town centres. There are no plans to enhance the A631 at present.
1669799	Resident	(3.14) There is nothing new with this statement. The population has been ageing in increasing numbers for many years but has been completely ignored by actions. In previous plans there have been similar statements regarding providing appropriate housing but the council has done absolutely nothing about it in Harworth & Bircotes. How many bungalows are being built on the sites off Bawtry Road? None. How many bungalows were built on the old pit land near the crossroads? None. How many bungalows have been built or are projected to be built on the pit site itself? None (3.26) Again these are just words. Bassetlaw sold off pensioner flats on Milne Road in Bircotes which were then “revamped” & then turned into general rental accommodation. Yes, people may want to downsize as they get older, maintain their independence & free up family housing but what has Bassetlaw done to enable this up to now? Very little.	The Local Plan ensures that all market housing is designed to be accessible and adaptable. This will make a significant contribution to provision for older people. The sites in Harworth & Bircotes are the result of speculative development and have been assessed against the Core Strategy. Strategic site allocations in the Local plan promote bungalows.
1670869	Resident	(3.12 - 3.14) these paras state that the population growth in Bassetlaw is predominantly due to a change in age profile - ie over 50% of the predicted growth will be in the over 65s (retired) cohort. It is not clear that this prediction has fully influenced some of the proposals in respect of type and importantly location of housing growth. this cohort cannot be isolated miles from town. for example - Why is Cottam considered a suitable location to address the housing needs - a new settlement here will not be suitable for this group. green agenda - paras 3.30 and vision para 4.5 Why is High Marnham considered the appropriate site for green energy rather than Cottam? see later comments, see no assessment of comparison between the two sites.	Cottam is identified as a possible area of growth in the future subject to various criteria in the policy being met. Marnham is identified as a green energy hub because of its ability to provide infrastructure to allow the green energy sector to connect to the national grid infrastructure. Green energy would be supported on Cottam subject to the provision so the policy being met.
REF032	Resident	para 3.4/3.5 It is worth noting that while agriculture may still be a significant presence in Bassetlaw, as a source of employment it has seen a decline. Mechanisation and changing patterns of land use mean that far fewer people are working 'on the land'. In the Misterton Ward, this, combined with the loss of heavy industry, means that there is very little local employment. With limited public transport, this forces people into their cars to seek employment further afield.	Comments noted.
REF138	Resident	Paragraph 3.11 says that "Figure 5 below provides a summary of the population of the District, Nottinghamshire and England & Wales...", but unfortunately the table columns are labelled "Bassetlaw, East Midlands and Great Britain"!	Comments noted. Figure 5 will be amended accordingly.
REF117	Barton Wilmore on behalf of land owners	Foreword 2.1 Welcome the statements at paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 which set out that Bassetlaw is an "ambitious" district, seeking to "secure our long-term economic future" and is "planning for growth". This is important context for the Local Plan strategy and policies as a whole, which is rightly focused on Bassetlaw being a 'growth' location. Support these comments in the Foreword.	Support noted and welcome.
REF117	Barton Wilmore on behalf of land owners	Relationship between development plan documents Note at paragraph 1.9 that the Council intends to also produce a "Worksop Central Development Plan Document" to enable the regeneration of the Worksop Central area (Policy ST6 relates). This strategy is generally supported in recognition of the important role of Worksop. Request that the Local Plan provides greater clarity on the relationship between the Local Plan and the Central Worksop Development Plan Document in respect of the strategy for housing delivery and timescales for the Worksop DPD. 2.3 The following comments are made: • The Council's recently adopted Local Development Scheme suggests that the Worksop Central DPD is at its embryonic stage and will not be adopted until at least March 2023; • Policy ST6 states that Worksop Central will provide for at least 660 dwellings. Policy ST1 states that Worksop Central Area will provide 700 dwellings; and • Figure 7 provides a housing trajectory and suggests that Worksop Town Centre	The Spatial Strategy and Policy ST5 provide evidence of that relationship between the Central Area and the Local Plan. The Local Development Scheme was updated and approved by Cabinet in June 2021. The Local Plan has been amended to provide consistency in the housing figures. Figure 7 has been updated to provide an up to date picture of the housing trajectory for the plan

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
INTRODUCTION			
		(presumably the 'Central' area in the Figure 7 key) will deliver a 'Town Centre Windfall' from year 2026 onwards, of around 50 dwellings per annum. Clarity is required as to the urban capacity of Worksop Town Centre for residential development, whether development would be windfall or plan-led and the timings of those sites coming forwards. Concerned that the amount of housing to be delivered within the Central area may be overstated. Structure of the Local Plan: Referencing to Strategic Policies (ST), Policies and Site References is a little confusing. It would perhaps be clearer to have Policies and Sites, given that this is a holistic Local Plan. Welcomes the structure of the Local Plan and commends the Council on its comprehensiveness in approach to development.	period. The draft Worksop Central DPD identified potential site allocation capable of delivering 700 dwellings in the plan period and a programme for delivery. Inevitably as this area includes the town centre there will be windfall sites, as a result of permitted development and changes to the use classes order. Reference to strategic policies is considered to reflect national policy and provides guidance to those preparing neighbourhood plans.
REF117	Barton Wilmore on behalf of land owners	Welcomes the inclusion of Section 3 in the Local Plan which helpfully sets out the context. Paragraph 3.1 refers to the functional economic market area. It is not accurate to state that "Bassetlaw does not sit in a functional economic market area". It is not in a single economic market area for planning purposes, but Bassetlaw does relate to and lie within both the Sheffield City Region and D2N2 economic market areas. The district is therefore very well-located to take advantage of those relationships. 3.3 Economy section does not identify the importance of the rural economy in Bassetlaw which is rich in terms of agriculture and food production. The importance of this sector should not be underestimated by the Council. Paragraph 3.25 identifies the affordable housing needs for the District stating that it is "relatively affordable compared to the national picture". Understand the sentiment that this sentence is trying to convey, it is worth noting that the affordability ratio in Bassetlaw is still very high. The Median ratio (used in Standard Method) is 6.35 for Bassetlaw, directly comparable to the East Midlands (6.86) and England 7.83, with the lower quartile (a reasonable first-time buyer benchmark) being 5.74 in Bassetlaw (compared to East Midlands 6.97 and England 7.27). Therefore, there is a massive need for both market and affordable homes to be provided in the District. These affordability ratios could be usefully inserted into the text. Agree with the comments in paragraph 3.26 that due to the aging population, there is a need for specialist housing for the elderly including retirement, extra care and assisted living accommodation to be provided and welcome the acknowledgement that this can be achieved by delivering a range of housing types including bungalows.	A more explicit explanation of the functional economic market area will be incorporated in the Plan. The Plan including the affordable housing policy is clear that there is a need for affordable housing in the District. Support for provision of specialist housing is welcome.
REF225	Sheffield City Council	The references to Sheffield City Region (SCR) and their Strategic Economic Plan should also include references to the SCR Strategic Employment Land Appraisal (SELA) ,that analysed levels of need and supply of employment land across the city region and by individual authority. It concluded that there was a surplus of employment land in Bassetlaw of 40 hectares, based on a need of 68 hectares and a supply of 108. The level of supply proposed in the current draft Plan is much higher, so this situation of an over-supply is an acknowledged cross-boundary issue and should be referenced in the draft Bassetlaw Plan. 3.0 Context and 4.0 Vision and Objectives These chapters fail to mention the employment land need or supply situation. Given the significance of the approach to provide much more land than has been assessed as needed, request that this is referenced here.	The Vision and Objectives has been amended to reflect the significant employment land supply experienced in the District. It is considered that the employment section appropriately covers all evidence base documents.
1670589	Resident	1.8.1 Given the insight and knowledge which has shaped the plan, it is suggested that council officers and Councillors provide more guidance on how the Levy could and should be invested to make the community improvements it is intended for such as projects to create more sustainable environments, provision of community housing, local free wi fi, etc	The Infrastructure Funding Statement produced annually by the Council identify the projects CIL will be used for. The Council has a protocol for determining how the community portion of CIL will be distributed to reflect local needs.
REF052	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Figure 3 Planning Officers should consider the inclusion of West Lindsey District Council and North-East Lincs Council. Although clearly not part of the North Derbyshire & Bassetlaw Housing Market Area, nevertheless Gainsborough (in West Lindsey) is the closest town to many of the villages in north-east Bassetlaw and has plans for extensive house-building. There is considerable movement for housing, employment, retail, and leisure between north-east Bassetlaw and Gainsborough	The Council engages in Duty to Cooperate with West Lindsey District Council and North-East Lincs Council but neither sit within the Housing Market Area, the D2N2 LEP area or the Sheffield City Region Combined Authority area defined by the map.
REF184	Doncaster Council	It is recognised and welcomed that Bassetlaw Council is committed to using the Sheffield City Region Statement of Common Ground. However, as with our previous letter dated 26th February 2020, there are concerns around the Duty to Cooperate and the absence of a Statement of Common Ground that covers further strategic issues relating to the Bassetlaw Local Plan and Doncaster Borough. Reliance on the SCR Statement of Common Ground is considered insufficient in respect of Doncaster where there are additional strategic issues such as highway network/capacity. Paragraph 1.13.3 of the Bassetlaw Local Plan states that signed Statements of Common Ground will be form part of the	Bassetlaw and Doncaster MBC have agreed a draft Statement of Common Ground in relation to matters identified by the Local Plan. Further Doncaster have confirmed that they would be willing to sign the agreement once the Publication

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
INTRODUCTION			
		evidence base and others will be signed and added on due course. Doncaster Council wishes to be involved in and to see a draft version (which is relevant to Doncaster) as soon as possible which would reflect the discussions, outcomes and agreements set out in the Doncaster Local Plan: Statement of Common Ground (particularly the section on the Local Highway Network page 30). The Duty to Cooperate Compliance Statement (paragraph 3.2) describes Table 2 – this table highlights the lack of discussion that the Council has had with Doncaster Council over strategic issues and omits to list any discussions held with authorities as part of the SCR SoCG.	Version has been considered. The Duty to Cooperate Compliance Statement has been updated to incorporate all discussions had between neighbouring authorities.
REF168	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	It is noted that following the January 2020 Local Plan consultation no Duty to Cooperate discussions have taken place. In view of the issues raised previously and reiterated in the comments above and in Appendix 1, the Council would welcome the opportunity for engagement at the earliest opportunity.	Bassetlaw and Rotherham MBC have agreed a draft Statement of Common Ground in relation to matters identified by the Local Plan. Further Rotherham have confirmed that they would be willing to sign the agreement once the Publication Version has been considered. The Duty to Cooperate Compliance Statement has been updated to incorporate all discussions had between neighbouring authorities including meetings held in the last six months relating to the Plan.
REF026	Rampton and Woodbeck Parish Council	The use of the term evidence based. Evidence should be explicit and open to external scrutiny; it may be quantitative and open to further statistical analysis. The term evidence based is often misleading and misunderstood. For instance, the Plan document lists the Council's existing Strategies and current Planning Policy as evidence which, of themselves, they are not. They may or may not be based on a sound evidence base. Equally, they may be based on opinion or ideological or political bias.	The Council consider that the Local plan evidence base is robust and positively prepared.
REF068	Ranskill Parish Council	In Section 1.8.2 (page 10) the document states that "Alongside this Local Plan, the Council is reviewing the CIL Charging Schedule". It is not made clear whether this will be the subject of a consultation.	The CIL Charging Schedule is expected to be consulted upon alongside the Publication Version of the Local Plan.
REF071	Minerals and Waste, NCC	The reference to the Minerals and Waste Local Plans as documents that need to be considered is welcomed by the County Council. Please note that until the emerging Minerals Local Plan is adopted, the adopted 2005 Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan (Saved Policies) remains a document for consideration. Also, the Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Waste Local Plan (2002, Saved Policies) also remains a document for consideration until the County Council and Nottingham City Council adopt a new Waste Local Plan.	Comments noted.
REF230	Chesterfield Borough Council	Support the continuing use of the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw HMA grouping as an appropriate geography	Comments noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES AND VISION			
REF040	Misterton Parish Council	Page 23, para 12 Misterton Parish Council has recently established a 'Green Working Group, which will focus, initially, on measures to encourage recycling and minimise waste. Other parishes could be encouraged to do the same and all adopt a more strategic approach to waste management. This paragraph could make reference to the waste hierarchy.	Nottinghamshire County Council are the waste planning authority for Bassetlaw and produce the Waste Local Plan for the County.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES AND VISION			
REF089	Resident	<p>References from section 4, Vision and Objectives</p> <p>4.1 '..... facilities which promote healthy and active lifestyles'.</p> <p>4.12 'communities will have improved access tomulti functional green and blue infrastructure close to home, active travel through walking and cycling will be commonplace.'</p> <p>4.13 'provision of better connectivity for walking and cyclingreducing reliance on the car'.</p> <p>4.15.8 'to ensure new developmentenables healthy, accessible green active lifestyles'.</p> <p>4.15.9 'to promote healthier active communities.....'.</p> <p>4.15.11 '.....green and blue infrastructure networks to create high quality multifunctional, well connected spaces, sites and landscapes that improve peoples quality of life and biodiversity.....'.</p> <p>4.15.12 '.....low carbon District..... promoting tree and woodland planting.....'.</p>	Thank you for your comment.
REF101 - Referencing January 2020 plan	East Markham Parish Council	<p>4.1.12 There is little evidence that BDC has applied this to existing developments within East Markham.</p> <p>4.2.1.6 There is little evidence of any attempts at regeneration in East Markham. East Markham Parish Council does believe that BDC can deliver this.</p> <p>4.2.1.8 – Strategic Objective East Markham development is not reflecting the local character of the village. Thanks to the conservation policy, we have seen a flurry of fake threshing barns in recent years. Again, the Neighbourhood Plan has a specific policy relating to this and it included below for reference. East Markham Parish Council draws BDC's attention to the ongoing development on the old Two Sisters Chicken Factory site where there are no pedestrian links to existing houses.</p> <p>POLICY NP1: Development Design Principles</p> <p>1. Proposals should demonstrate a high design quality that will contribute to the character of the historic, rural village. In order to achieve this new development should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) incorporate green boundary treatment including native trees and hedgerows; and b) use materials that are in keeping with the character of the surrounding area; and c) demonstrate how the buildings, landscaping and planting creates well defined streets and attractive green spaces that respond to the existing built form in terms of enclosure and definition of streets and spaces. <p>2. The conversion of buildings should be done sensitively to reflect the historic character of the building and its surroundings.</p> <p>3. Schemes should demonstrate a layout that maximises opportunities to integrate new development with the existing settlement pattern. This should include a layout that enables new pedestrian connections to be made.</p> <p>4. Where development sites are adjoining, proposals should include pedestrian links to connect both sites where feasible.</p> <p>4.2.13. Little evidence of an alternative to travel by car in the village. The bus service is not comprehensive enough to provide an alternative to the car for work purposes. In addition, there is not enough consideration for other forms of transport within the plan.</p>	Regeneration is taking place across the district, and is being actively promoted by the Council in a number of locations. Following the adoption of the Local plan a design code will be produced for the District which should provide more locally distinctive design. A similar approach can be undertaken through Neighbourhood Plans/review. The Local Plan looks to support infrastructure associated with the new development in the Plan. It cannot address existing issues. There are other measures that can be explored, with partners.
REF121	Harris Lamb on behalf of Muller Property Group	<p>Strategic Objectives</p> <p>MPG generally support the Strategic Objectives that have been identified, specifically objectives 1, 2 and 3 which seek to direct development to sustainable locations and to ensure that sufficient land is made available to meet housing and employment needs over the Plan Period. The only Strategic Objective we have reservations about is the Council's intention to pursue a Garden Village within this Plan Period (Objective 5), a point we will return to below.</p>	Noted. Thank you for your comment.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES AND VISION			
REF156	Babworth Parish Council	The Parish are supportive of Bassetlaw's economic aspirations for the district. However, it has some concerns regarding how those aspirations are proposed to be delivered and concerns in relation to how the Local Plan proposes to meet the needs of its communities. Chapter 4 of the Local Plan sets out the Council's vision and objectives for Bassetlaw in 2037 for increased access to quality homes, high skilled jobs and a range of quality facilities and services. We support those aspirations; however, we stress that the key to the effectiveness of the Local Plan is in its ability to achieve that vision. In its current drafting, we have strong concerns over the plan's ability to do so.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF190	Babworth Parish Council	The Parish are supportive of Bassetlaw's economic aspirations for the district. However, it has some concerns regarding how those aspirations are proposed to be delivered and concerns in relation to how the Local Plan proposes to meet the needs of its communities. Chapter 4 of the Local Plan sets out the Council's vision and objectives for Bassetlaw in 2037 for increased access to quality homes, high skilled jobs and a range of quality facilities and services. We support those aspirations; however, we stress that the key to the effectiveness of the Local Plan is in its ability to achieve that vision. In its current drafting, we have strong concerns over the plan's ability to do so.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF163	Pegasus Group on behalf of the Harworth Group	Section 5.4 confirms that the regeneration of brownfield sites forms a key part of the Local Plan's Vision and Objectives. Strategic Objective 1 confirms that the vision will be achieved through locating new development to make best use of previously developed land to minimise the loss of the District's highest quality agricultural land. This approach should also be reflected within the Vision at paragraphs 4.1 – 4.14.	Thank you for your comment. The desire for new development to be delivered in the most sustainable locations, many of which will be brownfield sites, is referenced in paragraph 4.6.
REF197	Resident	(4.13) This talks about managing water run off but what about ensuring truly permeable surfaces for drives/pavements etc are used, so that the water transfer is reduced.	This is covered by policies in the Plan and legislation.
REF201	Severn Trent	Paragraph 4.13 Severn Trent are supportive of the approach outline within paragraph 4.13 to improve the district's resilience to climate change through the sensible location of new development and delivery of SuDS to manage surface water. We would also highlight that by directing water to sustainable outfalls such as infiltration and watercourses will help limit the impacts of climate change on the sewerage system.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES AND VISION			
REF203	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	<p>4.15 This vision will be achieved by meeting the following objectives:</p> <p>11. To protect, restore and enhance the quality, diversity, character, distinctiveness, biodiversity and geodiversity of the District's natural environment, by creating links within and to the green/ blue infrastructure network to create a series of high quality, multifunctional, well-connected spaces, sites and landscapes that improve people's quality of life and where biodiversity can thrive, respond and adapt to change.</p> <p>Proposed amendment: Insert the word 'climate' before the word 'change'.</p> <p>5.4.1 States: The regeneration of brownfield sites forms a key part of this Local Plan's Vision and Objectives. Providing support to the comprehensive redevelopment of brownfield sites, particularly within town centres and at the former power station sites is a key Council Plan objective</p> <p>We note in the Appendix that the following definition is provided for Brownfield Land. It appears to have been taken from the NPPF. "Land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including land within the structures curtilage. This excludes land occupied by agricultural or forestry buildings; land developed for minerals extraction or waste disposal; land in built up areas, such as residential gardens, parks, recreation grounds and allotments; and land that was previously developed but where the remains of the permanent structure or fixed surface structure have blended into the landscape."</p> <p>We support for proposals for re-use of previously developed land outside development boundaries where it will result in the restoration or natural regeneration of the site e.g. sustainable wetlands. However, we feel there should be a presumption against development of brown field land for other types of development, where it has already developed significant nature conservation interest. Often previously developed land that has been left for some years will have developed significant biodiversity value. Open mosaic habitats on previously developed land (formally called post- industrial sites) Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 Section 41: Habitats of Principal Importance in England.</p> <p>In all likelihood responses the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan will indicate a strong preference for the redevelopment of brownfield sites rather than greenfield. This is understandable, because impacts on previously undeveloped land will always appear greater. Brownfield habitats however, particularly early successional sites can be important biodiversity resources that are cherished by a local community. There is increasing development pressure on brownfield sites and therefore to ensure sustainability every effort should be made to retain and/or recreate this habitat within a site. We acknowledge that the re-use of previously developed land for new development makes a major contribution to sustainable development by reducing the amount of undeveloped land that needs to be used. However, where such sites have significant biodiversity interest of recognised local importance, local planning authorities, together with developers, should aim to retain this interest or incorporate it into any development of the site. There needs to be a criterion based policy to assess the suitability of previously developed land as appropriate and sustainable. Assess the biodiversity of the site through a desktop study of wildlife sites (Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation/Local Wildlife Sites) and protected species, followed by a rigorous ecological assessment of the site.</p>	Objective 11 has been updated as requested. All new development will be expected to make provision for at least 10% net gain in biodiversity on site, and, where appropriate, follow the mitigation hierarchy set out in Policy ST42.
REF211	National Trust	The Strategic Objectives are generally supported, with particular support for the following objectives: 4. Regeneration and brownfield development 10. Historic and natural environments 11. Natural environment and biodiversity 12. planning for a low carbon district	Noted. Thank you for your comment.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES AND VISION			
1669799	Resident	<p>(4.1 & 4.11) Suitable housing? What is Bassetlaw's view on this? This does not only apply to the ageing population it also applies to people with varying degrees of need through medical or other reasons. Bungalows by definition mean no stairs. This means that anybody with mobility problems will not have to endure the ritual of struggling up & down them. This applies to people of any & every age & could also be for parents with disabled or handicapped children who have no choice but to carry their children up & down stairs because there were no bungalows available for them. I am not referring to rental or council bungalows but to private properties that simply aren't available because successive councils over the years have not ensured their provision. In my opinion any planning applications should only be granted if they include a certain number of bungalows of various sizes. You manage to do something similar for social housing but not for bungalows.</p> <p>(4.15.2) Local housing needs & aspirations? We live in a 4 bedroom detached house & for at least 15 years have been looking for a 3 bedroom bungalow. What few there are, are primarily not suitable for us. We have no choice. Both of us in our 70's we want to down size a little, not to a council size bungalow but a reasonable size 3 bedrooms detached. There simply aren't any. Our age isn't affecting us, yet, but the results of past accidents is & we want to move to a suitable home of our choice whilst remaining in our community with our family around us.</p>	Policy 32 will ensure that all housing sites provide a mix of housing tenures, types, and sizes appropriate to the site and needs of the area. This could include affordable housing and specific house types such as bungalows.
REF214	Historic England	<p>Para 4.15 - Objective 10 - This deals with the historic environment but separates 'heritage' and 'archaeology' which sets the scene for this approach to run throughout the draft Plan. It is rather unclear since archaeology is heritage and can be a heritage asset with setting.</p> <p>It would be clearer to keep cultural heritage under one umbrella to include the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting or a similar alternative and we would urge you to reconsider the current approach. The proposed alternative would also allow for designated and non-designated assets to be considered.</p>	Objective 10 revised to reference historic environment, heritage assets and their settings, with no separate provision for heritage and archaeology.
1670589	Resident	4.11 Mention of Community Housing schemes within developments are not mentioned as part of providing the mix for new generations of home owners to get onto the housing ladder.	Policy 32, Houses Mix, Type and Density, will ensure that all housing sites provide a mix of housing tenures, types, and sizes appropriate to the site and needs of the area. This could include affordable housing and specific types of housing.
REF030	Resident	I feel that the existing Local plan is more interested in satisfying the national housing needs and objectives rather than taking local needs and requirements, developing those and as an aside incorporating the national requirements imposed on it. I believe your aim or focus should be on the local needs first and then the national, centrally imposed requirements. I also get the impression from the local plan that the long-term view is not being taken and the fact that future generations of residents of Bassetlaw are going to have to live with the changes decided now.	The vision and objectives does address local housing needs. The Council is not able to discount national requirements. There is a requirement for the Local Plan to be consistent with national policy.
REF052	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>Page 23, para 12</p> <p>Misterton and West Stockwith Parish Councils have recently established a 'Green Working Group, of which I am a member. It will focus, initially, on measures to encourage recycling and minimise waste. Other parishes could be encouraged to do the same and all adopt a more strategic approach to waste management. This paragraph could make reference to the waste hierarchy.</p>	Nottinghamshire County Council are the waste planning authority for Bassetlaw and produce the Waste Local Plan for the County.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES AND VISION			
REF058	Sport England	Para 4.1 - Sport England supports the vision which has healthy and active lifestyles at its core. Para 4.12 Supported Para 4.15 – Sport England specifically supports Strategic Objective 8 and 9 14	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF110	Resident	Bassetlaw Vision and Objectives 4.7 on page 20 It states: "Retford will have grown in a sensitive and sustainable manner with a wide range of new houses available better suited to meet local residents needs irrespective of time in their life while a new Country Park, community infrastructure and connectivity improvements will enhance the town's character...." If the development at Ordsall South is reduced or removed from the plan will the country park continue to meet the above statement ? In the strategic objectives 4.15 on page 22 there appears to be a lack of desire to minimise the effects of development and the movement of those who live there, wherever it is, to the existing character of the small rural settlements	The delivery of a country park at Ordsall is closely linked to the scale of development proposed at Ordsall South. The country park would not be delivered if the development at Ordsall South was removed or saw a reduction in the scale of development.
REF189	NHS Bassetlaw CCG	Clearly the strategic objectives are aligned to those of local NHS organisations; and sustainable economic growth and education opportunities should positively impact on recruitment and retention of the NHS workforce.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF188	Emery Planning on behalf of J.G.Pears Property Ltd.	We welcome the recognition in the Plan of the importance of local businesses as an integral factor in creating and sustaining a diverse and strong local economy. Such businesses are essential to the continued prosperity of the District and a strong local economy is vital to improving living standards and quality of life for Bassetlaw's residents. J G Pears is one such business which is ideally placed to assist the Council in enhancing its economic prosperity. As set out throughout these representations the overall positive thrust of the Plan is welcomed and in our view, the Plan is fundamentally sound, positively prepared, effective and consistent with National Policy. Significant consideration has been given to how major previously developed sites can be reused to ensure most effective use of existing infrastructure. The positive and proactive approach to the delivery of our client's land at the Former High Marnham Power Station within this and the next plan period, is welcomed and it is considered that J G Pears is well placed to support the opportunity to realise the development potential of this major previously developed site; well connected to the strategic highway network adjacent to the village of High Marnham where proportionate development will be supported and offers a significant opportunity for sustainable redevelopment making use of readily available energy from J G Pears nearby CHP plant. The inclusion of this site as an employment allocation provides a significant opportunity for the LPA to meet its low carbon agenda in a sustainable and appropriate manner whilst also delivering on the wider D2N2 aspirations to improve economic prosperity of the region which must be supported. The allocation will support the Council in meeting the aims and objective of the Plan as a whole, including making best use of previously developed land (Strategic Objective SO1); encouraging and supporting economic growth (SO3); promoting rural Bassetlaw as a living and working landscape (SO6); and, supporting Bassetlaw's transition to a low carbon District (SO12).	Noted. Thank you for your comment.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES AND VISION			
REF198 Bevercotes	Gladman Developments Ltd	<p>Strategic Objectives 4.2.1 Gladman are generally supportive of the Council's vision and objectives which provide a positive and proactive approach to future development in Bassetlaw over the plan period to 2037. Notably, Gladman are supportive of the positive approach to new growth, which sees the Council make provision for new homes above that required by the Standard Method to help achieve the District's economic objectives.</p> <p>4.2.2 Strategic Objectives 3 and Strategic Objective 4 set out the intention of the Plan to encourage and support sustainable economic growth and support sensitive regeneration of previously developed, vacant or underused sites and spaces within urban and rural Bassetlaw. Strategic Objective 14 states that new settlements and development contribute to the provision of necessary infrastructure to deliver growth.</p> <p>4.2.3 The Bevercotes Colliery site has been identified by the Council as having the potential to accommodate a garden village community, together with Gamston Airfield and its potential allocation for this purpose has been tested through the emerging Plan's Sustainability Appraisal. Notwithstanding this, the site remains an existing employment site with extant planning permission for its redevelopment for B2 and B8 uses (reference: 09/05/00002). The current iteration of the Plan is now silent on Bevercotes Colliery. It is important that the full potential of the site to support economic development and regeneration is recognised through the plan making process and as such, the sites suitability, availability and achievability for a range of employment uses should also be given pro-active consideration.</p> <p>4.2.4 The strategic objectives of the Plan, principally SO3 and SO4, highlight the need to prioritise development on previously developed land that is capable of sensitively regenerating Bassetlaw and stimulating sustainable economic growth. Gladman are of the view that land at Bevercotes Colliery can help the Council achieve its strategic objectives and the site should, therefore, be identified as an additional Priority Regeneration Area. Land at Bevercotes Colliery can also be bought forward in a manner to meet the intentions of SO14.</p>	Support for vision and objectives noted. Bevercotes has planning permission for employment use; the Council will continue to work with the promoters to see the successful implementation of the permission. The site was discounted as a Garden Village due to environmental constraints which means that allocating the site is contrary to national and environmental legislation and planning policy.
REF117 (Ordsall South rep)	Barton Wilmore on behalf of land owners	<p>4.0 BASSETLAW VISION AND OBJECTIVES</p> <p>4.1 Section 4.0 of the Draft Local Plan sets out the Vision and Objectives. This Section is generally supported by our client, however there are a few points to note which do not align with the spatial strategy set out in Section 5.0.</p> <p>4.2 Paragraph 4.2 groups Worksop, Retford and Haworth alongside the Large Rural Settlements. This is not supported nor is it aligned with ST1 which puts the Large Rural Settlements in a lower tier. The Vision should reflect this.</p> <p>4.3 Our client questions the first sentence of paragraph 4.7. It is unclear why reference is made to Retford to grow in a 'sensitive manner,' a comment which is not applied to Worksop. Both Worksop and Retford are historic market towns with Worksop actually having a longer history. Whilst development in both settlements should be sustainable and reflective of the individual character of each settlement, the reference to 'sensitivity' in the context of Retford alone is misleading.</p> <p>4.4 We oppose the Council's vision for the new Bassetlaw Garden Village (paragraph 4.10) and as set out in detail later in these representations, consider the approach to be unsound, unfeasible and unviable. It should be the Council's priority to enhance existing settlements such as Retford and Harworth where development can benefit from existing transport networks and support the local economy and wider rural hinterlands rather than attempting to create a new village and transport hub which we consider not to be deliverable in the plan period.</p> <p>4.6 We are supportive of Objective 1 which seeks to locate development in sustainable locations whilst supporting a balanced pattern of growth across urban and rural areas. However, we consider the Local Plan does not adequately reflect this objective as the pattern of growth is not "balanced" across urban and rural settlements.</p>	Paragraph 4.2 will be revised to align with the spatial strategy. Paragraph 4.3 will be revised to reflect the approach taken to growth in Retford. Objective 1 will be revised to promote a sustainable pattern of growth across the urban and rural settlements. Objective 13 will be revised to clarify its intention

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES AND VISION			
		<p>4.7 We support Objective 2 which seeks to provide a choice of land to ensure the District's housing stock better meets local housing needs. As above, we suggest this objective should be supported by policy within the Local Plan to guide more development to suitable locations within the main settlements of Worksop, Retford and to a lesser extent Harworth. We consider that the Local Plan must focus development towards the District's main settlements to support their role and function as key service centres, not only for their own populations but their surrounding rural hinterlands. We consider that it is more appropriate for the Council to seek to deliver sustainable urban extensions which are defined by their sustainability benefits rather than solely through scale. The housing distribution model is still skewed towards the Rural areas.</p> <p>4.8 We disagree with Objective 5 which promotes the delivery of a new Garden Village. Whilst we note the Council's desire to follow the 'garden village movement' we do not consider that there is a driver for doing so in Bassetlaw. The garden village (and indeed the garden city) movement is driven by overcrowding in urban areas and a need to house significant amounts of people in new sustainably designed settlements given constraints elsewhere. Bassetlaw does not suffer from those urban problems and its main settlements are suitable for urban expansion and, as above, would benefit from additional growth to maintain and enhance their vitality and viability. Such additional growth will be vital as the current population of those towns ages and the number of working age people naturally declines; it will be vital to encourage younger people and families to those towns (which will be a key component of meeting the Council's economic aspirations).</p> <p>4.9 Although we agree in principle with Objective 6 in promoting rural Bassetlaw and acknowledge it is vital to maintain the vitality and viability of existing rural settlements, we consider that the rural settlements are not sustainable locations to meet boroughwide growth. The levels of growth required at rural settlements, based on identified needs and service provision, needs to be calculated on a settlement-by-settlement basis. The sustainability of rural boroughs is necessarily driven by the health and accessibility of its main service centres.</p> <p>4.10 We believe more emphasis should be placed upon Objective 7 to support and enhance the vitality of town centres and local centres and promote an appropriate mix and scale of development. We consider that it is important to stress here the opportunities that new development will provide in terms of unlocking existing development opportunities.</p> <p>4.11 Lastly, we are supportive of Objective 13 which seeks to make efficient use of existing transport infrastructure. We suggest the provision of a new Garden Village contradicts this policy as extensive new transport infrastructure must be delivered to cater for the proposed village. In addition, the Local Plan states that the Rural Settlements are less accessible and so it would be more beneficial to guide a higher proportion of development to the main urban areas, particularly Retford and Worksop which benefit from strong transport connections.</p>	
REF225	Sheffield City Council	<p>3.0 Context and 4.0 Vision and Objectives</p> <p>These chapters fail to mention the employment land need or supply situation. Given the significance of the approach to provide much more land than has been assessed as needed, we request that this is referenced here.</p>	The vision and objectives will be amended to align with the spatial strategy.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES AND VISION			
REF209 Apleyhead	NJL Consulting on behalf of Caddick	<p>5. Draft Local Plan vision and objectives</p> <p>5.1 Caddick supports the overall local plan strategy, vision, and objectives which seek to deliver significant economic growth that can benefit both Bassetlaw and the wider region. As we have identified in Section 2 of this report, Bassetlaw is ideally positioned to deliver on these aspirational objectives.</p> <p>Vision and objectives</p> <p>5.2 In terms of the draft local plan vision, Caddick welcome the aim of strengthening the economy and economic base, and as part of that seek a greater variety of employment, which encourages more people to live and work in the District¹⁶.</p> <p>5.3 The vision goes on to recognise the key growth sectors of <i>inter alia</i> manufacturing and logistics which capitalise on the District's locational advantage, in terms of proximity to the A1, the A57, and Sheffield Doncaster Airport for example.</p> <p>5.4 These vision points are then carried forward to the plan objectives¹⁸ which state that sustainable and stable economic growth will be delivered:</p> <p>'... by providing the right conditions, land and premises to meet District and sub-regional employment needs and those of inward investors, while helping to create more jobs, education and training opportunities that meet local employment needs and aspirations.'</p> <p>5.5 The visions and objectives are welcomed, although Caddick consider the visions and objectives can go further in explicitly stating that significant levels of growth will be sought in order to provide the desired step change in Bassetlaw which is referred to at various points in the plan¹⁹.</p> <p>Delivering more</p> <p>5.6 The availability of generally flat and unconstrained non Green Belt land in the district means it can logically accommodate major growth generating proposals. This also allows the area to respond quickly to live investment and development enquiries. The district has excellent access to the strategic road network (to the A1 and M1, the A57 corridor) and is within striking distance of major centres and areas of population.</p> <p>5.7 The district, and particularly the Apleyhead Junction site, being positioned on the A1/A57 junction, also has excellent access and connectivity to major freight hubs including large UK airports, ports, and multimodal freight interchanges both within and outside the region.</p> <p>5.8 There is also a suitably large and appropriately skilled local labour market which can fulfil the wider range of jobs that can be created through diverse economic growth which the local plan vision seeks to achieve.</p> <p>5.9 Such qualities make the area attractive for major occupiers who can themselves be key economic drivers.</p> <p>5.10 Hence the plan's strategy, vision, and objectives are entirely correct to push for a step change in economic growth in Bassetlaw which can benefit both the district and wider regional areas. That said, given the key characteristics identified above the plan could potentially be more ambitious and would be correct to do so.</p> <p>5.11 Caddick's representations on the draft local plan policies are made with these characteristics and ambitions in mind.</p>	The step change in the economy promoted by the Local Plan will be better reflected in the vision and objectives.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES AND VISION			
1671323	William Davis	<p>Bassetlaw Vision and Objectives supported. The focus for development on sustainable locations and emphasis on regeneration highlights the importance of Worksop as the largest and most sustainable settlement in the District and the benefits that regeneration can bring; this is consistent with national policy (NPPF para 72) as required by the tests of soundness. Part of creating a more prosperous, desirable and equal place for residents includes the provision of high quality homes in attractive locations including on greenfield sites on the edge of settlements; these sites can be well designed to provide a safe and inclusive environment and will complement regeneration in the town by providing a different offer to regeneration areas attracting new residents to the area. This change has been acknowledged in Policy ST1 (Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy) with the inclusion of the Worksop Outer Area as part of the Settlement Hierarchy; however, this has not been reflected in the Vision or Objectives.</p> <p>To ensure the Vision and Objectives reflect the strategy and are consistent with the NPPF (specifically NPPF 59, 67 and 73) it is proposed that the following be added:</p> <p>Paragraph 4.6 "High quality housing has been provided in appropriate edge of settlement locations around Worksop to complement the regeneration and improvements being delivered within the town centre". Objective 2 "this will include a mix of brownfield regeneration sites and appropriate greenfield sites on the edge of settlements."</p>	<p>Changes to the vision and objectives will better reflect the mix of locations available for housing growth</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF019	Resident	<p>Dear sir I see the plan and I would like to know why is the housing targeted at the Harworth area . 10000 houses for the whole of Bassetlaw And probably 3000 in Harworth area. Why isn't it being shared across the area. It talks about jobs as a priority , open space walks etc however no solid evidence on these promises.</p>	<p>The Council commissioned a housing and employment study earlier this year (Bassetlaw Housing and Economic Needs Assessment 2020). This assessment has informed the number of houses and amount of employment land proposed in the draft Bassetlaw Local Plan.</p> <p>The Local Plan is seeking to deliver new housing and employment across the district, it proposes a hierarchy based on settlement size. Policy ST1 Bassetlaw Spatial Strategy proposes to deliver the following number of homes per sub-area:</p> <p>Settlement/Area Number of dwellings proposed up to 2037 Worksop 3104 Retford 1802 Harworth & Bircotes 1702 Large Rural Settlement (5 villages) 1402 Small Rural Settlement (34 villages) 1502 Bassetlaw Garden Village 500.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
			<p>This will be updated in the Submission Plan</p> <p>With regard to Harworth and Bircotes, the draft Bassetlaw Local Plan does not propose to allocate new land for housing. The 1700 will be delivered on sites with planning consent for housing, for example Former Harworth Colliery.</p> <p>The draft Plan is proposing to allocate land for new employment and there are also sites with planning consent for employment across the district. Approximately 11,000 new jobs are expected to be delivered on these sites.</p> <p>With regard to open space, there are policies in the draft plan that set out what will be required to make a development acceptable. Development proposals will be required to comply with the policies in the adopted Bassetlaw Local Plan. That's why it's really important that the Council has an up to date Local Plan in place, so that we can ensure open space and other infrastructure is delivered to meet the needs of the district. If we don't have an up to date Local Plan in place, development will happen ad hoc and the Council will have to take a reactive approach rather than a proactive approach.</p>
REF019	Resident	thanks for your speedy and detailed reply.just can we clarify this the 1700 houses what is proposed on committed land for harworth does not include the construction that's taken place over the last 4 years. If that's added I'm guessing it's more like 5000 house and growing.Running in line with this there's been no improvement for our infrastructure to cope with the demand.no new jobs now walks ,doctors and schools that can not cope and traffic that's a real joke.	<p>Over the past three years, Harworth & Bircotes has seen significant housing growth with over 364 home completions.</p> <p>A significant amount of additional land has planning permission for over 1765 dwellings (as at 30/10/2020). On that basis, no further allocations are proposed in this Plan.</p>
1653147	Resident	How will you ensure that new housing and the garden village do not simply become lower cost commuter homes for people from Sheffield and Nottingham?	The site will be designed to offer a mixture of housing types to meet the needs of the different groups within the community.
1653147	Resident	What evidence is there of success in Garden Village development; are there specific examples used to shape the initiative	Garden City or Garden Suburb principles is a long established concept which had a great influence on the design of new settlements and expansion of existing. Localities such as Milton Keynes, Letchworth Garden City, and Welwyn Garden City have been developed directly as Garden Cities or their development has been heavily influenced by the

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
			Garden City movement. Recent examples include Ebbsfleet Valley, Kent, Bicester eco town expansion to Bicester in Oxfordshire. On 2 January 2017, plans for new garden villages, each with between 1,500 and 10,000 homes, and garden towns each with more than 10,000 houses were announced by the government in different parts of the country.
1653147	Resident	Cycling links; this is welcome but currently the condition of roads is poor and car and truck driver behaviour and HGVs make cycling hazardous, how will you mitigate this.	The aim of transport and movement policies is to segregate cycling and pedestrian movement from vehicular traffic wherever possible.
REF026	Rampton and Woodbeck Parish Council	<p><u>The inclusion of any new builds in response to the increased housing need</u></p> <p>What most reasonable people would agree with is that there is a housing crisis in the UK and that this is mirrored in a housing crisis in Bassetlaw. It is appropriate that the Council should draft a plan to address this crisis in the District as one of its two major priorities. The second major priority is that any solutions should be green ones. Neither priority should subordinate the other.</p> <p>The Plan quite rightly refers to, and approves of, appropriate change of use of vacant commercial properties such as shops to housing. The UK has, somewhat belatedly, moved from ideas of rigid zoning, the separation of housing from commercial or industrial land use to a more flexible approach. Late or not, it is welcome, and one can see good examples of this in nearby cities such as Sheffield where old, redundant Victorian warehouses and factories have been converted into, often quite desirable, apartments. The logic of this is obvious, it requires fewer building materials and is therefore cheaper and does less harm to the environment than building the equivalent number of dwellings from new. Other countries such as the Netherlands have grasped this point. Whether converting existing buildings offer the same profit margins to developers as new builds is a moot point. In short, no authorisation for new build housing should be approved until a full stock take has been made of redundant buildings that are appropriate for conversion though this will present difficulties.</p> <p>Currently, we are in the midst of the Covid 19 pandemic and also, we leave the Brexit transition period at the end of the month. Both of these events have consequences for commercial and industrial buildings. White collar workers have been encouraged to work from home if possible, during the pandemic and minimise trips to the office. There is speculation that for many workers this trend may become a permanent feature of life with a consequence that companies will downsize their requirement for centralised office accommodation which may, in turn, lead to a significant number of redundant office buildings. This is a matter of real concern for commercial landlords but an opportunity to use some of these office buildings to be converted to apartments which would be cheaper and greener than new builds.</p> <p>Brexit will have a similar impact. The Government's own, recently leaked, impact assessment of both a "no deal" Brexit or minimal deal Brexit forecasts a significant downturn in the economy with consequent large number of job losses and business failures. In turn, this will lead to vacant commercial and industrial buildings that can be converted to housing use.</p> <p>In summary, the Council should carry out a stock take of vacant buildings but not just yet. By the end of next year, the pandemic, hopefully, will have abated and we will also be clearer what the real rather than projected cost to the economy has occurred because of Brexit. Then, and only then, will it be possible to know whether we need any new builds at all.</p>	In accordance with the NPPF a key objective of the Local Plan strategy is for the reuse and redevelopment or conversion to residential of previously developed brownfield land. The quantity of available brownfield land is however, insufficient to meet the objectively assessed need for housing in the District. Hence the need to identify greenfield sites in the most suitable and sustainable locations.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF041	Retford Civic Society	<p>The scale of housing growth</p> <p>In its comments on the January 2020 Draft Plan the Society expressed concern about the scale of house building proposed and requested that it be reduced significantly. We note that this change has not been made. The Draft Plan proposes a scale of building almost double what is required using the 'standard method' required by the government. This method is intended to establish a minimum requirement, but the Society sees no justification for exceeding it to the extent proposed. Between 2011 and 2018 the District's population increased by 3.4%. In the January 2020 Draft it was projected to increase by 3.8 % by 2037. The annual rate of population growth was expected to fall significantly. Neither of these projections point to housing growth on anything like the scale being proposed. On the contrary, they suggest that there is no justification for exceeding the minimum required under the government's 'standard method'. The scale of housing is justified by expected employment growth. That could explain why the latest Draft Plan projects an increase in population of 17.8% by 2037. It is unclear from the supporting documents why this figure has changed so much since the January 2020 Draft when only 3.8% growth was predicted. It appears that the predicted growth in employment is expected to result in substantially increased inwards migration. We have reservations about the scale of the increase in employment suggested and consider it over-ambitious. The Society considers that the scale of house building proposed in the Draft Plan is excessive and that it should be reduced to around that required by the government's 'standard method' of assessment.</p>	<p>The standard method provides a minimum housing need figure.</p> <p>GL Hearn have undertaken an independent Housing and Economic Development Need Assessment published in November 2020. Findings - in order to meet the economic growth anticipated in the Local Plan more housing is required and it is considered that 591 dwellings per annum is the objectively assessed need.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF047	Resident	<p>Scale of housing growth</p> <p>The Draft Plan proposes a scale of housing growth which is unnecessary and excessive. The 'standard method' of assessment within Government guidance indicates a requirement for 228 additional dwelling a year. The Draft Plan makes provision for 586, almost double this figure. Although the guidance is intended to be a starting point and a minimum, there is no need for development on the scale proposed and it would lead to unnecessary and harmful development on greenfield land.</p> <p>Government guidance (https://www.gov.uk/guidance/housing-and-economic-development-needs-assessments) gives examples of circumstances when it may be appropriate to plan for more houses than required by its 'standard method':</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • growth strategies for the area that are likely to be deliverable, for example where funding is in place to promote and facilitate additional growth (e.g. Housing Deals); • strategic infrastructure improvements that are likely to drive an increase in the homes needed locally; or • an authority agreeing to take on unmet need from neighbouring authorities, as set out in a statement of common ground. <p>None of these circumstances apply at present to Bassetlaw. Housing is not required to meet the unmet needs of neighbouring authorities. There are no strategic infrastructure improvements to be allowed for. The scale of employment growth assumed in the Draft Plan is unrealistic and unlikely to be deliverable. Background papers for the Plan assess the potential of the area for employment growth. Reflecting the uncertainty in such projections, a very wide range of possibilities is indicated. The housing provision in the Draft Plan is based on a scale of employment growth close to the top of this range. This would require a sustained expansion of employment on a scale not previously seen. There has been success recently in attracting some major developments, but this is unlikely to continue on the same scale over the plan period. On the contrary, it is widely expected that recovery from the covid induced recession will take many years and this will inevitably affect all aspects of the economy. In the unlikely event of employment growth happening on the scale assumed in the Draft Plan, it would exceed what is needed for the local population. The background papers indicate that it would require more people to move into, and be accommodated within, the District. The Draft Plan is, in effect, seeking to expand the District's population by inducing increased immigration. This is unnecessary and harmful. There is no reason to believe that shortage of housing has ever restricted economic development in Bassetlaw or that prosperity requires increased immigration.</p> <p>The scale of house building proposed in the Draft Plan should be reduced to close to that required by the government's 'standard method'.</p>	<p>The evidence from Vision 2030: D2N2 Strategic Economic Plan, D2N2 Local Economic Partnership, and the Draft Bassetlaw Local Industrial Strategy, BDC, 2019 demonstrate that pursuing a housing target based purely on the standard method would not provide the sufficient and necessary dwellings to support the economic growth in the District. It would have consequences in terms of affordability for young people who will be unable to stay in the area. This could constrain economic growth because of labour shortages leading to increased levels of in-commuting to support economic growth, which would be unsustainable.</p> <p>The objectively assessed housing need of 591 dwellings per annum has been set at a level to support the full extent of this jobs growth (11,236 jobs) identified by the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment Update November, 2020.</p> <p>The Standard Method calculates a minimum housing need for Bassetlaw of 288 dwellings per annum for the period 2020-2037. This is not a housing requirement figure rather it is the minimum starting point.</p> <p>The increase in housing need above the standard method figure is a reflection of changing economic circumstances and growth strategies in the District. It also reflects market signals where over the past few years 64,045sqm floorspace has been completed on the General Employment Sites, 70.9ha has been granted planning permission since April 2018, and 17.7ha is under construction at Symmetry Park and Manton Wood.</p> <p>This higher figure would also help delivering infrastructure and there is support for it from the D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF060	Notts County Council	<p>2a) Cottam is remotely located and therefore beyond what could be considered as an acceptable walking or cycling distance from the majority of everyday services and amenities. The nearest town offering key services is Retford, approximately 9 miles to the west by car. Bus services in the area are limited with a single bus service providing a limited daily service on a pre-booked stop basis. It would be unlikely that the scale of the development would be capable of generating sufficient patronage to sustain a reasonable level of service to main destination. The County Council considers that the site is not in a sustainable location as a choice of transport modes is not available.</p>	<p>The Former Cottam Power Station site is redundant brownfield sites. Its remediation, reclamation and redevelopment would regenerate and enhance the quality of the environment for the benefit of the economy and the local community. This is supported by NPPF policies and objectives. Paragraph 117 : "Strategic policies should set out a clear strategy for accommodating objectively assessed needs, in a way that makes as much use as possible of previously-developed or 'brownfield' land." Paragraph 137a "LPA should make as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land." The Cottam power Station is a good example of such a site.</p> <p>The site has good accessibility to Gainsborough and Lincoln two major service centres with a wide range of services and facilities.</p> <p>An objective of the masterplan would be to reduce car travel by providing on site services and facilities and employment opportunities. There would also need to be improvements to public transport provision to Retford as well as Gainsborough and Lincoln.</p>
1661414	Planning With People	ST1 3b page 33 the 'by up to 5%' reference should be before the first comma otherwise it reads that site allocations in NPs can still only allocate dwellings in accordance with the 5% growth allowance	Noted

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF087	Highways England	<p>Highways England welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Draft Local Plan for Bassetlaw District which covers the period 2018 to 2037. The document provides a vision for the future of the area and sets out several key objectives and planning policies which will be used to help support growth across the region.</p> <p>Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as a strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). It is the role of Highways England to maintain the safe and efficient operation of the SRN whilst acting as a delivery partner to national economic growth. In relation to the Bassetlaw Local Plan, our principal interest is safeguarding the operation of the A1 which bisects the Local Plan area.</p> <p>In February 2020, Highways England provided comments on the draft version of the Local Plan, with a housing target of 9,087 dwellings and a minimum of 108 ha of new employment land and 199.6 ha of strategic employment land.</p> <p>Regarding the current draft version of the Local Plan, the housing target has increased to 10,013 dwellings. This is shared over:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3,104 in Worksop (200 completed, 1,320 committed, 1,959 unallocated); • 1,802 in Retford (200 completed, 820 committed, 1,181 unallocated); • 1,702 in Harworth & Bircotes (260 completed, 1,765 committed); • 1,402 in large rural villages and 1,502 in small rural settlements; • 501 in Bassetlaw Garden Village, adjacent to the east of the A57 / A1 / Blyth Road junction (Apleyhead junction) at Upper Morton. <p>The Bassetlaw Garden Village has been proposed to accommodate a total of 4,000 dwellings, however we note that a minimum of 501 have been allocated for this Local Plan period.</p>	<p>No specific objection to the overall strategic distribution proposed providing that the impacts on the SRN are assessed and inform the development of the infrastructure delivery plan.</p> <p>The Council welcomes the acknowledgement by the HA of the need for all major developments in the area to be supported by Transport Assessments to demonstrate the impacts on the highway network and determine the need for mitigation.</p>
REF097	Gamston with West Drayton and Eaton Parish Council	<p>The general consensus was that this version of the plan is a clear improvement on the previous document. However, many concerns were raised and are now put to you in order to consider and develop the plan further. The Parish Council acknowledges the need to develop new and appropriate dwellings and services for a growing local and national population for the future. However, they have some considerations which need to be addressed by Bassetlaw Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An overarching concern was raised as to the need to build new houses at a rate that is almost double that required using the current Government's recommended method of calculation. • There is further scepticism of the calculations used to forecast the growth in employment and the creation of jobs which is clearly based on pre-COVID expectations and understanding of working environments. <p>Councillors appreciate that some local communities have to suffer in order for major residential developments as suggested in this Draft Plan. However, it was unanimously agreed that it would be more sensible and indeed beneficial to residents for the BDC to increase the number of houses to be built in the Bassetlaw Garden Village from the start thus being able to reduce the number of buildings in inappropriate sites such as the Ordsall South site.</p>	<p>The Garden Village is a long term vision which is being developed because it requires a long lead in time.</p> <p>With the vaccination programme now under way it is considered that Covid-19 is only a temporary setback, and economic growth and house building should not be based on long term Covid-19 assumptions. A quick economic recovery is now forecast.</p>
REF098	Bawtry Town Council	Substantial expansion is planned for Harworth and Bircotes – “effectively doubling its size” according to paragraph 3.2.3 of the Draft Local Plan. The adjacent much smaller town of Bawtry lies just over 2 miles away, with access being the A631. Bawtry Town Council is	Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 61-009-20190315 of PPG advises:

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY		<p>concerned that this expansion may place an unsustainable load upon Bawtry's infrastructure (roads, health and education) if not adequately mitigated.</p> <p>A satisfactory discharge of Bassetlaw's Duty to Cooperate would have assessed this risk and identified appropriate mitigations. That has not occurred. It is suggested that Bassetlaw's compliance with that Duty has been perfunctory. DMBC has commented that "Substantial development has already occurred in Harworth and Bircotes without adequate consultation" but it is to be regretted that DMBC has not properly held them to account.</p> <p>Following BTC's similar comments in an earlier consultation round, Bassetlaw made a commitment "to explore the potential of a Statement of Common Ground with Bawtry Town Council at the relevant time." Bassetlaw has not honoured that commitment.</p> <p>As far as BTC is aware, there has been no discussion whatsoever about the impact of Harworth and Bircotes expansion upon Bawtry's health and education facilities. Such discussion should take place as a matter of urgency.</p> <p>As far as roads are concerned, our major concern is the junction between the A631 Tickhill Road and the A638 High Street in Bawtry. The A631 Tickhill Road, which is the primary route from Harworth and Bircotes, terminates on the A638 High Street in an uncontrolled T junction. It is already very congested at busy times, with long queues building up on Tickhill Road caused by traffic waiting to turn right, and increasing volumes of traffic diverting along the adjacent (and very narrow) Top Street as a rat run for traffic turning left. Traffic surveys conducted to support new housing planning applications in Harworth and Bircotes have concluded this junction will not be significantly impacted, such that there is no need for any improvement or mitigation of it.</p> <p>BTC has been surprised and disappointed that DMBC accepted this conclusion because we believe those traffic surveys were flawed. They were all conducted on single days only, which we believe to be contrary to best practice, which recommends surveys on between 5 and 10 days. Those single days appear to have been Tuesdays and Thursdays only – never Mondays or Fridays which are busier. We further believe best practice to be an assumption of a 10% variation of traffic flows on a daily basis. The surveys do not appear to have built in such a margin of variation. Further, we believe it is deemed prudent to assume that traffic simulation models inevitably have inbuilt margins of error, such that the threshold of 80% (Ratio of Flow to Capacity of 0.8) is the practical capacity limit below which estimations of queues and delays experienced by those using the junction are likely to be reliable. The surveys presented in these planning applications do not appear to have applied this advice, that figure of 80% sometimes being exceeded.</p> <p>In the most recent housing planning application, for 650 houses, with the apparent agreement of DMBC, Bassetlaw "stacked" eight traffic generation and junction flow assessments on top of each other, each representing Harworth developments that had already been approved. They then calculated the effects of the extra traffic generated by the 650 development. If a single simulation model has margins of error, such that RFC's over 80% are the practical limit, what margin of error will there be in a stack of nine?</p> <p>It is acknowledged that these objections should have been made by DMBC previously. The Duty to Cooperate, does, however, "require all Local Planning Authorities to engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis in relation to cross-boundary issues".</p> <p>We would wish for the following to occur:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rigorous assessment of the impact of Harworth and Bircotes expansion upon Bawtry's health facilities, and the provision of appropriate mitigation if necessary • Rigorous assessment of the impact of Harworth and Bircotes expansion upon Bawtry's education facilities and the provision of 	<p>"Strategic policy-making authorities are required to cooperate with each other, and other bodies, when preparing, or supporting the preparation of policies which address strategic matters. This includes those policies contained in local plans (including minerals and waste plans), spatial development strategies, and marine plans. The National Planning Policy Framework sets out that these authorities should produce, maintain, and update one or more statement(s) of common ground, throughout the plan-making process. Local planning authorities are also bound by the statutory duty to cooperate. <u>Neighbourhood Planning bodies</u> are not bound by the duty to cooperate, nor are they required to produce or be involved in a statement of common ground."</p> <p>A Statement of Common Ground has been signed between the Council and Doncaster Council which includes an ongoing commitment to work together to manage traffic impacts across boundaries. This will be updated throughout the plan-making process.</p> <p>The Local Plan proposes no allocations in Harworth & Bircotes. The developments referred to have planning permission and transport infrastructure improvements have been agreed through the planning application process for each site.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
		<p>appropriate mitigation if necessary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rigorous evaluation of the integrity of the traffic assessments of the impact of Harworth and Bircotes expansion upon roads in Bawtry, including the A631 Tickhill Road/A638 High Street junction and Top Street, and, if they are found to be unreliable, re-assessment. <p>We believe these concerns should be addressed prior to any further expansion of Harworth and Bircotes.</p>	
REF101	East Markham Parish Council	<p>The plan is again driven more by housing development than by economic interest. In the plan the projected population increase will be 20,700 by 2037. Given the present birth rate in the UK to achieve this growth there will be an inward migration of approx. 7,000 people. The plan assumes with no supporting evidence that 11,836 additional jobs can be provided over the period of the plan. This would appear over optimistic. The plan also calls for the building of 10,137 houses this seems to be an oversupply of houses given the probable population increase. East Markham Parish Council is of the opinion the District is being used to provide low cost housing for surrounding councils which are unable to meet their housing needs</p>	<p>The objectively assessed housing need of 591 dwellings per annum has been set at a level to support the full extent of the jobs growth (11,236 jobs) identified by the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment Update November, 2020.</p> <p>The Standard Method calculates a minimum housing need for Bassetlaw of 288 dwellings per annum for the period 2020-2037. This is not a housing requirement figure rather it is the minimum starting point.</p> <p>The increase in housing need above the standard method figure is a reflection of changing economic circumstances and growth strategies in the District. It also reflects market signals where over the past few years 64,045sqm floorspace has been completed on the General Employment Sites, 70.9ha has been granted planning permission since April 2018.</p> <p>This higher figure would also help delivering infrastructure and there is support for it from the D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership</p>
1665982	Resident	(5.1.47 page 31 regarding Harworth) States no further allocation for development will be applied for.... this is false plans are still being submitted and granted	Although there are no proposals to allocate land for residential in the Local Plan this cannot prevent planning applications from being made. All applications are considered on their merit and will be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material consideration indicate otherwise.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF120	Barton Wilmore on behalf of land owner	<p>Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy</p> <p>The draft policy identifies that the District will accommodate a minimum of 10,013 dwellings (589 dwellings per annum) for the plan period 2020-2037. This figure is higher than the target in the previous draft Plan Regulation 18, which is welcomed. Whilst we do not oppose the overall housing requirement, we continue to raise issues with the manner in which it is distributed within the District, namely that more growth should be directed to the Large Rural Settlements, particularly Blyth. Policy ST1 states the District's housing need in the Plan period will be delivered via the following spatial strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - About 6,600 dwellings in the 'main towns'; Worksop, Retford, Harworth and Bircotes; - About 1,400 dwellings on allocations in the draft Plan or to be allocated in Neighbourhood Plans for the Large Rural Settlements (including Blyth); - About 1,500 dwellings on non-allocated or sites to be allocated in Neighbourhood Plans for the Small Rural Settlements; - 500 dwellings through a site allocation at the Bassetlaw Garden Village (within the Plan period, toward a total 4,000 dwelling capacity). <p>We set out concerns around the deliverability of the 500 dwellings at the Garden Village in response to Policy ST3. Whilst we support the ambition to deliver beyond the Plan period, we do not consider these 500 dwellings are deliverable and should be removed from the overall supply. We have significant concerns around the approach to Large and Small Rural Settlements detailed below in our response to Policy ST2. In addition to this, the growth identified in Policy ST1 (and ST2) is in part reliant on the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans and their ability to identify sufficient sites which can deliver the identified housing. As an example, the draft Blyth Neighbourhood Plan is reliant on one site to deliver practically its entire housing requirement, despite there being no public evidence on this being deliverable or developable. This may be the case for a number of other Neighbourhood Plans and this presents risks to the Council's housing supply.</p> <p>We support the revision to the draft Plan which applies a lapse discount rate to the housing supply. As the LAA states, this should result in a 24% reduction to the total supply of outline permissions, minor sites (9 or fewer), and Neighbourhood Plan Allocations. We have identified in our response to Policy ST2 confusion around the precise makeup of the housing supply for rural settlements. There is a need for a table setting this out and the implications of the lapse rate so it can be readily understood whether the housing requirement for rural settlements is appropriate or whether it needs adjustment. The spatial strategy needs to ensure that housing and employment needs are aligned, so that housing is proposed where there is demand for employment. As paragraph 3.5 of the draft Plan notes: "The logistics sector continues to grow, with significant investment taking place, and market interest evidenced, along the A57 and A1 corridors". The recently upgraded A1 junction to the north of Blyth offers a significant opportunity to meet this need and assist in delivering economic growth in the District, particularly in sustainable rural locations to ensure growth is balanced. Housing should be located nearby to ensure jobs and workers are closely located and accessible by public transport – there are regular buses running between Blyth and the A1 roundabout to the north. Unmet need Bassetlaw is within the defined North Derbyshire & Bassetlaw Housing Market Area (HMA) alongside North East Derbyshire, Bolsover and Chesterfield Councils. We continue to raise the point that the Council should provide more evidence as to whether or not it can assist with meeting the unmet needs of any neighbouring authorities. The draft Plan needs to consider the linkages with the Sheffield City Region HMA, which includes Doncaster and Rotherham Councils. At page 145 of the Sustainability Appraisal Appendices, it is identified that there is a net outflow of workers, with 2011 census data indicating that the majority of the District's residents commuted to Doncaster, Sheffield and Rotherham (6,945 people). Doncaster and Rotherham were also the origin of most in-commuters into Bassetlaw District (4,395 people). The Publication version of the draft Doncaster Local Plan, now submitted for Examination, identifies an unmet housing need (paragraph 6.5), although it identifies elsewhere that discussions have not identified housing or other needs that would be more appropriately shared with other local authorities (paragraph 1.3). This follows an apparently unsuccessful attempt to get neighbouring authorities such as Bassetlaw to assist. At page 23 of the Doncaster Revised Draft SoCG (August 2019), Bassetlaw are reported to state it is: "Not considered appropriate to make provision for housing needs as Bassetlaw is currently developing the evidence underpinning their Local Plan, such as setting housing growth and economic growth targets and identifying Local Plan site allocations. Therefore it is not in a position to plan for any additional housing needs. It is also not considered appropriate to make provision for housing needs for an authority within a separate housing market area."</p> <p>It is accepted that Bassetlaw is within a different HMA. However there are clear functional relationships between the North Derbyshire & Bassetlaw HMA and the Sheffield City Region HMA. There are also clear relationships specifically between Bassetlaw and Doncaster and the draft Plan should do more to demonstrate how it could assist neighbouring authorities. Additional growth within Blyth could assist in respect of assisting Doncaster. The Duty to Cooperate Compliance Statement (October 2020) does not appear to address this, as there have been no further meetings with Doncaster Council</p>	<p>The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence and comments received. The distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy. A large part of the supply comes from existing commitments.</p> <p>Most of the delivery in the Small and Large Rural settlements will come from existing commitments on sites with extant planning permissions.</p> <p>The housing trajectory for the Local Plan has also been updated.</p> <p>The Council considers that Strategic Policy ST1 together with the housing elements of Policy ST16 provide a positive strategy for meeting both Bassetlaw's housing needs and contributing to meeting the needs of the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw Housing Market Area as a whole. The policies provide land for more dwellings than needed to meet the locally derived housing need. This would deal with unexpected issues affecting the delivery of housing land, and could contribute to meeting possible unquantified unmet needs arising from other areas.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
		<p>since September 2019. This should be updated to reflect the potential for Bassetlaw to assist. In summary, we therefore continue to object to Policy ST1 as it is inconsistent with the evidence base around relative sustainability of settlements and will fail to deliver the required housing in the right places. This is contrary to the NPPF and the draft Plan's own Vision, specifically:</p> <p>"The District will have a diverse and thriving economy, with Worksop, Retford and Harworth & Bircotes, and the Large Rural Settlements acting as employment and service centres for their surrounding rural areas New development will have been delivered in the most sustainable locations. Residential development within the Large Rural Settlements of Blyth, Carlton in Lindrick, Langold, Misterton and Tuxford will have been delivered to meet strategic and local needs. Necessary physical, community, green and digital infrastructure needed to support this growth will have been delivered on time.The Small Rural Settlements will have seen small-scale, sensitively located development to support local community objectives and aspirations, to meet local housing needs and sustain village services"</p> <p>Suggested changes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Update the Duty to Cooperate Compliance Statement to demonstrate compliance with the duty in relation to assisting with unmet housing needs from neighbouring authorities. 2. The anticipated supply set out in Policy ST1 and the supporting evidence (particularly around viability) should be reviewed in light of the evidence of deliverability for Bassetlaw Garden Village (see our concerns set out in response to Policy ST3). 3. The growth targets for specific settlements should be updated to reflect the lapse rate and a mechanism for guarding against non-delivery of housing through Neighbourhood Plans should be included (see Policy ST2). 4. In light of the matters raised in relation to Policy ST1, and issues around supply, trajectory and deliverability, further growth should be directed to the sustainable settlement of Blyth. 	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF121	Harris Lamb on behalf of Muller Property Group	<p>Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy</p> <p>The Council set out its spatial strategy for development in Chapter 5, noting that at the heart of this is the need to use sustainable development as the framework for growth and change in Bassetlaw. MPG do not disagree with intention. The Council go on to state at paragraph 5.1.9 that the spatial strategy promotes a 'step change' in the District's economy and that the Council are seeking to retain employment locally, provide opportunities for better paid, higher skilled jobs and increase productivity. It goes on to state that "The strategy seeks to align economic growth with the housing offer, by providing the right type of new homes in the right places, to ensure that past trends of out-migration are rebalanced. This will ensure the sustainability of our area in the future as a place to both live and work." In doing so, the strategy seeks to align itself with the priorities of the D2N2 Strategic Economic Plan and emerging Bassetlaw Local Industrial Strategy. MPG are fully supportive of this economic led, jobs growth strategy that is proposed by the Council. Having identified that the Plan's strategy is to be economic led, it goes on to identify that it is seeking the creation of 11,236 jobs over the Plan Period, of which 5,878 are to be within general employment sites and between 3,857 – 5,358 at the strategic employment site proposed at Apleyhead. Due to the Council's significant supply of employment land (circa 287 hectares) it feels well placed to be able to deliver this level of job creation.</p> <p>In seeking to deliver an economic/jobs led strategy, the Council note at paragraph 5.1.10 that this will have a knock-on effect on the supply and delivery of housing, including affordable and specialist housing in the District, along with new infrastructure. However, the Council note that the current standard method for calculating housing need indicates that the minimum housing need for the District is 288 dwellings per annum (dpa). If the Council pursued the standard method housing requirement of 288 dpa against its job creation target of 11,236 jobs, this would lead to an imbalance between the two leading to unplanned housing growth across the District. As such, the Council are proposing a significantly higher housing requirement than the standard method figure of 589 dpa, in order that this can support the full extent of the jobs growth that is sought by the Council. MPG welcome and support the Council's stated objective of securing economic growth and job creation and vis a vis the need to plan for significantly more dwellings than the minimum housing need as identified by the standard method. Clearly more than doubling the housing requirement over and above the minimum housing need is an ambitious strategy, but it is one that does seek to boost the supply of housing and which will also hopefully secure economic growth and inward investment, both of which are key objectives of Government policy as set out in the Framework. In seeking to deliver this level of housing growth, MPG maintain that it is essential that the Council identifies the right sites, in the right location, in order that they can meet this demand in a timely manner.</p> <p>In setting out its spatial strategy, the Council acknowledge at paragraph 5.1.36 that not all new housing can be accommodated on previously developed land and that two Sustainable Urban Extensions are planned at Worksop and Retford. In addition, a large Garden Village is also planned that will ostensibly deliver more growth for the next Plan Period than the current one, albeit that it is envisaged to make a modest contribution to housing supply in the emerging Plan. We return to this point below. In light of comments above, our response to Policy ST1 is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support the focus on delivering sustainable development and growth, appropriate to the size of each settlement to meet the evidenced need for new homes and jobs, regenerate the District's town centre; - Support the provision of 589 dpa - Support the provision of 1,800 dwellings in Retford - Object to the provision of 500 dwellings at the Retford Garden Village in the current plan period - Support the creation of at least 11,200 jobs 	<p>The determination of the appropriate distribution of housing and employment growth takes account of strategic growth locations, the settlement hierarchy, and the ability to provide essential utilities and infrastructure, whilst safeguarding local heritage and sensitive landscapes.</p> <p>The settlement hierarchy identifies the settlements which are most suitable in sustainability terms to meet the development needs of the District to 2037. It provides the framework from which the spatial strategy has evolved and sustainable development can be realized.</p> <p>In proposing the preferred allocations in the first draft Local Plan version the council assessed sites against a detailed set of criteria and were also subject to a process of Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>The assessment of potential development areas focused on sites which lie within or close to one of the settlements identified for growth potential. Locations where development would not be permitted by national policy, such as those in high flood risk areas, were discounted.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan does not allocate very small sites of less than 0.25 hectares in size and these have not been considered for allocation.</p> <p>10% of the identified housing supply comes from sites no larger than one hectare in accordance with the NPPF.</p> <p>The site assessment methodology involved a multistep approach. Sites were assessed against a detailed set of criteria and have been subject to a process of Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>The site selection methodology is explained in detail in the site selection background paper.</p>
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Area Plan	<p>Page 32, Para A and A.1 – The use of the words "evidenced" and "re-use of previously developed land" are very welcome but do need to be strictly adhered to / policed they often are over-ridden for some "compelling reason"</p> <p>Page 33, Para B.3. The separation of Rural Bassetlaw to large and small and the consequent reduction to 5% are more than welcome.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF142	Retford Branch Labour Party	<p>We broadly welcome the Plan, and its aims of making Bassetlaw's diverse villages and towns a good place to live and work in, and a beautiful place to enjoy for leisure activities. In particular, the plans to develop a garden village with road and rail links and quality employment potential is particularly impressive.</p> <p>The Plan will affect residents and visitors alike for the next 40 years. The expensive schemes for the regeneration of Worksop, and the road network improvements around Peaks Hill will make a huge difference to generations of people.</p> <p>Within our town Retford Branch Members are also extremely pleased to see the preservation of Green Space on the Sandhills, retention of allotments, and the burgeoning plans for the Town Centre.</p> <p>However, we do feel that the Plan has some serious failings which need to be addressed, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A disproportionate housing allocation Retford with serious concerns around the impact of housing on transport and traffic. 2. No clear links between these and job creation in the District - either physically or in our transport network. Retford is getting homes but not the jobs. Job creation opportunities such as the High Marnham Energy Hub lack the ambition to create the jobs needed to justify the homes. 3. A lack of environmental vision particularly not using powers to enforce low carbon technology, EV charging, recycling and better walking/cycling. <p>If these are addressed, then we feel that the Plan can be truly future proof and ensure responsible development for our Town and District. Our response reflects the specific concerns of the Retford Branch of the Labour Party. We have also consulted, where needed, specialists in the areas of concern to our members. In developing this response, we hope not just to raise concerns but also provide considered recommendations on how the Plan should be altered within to alleviate our concerns.</p>	<p>The response to the 3 points of concern is as follows:</p> <p>An objective of the Local Plan is to see Retford grow in a sensitive and sustainable manner with the provision of well-located housing to better meet the needs of the different groups in the community. New infrastructure and connectivity improvements will flow from housing development which will enhance the town's character for the benefit of local residents.</p> <p>The aim is for the new housing developments to be high quality, well designed, energy efficient and respectful of their setting.</p> <p>The local plan contains objectives and policies aimed at producing low carbon and energy efficient design techniques, use of green technologies, extensive tree planting, use of electric vehicles and alternative fuel vehicles will reduce the carbon footprint enabling the transition to a low carbon economy, and mitigating the impact of climate change.</p>
REF146	Elkesley Neighbourhood Plan Group	<p>5.1.31 states there is no identified need for new retail development to 2035. Does the garden village not fall into this heading as retail is identified within the policy for it?</p> <p>5.1.35 'encourage use of brown field sites and where possible reduce impact on green fields'. Could this dissuade planners from approving developments in localities that don't have brown field sites available or could Neighbourhood Plans that support development in green field sites enable development to happen?</p>	<p>The Garden Village provides a genuinely long-term</p> <p>Sustainable growth plan for Bassetlaw, beyond the lifetime of the Local Plan. On that basis 500 Dwellings will be provided by 2037 providing greater resilience in housing delivery.</p> <p>The scale of development will mean that this provides the basis of a genuinely long-term sustainable growth plan for Bassetlaw, beyond the lifetime of the Local Plan. A commercial hub to include retail provision will be provided but expected after 2037 when the majority of the housing will be built.</p>
REF159	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>Page 31 is misleading 5.1.47 states that there has been 260 completions and 1765 in planned form. However the summary sheet sets out that 1702 new houses in plan or completed. Also within the plan there is discussion around there being a doubling in size! This would not be the 2028 stated and i would say that this is an under estimation as there are many more new houses in this area than is quarter.</p>	<p>Figures to be updated.</p> <p>The information on outstanding permissions reflects the position as at 30/11/2020. The 1702 dwellings is the required figure set for Harworth and Bircotes.</p>
1666746	Resident	<p>Page 25, para 5.1.1. Use of words 'sustainable'/'sustainability' is vague. Does it refer to land that will pay its way and continue to produce revenue for the council in terms of rent or council tax? Strait forward statements of intent to acquire, re-use land for building to increase tax revenues would do. Will my council tax bill sky rocket through the 19 years of the plan?</p>	<p>The term sustainable development is defined in the Local Plan Glossary and in the NPPF (Resolution 42/187 of the United Nations General Assembly)</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
			<p>See paragraph 8 of NPPF for what sustainable development means in social, economic and environmental terms.</p> <p>The purpose of the plan is to provide housing, employment and the necessary infrastructure for the benefit of the community. Much of the infrastructure is funded by developer contribution under planning agreements tied to the granting of planning permission.</p>
1666746	Resident	<p>Page 26/27/30, para 5.1.9/5.1.10/5.1.18/5.1.35. The premise that economic development will attract skilled workers is at best hopeful, given Covid and the legacy that will be with us at national and local level. Use of the Govt Standard Method to calculate housing need needs a rethink in the light of Covid. No stats are included to indicate present housing capacity and recent uptake of rented /private dwellings that would effect the guesstimates of GSM. Current rates of new housing completions in Bassetlaw-this is no where robust enough , based on a two year average; Covid will act as a massive brake on future delivery targets.</p>	<p>The long term impacts of the pandemic are unclear. There could be a sharp economic rebound. The need and demand for affordable housing is unlikely to change.</p>
REF132	JVH Planning on behalf of Kilner Estate	<p>1 The Plan Period and the Housing Requirement. The Plan period goes from 2020 to 2037 and seeks to make provision for 10,013 new homes. This is derived from the demographic calculation of 288 dwellings per annum, with an economic uplift to 589 dwellings per annum. The Plan does not set out where in the calculation the affordable housing need has been included, as this is a need of 2,814 new homes, which is a significant amount of the proposed total. The Plan should set out the calculation in a simple table which identifies the required elements and how much they have added over the base calculation. At the moment it is not clear how the figures have been arrived at and if they are adequate to meet the need identified. The calculations should be in the plan so that it is clear and not in an accompanying document</p> <p>2 The Spatial Strategy The strategy for the distribution of new homes is based on the three main settlements of Worksop, Retford and Harworth/Bircotes; the larger rural villages, smaller villages; a garden village and the redevelopment of a power station site.</p> <p>However the Plan is very confusing over the amount of land to be allocated in each of these tiers or locations once the existing commitments in the form of planning permissions have been deducted.</p> <p>As a result of this the Plan is misrepresenting the position in the small rural settlement as set out in the table on page 36, which is completely misleading. It is not clear from the plan if the 1502 dwellings in the small rural settlements are a new requirement or include existing permissions.</p> <p>Furthermore it makes no sense to be allocating a Garden Village in the rural area to deliver 500 homes in the Plan Period when the existing sustainable small rural villages are already showing a surplus over their projected requirement. New settlements are notoriously difficult to get started, infrastructure heavy and unreliable. They have only succeeded in areas of very high demand and have taken many years to deliver homes.</p> <p>A better strategy would be to increase the level of homes in the smaller settlements so that new permissions can be granted here, making best use of the existing social community and physical infrastructure in those settlements.</p> <p>There is no meaningful table in the Plan for each level of the settlement hierarchy showing the requirement, the commitments and what is left to be found. As the Plan stands it is a highly confusing document that does not convey to Plan users what is to be found where, which is the basic requirement of a Local Plan.</p>	<p>An explanation of the calculation and assessment of need is set out in the evidence document the Housing and Economic Development need Assessment produced by GL Hearn in November, 2020.</p> <p>The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>The housing need to be provided for does include all outstanding permissions as at November 2020 position. Sixty six percent of the housing requirement has planning permission. This will be updated in the Submission version of the Plan.</p> <p>The allocation of sites in the small rural village needs to be proportionate in order to preserve their character and identity.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY		<p>We do not consider that the redevelopment of the Cottam Power Station is a sustainable Proposal. The site lies in an isolated area, and would not be a choice for development if it were not a brownfield site. It is not considered that the development timetable is realistic and that homes will be delivered in the timescales anticipated.</p> <p>Accordingly we object to Policy ST1 on the basis that it includes new settlements at Cottam and at the A57/A1, which we consider are unsustainable and undeliverable.</p> <p>We object to the Cottam Power Station and the Garden Village being included in the strategy and suggest that the whole settlement hierarchy needs to be re visited with proper consideration of the level of homes that are needed over the Plan Period. The proposed development in the Garden Village and Cottam can be redistributed within the existing settlement hierarchy to settlements that can deliver new homes and can provide existing social and physical infrastructure.</p> <p>We object to Policy ST2, it is not clear if the figures on page 35 are a new requirement or include existing permissions.</p> <p>Pages 36 and 37 lists the smaller rural settlements which collectively accommodate 1,502 of the housing requirement, again it is not clear if these figures include existing commitments</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF135	Pegasus Group on behalf of land owner	<p>Policy ST1: Bassetlaw Spatial Strategy</p> <p>Policy ST1 identifies a minimum housing requirement of 10,013 dwellings over the plan period (2018-2037). This is expressed as an average annual requirement of 589 dwellings per annum (dpa). The expression of the housing requirement as a minimum is supported and is considered consistent with the NPPF. It is acknowledged that Langold is identified as a Large Rural Settlement within the Local Plan Spatial Strategy and that due to the population and services available it is one of the most sustainable rural settlements (paragraph 5.1.49). This is supported.</p> <p>Our client's site, Land at Chestnut Road, is identified as a committed housing site with a housing capacity of 300 dwellings. However, it is noted that the Development Boundary does not include the site within the boundary for Langold.</p> <p>As discussed with Officers, it is our client's intention to develop on the Land at Chestnut Road, as per the approved consent. It is, therefore, considered that the site should be included within the development boundary of Langold. Furthermore, the site is included as an identified development site with assigned design code within recently Examined Hodstock and Langold Neighbourhood Plan. To place the site outside Langold effectively places the site within the wider countryside, undermining policies ST1 and ST2.</p> <p>The exclusion of the committed sites from within the development limits of Langold does not promote sustainable development and is therefore contrary to the requirements of Paragraph 35 of the NPPF.</p>	All committed sites with planning permission to be shown as falling within settlement boundaries.
REF137	Pegasus Group on behalf of Sunnyside Dairy Farms Limited	<p>Policy ST1 Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy</p> <p>Policy ST1 Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy focuses on delivering sustainable development and growth, appropriate to the size of each settlement in order to meet the evidenced need for new homes and jobs, regenerating the District's town centres, and supporting necessary improvements to infrastructure, services and facilities. Policy ST1 A advises that this strategy will be achieved through;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) promoting the efficient and effective use of land and the re-use of previously developed land in sustainable locations, unless there are overriding amenity, biodiversity or heritage matters, and minimising the use of the most versatile agricultural land; 2) emphasising the need to develop in sustainable locations in close proximity to transport hubs, key transport nodes and encouraging higher density development in those locations; and 3) ensuring that sufficient physical, social and green infrastructure is delivered to meet identified needs in a timely manner. <p>Sub clause B of Policy ST1 sets out the housing requirement of a minimum of 10,013 dwellings over the plan period 2020-2037 (589 dwellings per annum), with this requirement to be distributed in accordance with a settlement hierarchy that focuses on the Main Towns (Worksop Outer Area, Worksop Central Area, Retford and Harworth and Bircotes), the Large Rural Settlements, Small Rural Settlements, and the Bassetlaw Garden Village as a New Settlement. Normanton on Trent is included as a Small Rural Settlement. The settlement hierarchy at Policy ST1 B, advises that for eligible Small Rural Settlements growth will be supported for about 1,500 dwellings on appropriate sites within development boundaries or on site allocations in Neighbourhood Plans by up to 5%. This has been amended from the 20% growth previously proposed within the January 2020 Draft Local Plan. Whilst policy commentary at paragraph 5.1.53 states that Policy ST1 proposes 'a minimum of 1,500 dwellings across the eligible Small Rural Settlements', this is not expressed as a minimum in Policy ST1 itself.</p> <p>Policy commentary at paragraph 5.1.52 advises that the sustainable growth of Small Rural Settlements will help to sustain these settlements in the long term, but that it is recognised that their often greater environmental constraints can limit the ability of each settlement to accommodate growth. The NPPF at paragraph 78 confirms that in order 'to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services.' The support for development proposals that would help maintain local services and facilities was highlighted through the public consultation exercise in relation to land at Gracefield Lane, Normanton on Trent, which took place in September/October 2017. 10% growth for Small Rural Settlements is considered appropriate and will help sustain these settlements as sustainable settlements, and</p>	For settlements with, or without development boundaries any proposed new housing allocations in addition to existing commitments will need to be carried through the Development Plan process. All planning applications will be considered in accordance with the policies of the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
		<p>contribute to meeting the District's now higher housing requirement. The Spatial Strategy Background Paper (November 2020) confirms that there are 27 settlement that have development boundaries in the Core Strategy, some of which have been subject to review as part of the Local Plan Review. There is no development boundary (existing or proposed) for Normanton on Trent (and for many other Small Rural Settlements), this means that additional growth over the proposed 5% can only be accommodated through Neighbourhood Plans in such settlements. Reference to settlement boundaries should therefore be removed.</p> <p>For Policy ST1, sub clause 3 should be amended to read: 'By supporting the growth of eligible Small Rural Settlements for at least 1,500 dwellings on appropriate sites by up to 10% of 2018 dwelling numbers for each settlement, with any additional provision to be identified on site allocations in Neighbourhood Plans.'</p>	
REF158	Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council - in agreement with Rotherham and Doncaster Councils	Whilst the draft plan recognises at paragraph 5.1.17 that the Council will work with neighbouring authorities to undertake additional work to further consider the impacts of the strategic employment site, it is noted that no discussions or Duty to Co-operate engagement has been undertaken on this matter following the concerns expressed in relation to the January 2020 draft.	Statements of Common Ground have been signed between the Council and Doncaster and Rotherham councils which include an ongoing commitment to work together to consider strategic cross-boundary matters including strategic employment sites and traffic impacts. These will be updated throughout the plan-making process.
REF172	Elkesley Parish Council	<p>4.15, 5.1.35 'encourage use of brown field sites and where possible reduce impact on green fields'. We would like to see something within the plan that ensures planners are not dissuaded from approving developments in localities that don't have brown field sites available and when those developments are supported by the residents.</p> <p>5.1.31 states there is no identified need for new retail development to 2035. The garden village and the Yew Tree site at Elkesley both have retail development as part of the pre planning application and the draft local plan, will this now be changed or will this retail development be allowed to continue.</p> <p>Having read through the plan we are broadly in support of the direction it is going with planning for development in future years. What we would like to see within the plan is a policy that protects existing settlements from decline due to the promotion of new development. Whilst good quality new development is inevitable that should not be to the detriment of any existing settlement, the existing settlements need to be included and considered when new development is considered.</p>	<p>The Spatial Strategy recognises that the Large and Small Rural Settlements should be allowed to grow appropriately in order to maintain rural vitality, but Policy ST2 also ensures that this is sensitive to place.</p> <p>The Bassetlaw Retail and Leisure Study, 201716 states there is no identified need for retail development. It does not consider needs on proposed new housing sites such as the Garden Village.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF175	Resident	<p>In principle I do not oppose the revised list of Retford housing 'Allocation Sites'. They are on the periphery of the town with relatively easy access.</p> <p>I accept that the government have put targets for you, BDC, to meet, and that as a town we have to grow but I, like everyone wants a pleasant and safe living environment.</p> <p>Within very recent times housing estates have sprung up all-around Retford – Tiln, Hallcroft, London Road, Ordsall. Over the years the town has lost many big employers with just Rampton Hospital and Ranby Prison being left. We have become a commuter town where people have to travel to work. Most families have two cars. Many families with young people will have three/four cars.</p> <p>My main concerns regarding Policies 23, 25, 26, 27, 29 and the Garden Village are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Increased and flow of traffic into and through the town b. junctions c. Estate layout, car parking and safety of pedestrians and cyclists d. Walking and cycling pathways 	<p>The Local Plan vision is for Bassetlaw to provide residents with a high quality of life, increased access to: quality, suitable housing, a wider range of higher skilled, well paid jobs, high quality facilities in a low Carbon environment. The policies of the adopted plan will be implemented with that vision in mind.</p>
REF186	Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England	ST1: We welcome the additional criteria at A. 2. (transport hubs and nodes) and 3. (social and green infrastructure).	Support noted

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF151	Guy Taylor Associates on behalf of land owners	<p>Overall we are pleased to see Bassetlaw District Council reviewing the requirements for housing within rural locations. As is the case with a number of authorities it is recognised that the sustainability of rural communities has been restricted by previous policies leading to the loss of many community facilities in these locations during the plan period.</p> <p>Policy ST1 - Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy.</p> <p>The Spatial Strategy in relation to Small Rural Settlements has seen the most dramatic and impactful policy changes within the Draft submissions of the Part II Plan. The two versions of the strategy published for consultation in 2020 show an increased requirement for the delivery of rural housing from a minimum of 1,090 in January 2020 to a minimum of 1,502 in the November 2020 version, however, this 45% increase in housing requirement across rural settlements, the allocations for individual parishes have significantly reduced from around a 20% uplift to around a 5% uplift with a considerable number receiving no growth allocation. It is therefore difficult on first reading to reconcile the disparity between the increased housing requirement within rural settlements and the net reduction by 75% for each Parish. It is worthy of consideration at this point that whilst the target figures have increased and Bassetlaw have exceeded the housing requirements for the district at the time of publication, it is common knowledge that the New Standard Method for Housing Need was issued on the 16th December 2020 subsequent to the publication of the November draft of the Part II Plan. This will have generated an uplift in the housing requirements for the district and whilst Bassetlaw had exceeded requirements, it is now likely to be very close to the minimum delivery level if not below it. Consequentially this revision to the housing requirements will need to be reviewed within the next draft of the plan and it would be prudent to reconsider the level of growth allocated for the rural settlements in order to deliver the aspirations of the plan in terms of supporting the rural economy. It is expected within the policy that growth within rural communities should be identified by communities through their Neighbourhood Plan and should not exceed the allocation by more than 5% unless identified by the Neighbourhood Plan. Whilst this premise is admirable, it is the case that many Neighbourhood Plans are at various stages of their cycle and a number have been caught out by the shifting position of Bassetlaw with specific reference to the allocation tables within the Part II Plan submissions and are unable at present to establish whether they need to allocate sites and the scale of allocation due to this indecision which is likely to change once more once the New Standard Method of Housing Need is applied.</p>	Policy ST2 has been updated to show housing provision for the large and small rural settlements.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF163	Pegasus Group on behalf of the Harworth Group	<p>Harworth Group is one of the leading land and property regeneration companies in the UK, owning and managing around 18,000 acres on around 100 sites in the north of England and the Midlands, including residential development land, commercial property, agricultural estates and low carbon energy and environmental schemes. Harworth are highly experienced at redeveloping previously developed land, including former collieries and power stations. Policy ST1 Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy focuses on delivering sustainable development and growth, appropriate to the size of each settlement to meet evidenced need for new homes and jobs, regenerating the District's town centres, and supporting necessary improvements to infrastructure, services and facilities. Policy ST1 A advises that this strategy will be achieved through;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) promoting the efficient and effective use of land and the re-use of previously developed land in sustainable locations, unless there are overriding amenity, biodiversity or heritage matters, and minimising the use of the most versatile agricultural land; 2) emphasising the need to develop in sustainable locations in close proximity to transport hubs, key transport nodes and encouraging higher density development in those locations; and 3) ensuring that sufficient physical, social and green infrastructure is delivered to meet identified needs in a timely manner. <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2019 encourages the use of previously developed land, and paragraph 117 confirms that strategic policies should set out a clear strategy for accommodating objectively assessed needs, in a way that makes as much use as possible of previously-developed land. Paragraph 118 advises that planning policies and decisions should give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land for homes and other identified needs, supporting opportunities to remediate land. The emerging Local Plan will play a critical role in bringing forward previously-developed land such as Cottam Power Station. Policy ST1 A is considered to be consistent with Section 11 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Subsection B of Policy ST1 sets out the housing requirement of a minimum of 10,013 dwellings over the plan period 2020-2037, in accordance with a settlement hierarchy, focusing on the Main Towns (Worksop Outer Area, Worksop Central Area, Retford and Harworth and Bircotes), the Large Rural Settlements, Small Settlements, and the Bassetlaw Garden Village as a New Settlement. Paragraph 3.22 within Section 3 Context confirms that within the rural area are two significant redundant brownfield sites; the former High Marnham and former Cottam Power Stations, advising that the extensive remediation, reclamation and redevelopment are priorities to positively regenerate these significant sites to the benefit of the economy, community and the environment. The regeneration of these significant brownfield sites is however not reflected within the settlement hierarchy. Whilst Subsection D of ST2 confirms support for prioritising the use of brownfield sites within the Small Rural Settlements, it is considered that these sites should also be included within the settlement hierarchy at Policy ST1 B under New Settlement.</p> <p>Policy ST1 B. 5. – Suggested Amendment:</p> <p>Category Settlement New Settlement</p> <p>Bassetlaw Garden Village, Former Cottam Power Station</p>	As delivery the Former Cottam Power Station site is unlikely during this plan period it would not be justified to allocate it as a new garden village settlement. Priority Regeneration Area is considered more appropriate.
REF164	Fisher German on behalf of land owners	<p>Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy</p> <p>Policy ST1 sets the housing requirement for Bassetlaw during the period 2020-2037. The Council have followed national policy and guidance utilising the Local Housing Need (LHN) as a starting point for establishing its housing requirement. It is noted that in December 2020 the Government published further changes to the Standard Method for assessing LHN, however, for Bassetlaw this results in no change from the existing method, albeit the LHN significantly increases for Sheffield.</p> <p>The Planning Practice Guidance is unequivocal that “the standard method for assessing local housing need provides a minimum starting point in determining the number of homes needed in an area. It does not attempt to predict the impact that future government policies, changing economic circumstances or other factors might have on demographic behaviour” [our emphasis]. In this context, it is worth remembering the LHN is predominantly demographic led, and as such ‘policy-on’ considerations such as delivering infrastructure, increasing the supply of affordable housing or as in this case, ensuring economic growth and prosperity cannot always be achieved using this base figure. In this regard, the Council’s approach to increase the Housing Requirement to 589 dwellings per annum is supported and has been effectively justified in the supporting Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (Update 2020). Without suitable increases in housing, the Council’s employment and economic goals are likely to be restricted due to lack of available working population, or alternatively will lead to large patterns of unsustainable movements as residents commute out of the District to access jobs.</p> <p>Increasing the Housing Requirement also reflects Government ambitions to boost significantly the supply of housing (NPPF Para 59). The Council’s approach to increasing the LHR above the figure derived from the Standard Methodology is considered sound and is supported. Notwithstanding the above, it should be noted that the recent changes to the Standard Method significantly increase the housing requirement for Sheffield City. It is therefore considered that additional flexibility should be built into Bassetlaw’s emerging Plan so in the event that Sheffield City confirm it is unable to meet its own needs, any share of the unmet need can be accommodated by Bassetlaw</p>	There are currently more than 1500 dwellings committed on sites with extant planning permissions within, or on the edge of the small rural settlements. These are expected to be delivered within 5 years.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
		<p>ahead of any review of the Plan.</p> <p>The proposed Spatial Strategy within Policy ST1, which seeks to deliver sustainable development and growth, appropriate to the size of each settlement to meet the evidenced need for new homes and jobs in the District is generally supported.</p> <p>With regards to spatial distribution, the Council intends to locate 65% of its housing requirement in the Main Towns of Retford, Worksop and Harworth. The approach focuses development in the most sustainable locations, whilst still enabling suitable rural growth which is essential for ensuring rural communities can support essential services and ensures their long-term vitality. Concerns are however raised in respect of the proposed Bassetlaw Garden Village (Policy ST3). The Garden Village allocation is intended to make a contribution of 5% of the total requirement over the Plan period. Whilst the contribution of the Garden Village to the supply of housing over the Plan period has been reduced since the Plan was last consulted on it is still considered that assumed delivery from the site is ambitious and may result in the Council not meeting its housing need over the Plan period. To ensure a deliverable Plan, it is imperative that the Council's delivery assumptions for the emerging sites are realistic.</p> <p>In addition to the above, circa 15% of the housing requirement is to be delivered by Local Plan allocations, Neighbourhood Plan allocations and windfalls in the Large Rural Settlements.</p> <p>A further 15% of the total housing requirement (approximately 1,500 dwellings) is proposed to be delivered in the Small Rural Settlements (which include Treswell), on sites within settlement boundaries or on sites allocated in Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <p>Regarding the overall number of homes to be allocated to Small Rural Settlements, it is noted that this has increased by 3% from the previous Draft Plan. The increased quantum of housing to the Small Rural Settlements is generally supported as this will serve to enhance and maintain the vitality of these rural communities.</p> <p>Concern is however raised in respect of the proposed cap on growth of 'up to 5%' of the existing settlement size (whereas the previous Draft Plan allowed up to 20% growth). The cap does not seem to be based on any clear evidence and could result in the failure to deliver the 1,500 homes assigned to Small Rural Settlements (as detailed in response to Policy ST2 below).</p>	
REF166	Fisher German on behalf of land owners	<p>Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy</p> <p>Policy ST1 sets the housing requirement for Bassetlaw during the period 2020-2037. The Council have followed national policy and guidance utilising the Local Housing Need (LHN) as a starting point for establishing its housing requirement. It is noted that in December 2020 the Government published further changes to the Standard Method for assessing LHN, however, for Bassetlaw this results in no change from the existing method, albeit the LHN significantly increases for Sheffield.</p> <p>The Planning Practice Guidance is unequivocal that "the standard method for assessing local housing need provides a minimum starting point in determining the number of homes needed in an area. It does not attempt to predict the impact that future government policies, changing economic circumstances or other factors might have on demographic behaviour" [our emphasis]. In this context, it is worth remembering the LHN is predominantly demographic led, and as such 'policy-on' considerations such as delivering infrastructure, increasing the supply of affordable housing or as in this case, ensuring economic growth and prosperity cannot always be achieved using this base figure. In this regard, the Council's approach to increase the Housing Requirement to 589 dwellings per annum is supported and has been effectively justified in the supporting Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (Update 2020). Without suitable increases in housing, the Council's employment and economic goals are likely to be restricted due to lack of available working population, or alternatively will lead to large patterns of unsustainable movements as residents commute out of the District to access jobs.</p> <p>Increasing the Housing Requirement also reflects Government ambitions to boost significantly the supply of housing (NPPF Para 59). The Council's approach to increasing the LHR above the figure derived from the Standard Methodology is considered sound and is supported. Notwithstanding the above, it should be noted that the recent changes to the Standard Method significantly increase the housing requirement for Sheffield City. It is therefore considered that additional flexibility should be built into Bassetlaw's emerging Plan so in the event that Sheffield City confirm it is unable to meet its own needs, any share of the unmet need can be accommodated by Bassetlaw ahead of any review of the Plan. The proposed Spatial Strategy within Policy ST1, which seeks to deliver sustainable development and growth, appropriate to the size of each settlement to meet the evidenced need for new homes and jobs in the District is generally supported.</p> <p>With regards to spatial distribution, the Council intends to locate 65% of its housing requirement in the Main Towns of Retford, Worksop and Harworth. The approach focuses development in the most sustainable locations, whilst still enabling suitable rural growth which is essential for ensuring rural communities can support essential services and ensures their long-term vitality. Of the three Main Towns, Harworth & Bircotes is proposed to receive the lowest number of proposed dwellings (approx. 1,700 dwellings). Regarding Harworth & Bircotes, the text associated with Policy ST1 (paragraph 5.1.47) states the following: "Over the past two years, Harworth & Bircotes has seen strong growth with just over 260 completions. A significant amount of additional land has planning permission for over 1765</p>	Harworth and Bircotes will receive over 14% of the growth during the plan period. This is considered to be commensurate with its size. It is a smaller town than Worksop in population terms, and has less services and facilities provision.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
		<p>dwellings (as at 30/10/2020). On that basis, no further allocations are proposed in this Plan".</p> <p>The Council's proposed approach to not direct any further growth at Harworth & Bircotes purely as a result of the existing commitments for the town is not supported.</p> <p>The January 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan advised that the number of homes 'in the pipeline' was 1,853 dwellings and Harworth & Bircotes was assigned a housing requirement of 2,000 dwellings. It is not clear why the housing requirement for Harworth has since been reduced to circa 1,700.</p> <p>Whilst it is recognised that the current housing commitments in the town will provide a much-needed boost to housing supply in the early years of the plan period, it is considered that allocating more homes to Harworth & Bircotes will enable the Plan to encourage further growth, into the later years of the plan period. Paragraph 67 of the NPPF sets out that planning policies should identify a supply of specific deliverable sites for years one to five and "specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth, for years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-15 of the plan". Whilst it could be argued that the current commitments may deliver homes for the town for around a 10 year period, we are concerned that not allocating further homes now may stifle development in years 11 – 15 of the plan period.</p> <p>As the Council's Land Availability Assessment (November 2020) shows, there are a number of available sites at Harworth & Bircotes which could be allocated to future proof the Plan and ensure delivery throughout the whole plan period.</p> <p>Allocating such sites now, or even safeguarding the land to enable them to be brought forward should other sites be delayed in delivery, would be appropriate given Harworth & Bircotes status as a 'Main Town' in the emerging Settlement Hierarchy. Moreover, crucially, this will continue to encourage further investment and regeneration in the town, as well as its planned economic growth.</p> <p>Regarding the Main Town tier of the proposed Settlement Hierarchy, it is noted that Worksop is proposed to receive a much higher amount of growth (circa 3,100 dwellings) than what is proposed for Harworth & Bircotes (circa 1,700 dwellings). Due to Harworth & Bircotes being located within the same settlement tier as Worksop we consider that it would be logical for Harworth to receive more housing, commensurate with its tier in the hierarchy.</p> <p>Finally, Harworth & Bircotes is a designated Neighbourhood Plan area and the Neighbourhood Plan was Made in December 2015. It is important that the District Council's Plan should set out a housing requirement for the Town which will encourage the Neighbourhood Plan to be reviewed in a timely manner to meet the development needs of the period up to 2037.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF167	Marrons Planning on behalf of Vistry Homes Limited.	<p>Plan Period</p> <p>5. It is suggested that the plan period is reviewed. The intended plan period is 2018- 2037 but it is now unlikely that the plan will be adopted until 2023. A plan period of a minimum of 15 years from the point of adoption (NPPF, para. 22) is expected.</p> <p>6. The plan period should run to at least 2038, and arguably to 2039, in order to allow for any unexpected delay in the plan making process. The housing requirement should therefore be increased by circa 1,200 homes over the extended Plan period and the council should identify further housing allocations to meet this requirement.</p> <p>Windfalls</p> <p>7. It appears that the Plan relies upon past trends in part to support a windfall rate of 100 dwellings per annum from Year 6 of the Plan. It is suggested this is unreliable as delivery rates will vary and the Council should review the sources of historic supply; consider whether they will continue at the previous rate, and consider whether there are other sources of supply that may transpire.</p> <p>8. In addition, the Council needs to consider whether any proposed policies will affect the supply of windfalls. Factored into this should be consideration of known sites that may come forward from a comprehensive brownfield land register and housing land availability assessments. Spatial Strategy.</p> <p>9. The Draft Local Plan proposes a five-tier settlement hierarchy comprised of Main Towns, Large Rural Settlements, Small Rural Settlements, a New Settlement (Bassetlaw Garden Village) and then Countryside. Retford is the second largest settlement in the Bassetlaw District and is identified as a 'Main Town' along with Worksop (the largest settlement) and Harworth & Bircotes.</p> <p>10. Retford is a sustainable location for new development and its position as a Main Town is supported. Paragraph 5.1.43 of the draft Local Plan confirms that Retford is a sustainable location for growth due to its ability to maximise opportunities for sustainable and public transport choices.</p> <p>11. The proportion of housing growth that Retford will accommodate has increased from the previous draft version of the plan (January 2020). The increase in the number of dwellings to be provided at Retford is welcome, and better reflects the role of the town in the settlement hierarchy and as a sustainable location for development.</p> <p>12. However, should the Council need to find additional sites to supplement its supply to ensure the Plan is sound when submitted it should first consider sites around Retford owing to its sustainability and ability to accommodate further growth.</p>	<p>The Council has undertaken an assessment of historic windfall delivery on small sites. It considers that the evidence justifies the 100 windfall allowance. There will be no windfall allowance for the first 5 years of the plan.</p> <p>Retford will be contributing 17% of the required housing growth during the plan period. The council is not looking to allocate additional sites at present.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF171	Lichfields on behalf of land owners	<p>Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy</p> <p>The draft Policies Map show various amendments to the development boundary of Ranskill, in accordance with draft Policy ST1. As part of this, the development boundary to the west of the settlement is shown to be significantly extended, we assume to accommodate a potential housing site that was formerly proposed to be allocated within the emerging Ranskill Neighbourhood Plan (site ref. NP19).</p> <p>This particular amendment to the development boundary is no longer justified on the basis that Policy ST1 now looks to deliver a significantly reduced number of new dwellings in Ranskill. Whilst provisions under draft Policy ST2 allows for an uplifted level of growth to be provided if support is demonstrated via a neighbourhood plan, in this case, the Neighbourhood Plan Group is only just consulting on whether Site NP19 should be included in light of the reduced housing requirement figure (see Appendix 1). For the reasons we set out below, our client has - and will continue to - object to this site being allocated. To include this site within the settlement boundary at this stage, would therefore clearly pre-empt the Neighbourhood Plan process. Accordingly, the proposed amendment to the western development boundary of Ranskill remains unjustified within the draft Bassetlaw Local Plan and, thus, unsound in the context of paragraph 35 of the NPPF. In any event, in the context that it is deemed appropriate to amend Ranskill's settlement boundaries, we do not consider that Site NP19 represents the most appropriate extension to the settlement on the basis that any such allocation:</p> <p>1 Does not represent a natural extension to the village and, in the absence of any particular natural or physical boundaries, would risk future unconstrained sprawl. Indeed, the layout of the proposed masterplan for Site NP19 – as submitted to the Neighbourhood Plan – makes clear the intent to develop further southwards beyond the proposed revised development boundary.</p> <p>2 Would require residents - including school children - to cross the busy, Great North Road in order to access services such as the school and recreation area. Conversely, an extension to the north of Ranskill would represent a far more logical, 'rounding off' of the existing settlement by extending the area of existing housing off Aundel Drive and infilling land that is bound to the north, west and east by existing roads. Indeed, these would act as physical, defensible boundaries from which the extent of growth can be controlled. A vision document showing the extent of this area is attached and demonstrates how new housing – alongside a village hall / GP surgery, shop and new open space - could be provided in this location and form a natural extension to the village. Accordingly, in the event that Ranskill's settlement boundary is to be amended, then this site clearly represents the most appropriate location. We welcome, however, the proposed amendment to south eastern development boundary of Ranskill. This is in accordance with the draft Ranskill Neighbourhood Plan seeking to allocate site NP25 for employment purposes and follows earlier rounds of public consultation demonstrating clear local support for this. The Neighbourhood Plan Group has also confirmed that this allocation is to be taken forward regardless of the outcome of the additional consultation on Site N19 referenced above. As such, and quite distinct from the wider proposed extensions to the settlement boundary, this particular amendment to the development boundary is effective, justified and sound in the context of paragraph 35 of the NPPF.</p>	<p>There is sufficient provision in the supply including significant buffer to meet the assessed requirement.</p> <p>It will be for the neighbourhood plan process to consider the development boundaries, and whether any new additional allocations should be made in conformity with the strategic policies of the local plan/core strategy.</p>
REF171	Lichfields on behalf of land owners	In summary, our client considers the draft Local Plan to be unsound in respect of draft Policy ST1 (insofar as it relates to the amended development boundary to the west of Ranskill) and draft Policy ST2. Whilst support is given in principle for draft policies ST11 and ST12, the comments set out in this letter seek to ensure the soundness of these policies in the context of paragraph 35 of the NPPF. We trust that the above representation is helpful and will be taken into account in the further preparation of the Bassetlaw Local Plan. We would be grateful if you could keep us informed of all stages of progress, including with regard to submission and opportunity for participation in the Examination in Public.	Support is noted – see above

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF184	Doncaster Council	<p>Development in Harworth/Bircotes and the Bawtry Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>Doncaster Council's previous response (February 2020) reiterated our concerns and all those of Bawtry Town Council over the additional impact of the expansion of Harworth/Bircoates on traffic in Doncaster Borough especially Bawtry (as shown in the adopted Bawtry Neighborhood Plan (Section 9: Impacts of the Expansion of Harworth, p25)). Although traffic modelling work to assess the impact of the major Harworth/Bircotes housing developments on the Tickhill Road/ High Street junction in particular and Bawtry/Tickhill area in general has been undertaken, it is not obvious from the Local Plan that the results of this have been considered.</p> <p>The Consultation response summary document (January 2020) for ST01 Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy reference 171 states that "A Statement of Common Ground has been signed between the Council and Doncaster Council which includes an ongoing commitment to work together to manage traffic impacts across boundaries. The Local Plan proposes no allocations in Harworth & Bircotes."</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the Bassetlaw Local Plan does not include further allocations in Harworth & Bircotes, however, the comment reflects concerns over the impact of development to date on traffic in Bawtry. Doncaster Council wishes for the discussions regarding the duty to cooperate to continue.</p> <p>Also, please ensure that Bawtry Town Council, a neighbouring parish council, are consulted on the Bassetlaw Local Plan at each stage.</p>	<p>All housing growth in Harworth/Bircotes will come from existing commitments with planning permission. The impact of this growth has already been considered including at appeals.</p> <p>All who commented on this version of the plan will be notified of the publication of the proposed submission plan and invited to comment.</p>
REF197	Resident	In terms of geographical and social adjacency, areas to the west and south of Bassetlaw are included but much less emphasis is placed on the areas to the east and north, especially Gainsborough and Doncaster. As Bassetlaw shares a river with West Lindsey, and many in the north east of the District travel to Gainsborough for education, employment and social activities, it would seem worth including.	<p>The policies apply to the whole district. Decisions on site allocations were based upon an assessment of the most sustainable alternative options. The Former Cottam Power Station site is redundant brownfield sites on the eastern edge of the District.</p> <p>Its remediation, reclamation and redevelopment would regenerate and enhance the quality of the environment for the benefit of the economy and the local community</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF211	National Trust	<p>Spatial Strategy supporting text - 5.1.11 – 5.1.17</p> <p>The strategy for employment land is led by 'land supply' i.e. land being promoted to the Council by its owner or agent. The fact that a piece of land is being promoted does not necessarily make that land a sustainable development proposition, particularly if it is greenfield land for which there is no demonstrable need. The allocation of a 'strategic employment site' on greenfield land at Apleyhead could impact on the viability of other development/regeneration sites both within the district and elsewhere, as well as having impacts on the local environment and strategic road network. We urge the Council to reconsider this strategic approach. In this iteration of the plan, the Council does recognise that boosting the employment land allocation significantly above what is required to support local employment will also have implications for housing requirements, effectively doubling the housing requirement over the plan period.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal report (table 4.6) suggests that an employment target based on large-scale aspirational growth may have a significant negative effect on biodiversity and geodiversity and may also have negative effects on land use and soils, water, flood risk, air quality, resource use and waste, cultural heritage, landscape and townscape. However, the associated Sustainability Appraisal of the Spatial Strategy (table 6.3 and supporting text) fails to properly consider the implications of large-scale greenfield allocations.</p> <p>We note with some concern that according to the Habitats Regulations Assessment (Appropriate Assessment) there may be adverse effects on the integrity of Sherwood Forest ppSPA as a result of air pollution and potentially recreational pressure and cat predation arising from the sizeable increase in employment and housing utilising large greenfield sites close to Clumber Park. The HRA clearly states that further information on traffic and potentially air quality modelling 'is required before the Local Plan is submitted for Examination' (para 6.7). The acceptability of major site allocations at Apleyhead and Bassetlaw Garden Village in relation to air quality has therefore not yet been established and cannot be deferred to project level HRAs after the plan has been adopted.</p> <p>ST1 A Part A of Policy ST1 states that the Spatial Strategy will focus on delivering sustainable development and growth 'to meet the evidenced need for new homes and jobs'. In line with our comments above, we are concerned that the Spatial Strategy approach conflates the concepts of 'need' and 'supply' and that the resulting strategy may not constitute sustainable development.</p> <p>ST1 A1 We support the promotion of 'the efficient and effective use of land and the re-use of previously developed land' along with 'minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3 agricultural land'. However, the proposed allocation of a large amount of greenfield development land for which there is no demonstrable need would appear to contradict this aspect of the strategy.</p> <p>ST1 B The provision of land for a minimum of 10,013 dwellings (589 dpa) – approximately double the assessed need – is tied to the over-allocation of employment land and may not therefore constitute sustainable development.</p> <p>ST1 D The provision of land to create 11,200 jobs is associated with the proposed allocation of greenfield development land significantly over and above an upper end need calculation for employment and may not therefore constitute sustainable development.</p>	<p>The evolution of the preferred Spatial Strategy has followed a methodical and flexible approach. It has followed national planning policy and guidance, and local planning objectives, as well as the sustainability objectives criteria contained within the Sustainability Appraisal. It is based upon the most up to date evidence that was available at each stage in the process.</p> <p>The process has responded to the views expressed by the local community, elected members, parish councils, statutory bodies and developers at the different stages of consultation in the selection of the preferred development Options.</p> <p>The process has also responded to changing circumstances as the evidence was refined relating to the re-distribution of land uses in order to help deliver a significant increase in housing provision balanced with environmental protection, in accordance with government objectives.</p>
1667329	Resident	<p>Disagree with the degree of supply led employment and housing. The government minimum for housing is 288 per annum. the BDC figure of 589 is over a 100% increase.</p> <p>This will be too damaging to the environment, and put too much strain on existing infrastructure. Too much development of Retford and Worksop will spoil the market towns character.</p> <p>Page 32 5.1.53 I agree with the small rural settlements definition and the percentage being limited to 5%. This should help minimise the use of agricultural land being used to meet unrealistic targets set for small villages</p>	<p>The evolution of the preferred Spatial Strategy has followed a methodical approach. It has followed national planning policy and guidance, and local planning objectives, as well as the sustainability objectives criteria contained within the Sustainability Appraisal. It is based upon the most up to date evidence that was available at each stage in the process.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
1668401	Resident	Much of the proposed development is supported. The proposal rightly makes the case for sustainable development and an investment in the future for the young residents. The ability of the first time buyers to get on the property ladder is extremely difficult. I would ask the following: what will be done to ensure the homes are for the people of Bassetlaw firstly, what limitation on numbers will be in place to reduce foreign buyers from purchasing homes , finally what limitations on private property investors will be in place .	The objective is for affordable housing provision to benefit the local community of Bassetlaw. Support noted.
1669799	Resident	(5.1.9) The right types of homes in the right places? What does Bassetlaw consider to be the right type of home? Where do bungalows come into this strategy, if at all? Bassetlaw's past failure in ensuring sufficient bungalows were built to meet the needs of the elderly or infirm has contributed to the "outmigration" of people who needed such housing. I have referred to several reasons why people require bungalows but not yet mentioned their preference. Why does someone have to be elderly or infirm to want to live in a bungalow. They may just simply prefer to live in a bungalow for any number of different reasons but in Bassetlaw their preferences are not even taken into account. (5.1.21) Is this the crux of the problem? Only grant planning permission if the developers cram as many houses onto the site as possible. This suits developers all the way as they obviously cream off far more from houses than bungalows or they would be building bungalows. Or, perhaps the truth of the matter is that Bassetlaw is telling developers not to build bungalows? Quality housing is also mentioned & that is all I am asking for, a nice 3 bedroom quality detached bungalow that we can spend the rest of our years in, with our family close by & at the same time free up a large 4 bedroom detached house to a young family. (5.1.47) I refer back to my earlier comments regarding recent & proposed housing & the number of bungalows included. Out of the 260 recent completions how many were bungalows? The only ones as far as I am aware are on Well Hill Drive but I am open to correction. Out of the more than 1765 to be built how many are bungalows? The information that I have is none but again I am open to correction.	Policies 32 and 33 require development to provide an appropriate mix and type of market and affordable housing, and specialist housing for older people and disabled persons informed by the most up to date Council evidence of housing. This would include the provision of bungalows.
1670549	Resident	The assumptions of growth and housing demand behind this work have been overtaken by the pandemic which will have weakened demand for housing going forward. New jobs are the priority for the area and should be prioritised over housing.	Demand for housing is strong and there has been a recent increase in prices despite the pandemic. According to the Halifax the property market showed a 1.3 % jump in the cost of homes in May 2021 in the UK.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
1670589	Resident	<p>5.1.21 The housing requirement it is asked that numbers in Small Rural Settlements are increased to support and sustain infrastructure in the settlements. The 5% growth in numbers in Sutton-cumlound mitigates against providing starter homes or accommodation for elderly people looking for smaller housing. It will drive up the building of fewer, and to keep within the growth percentage it will mean more large and more expensive houses. It is important that the mix of houses to be developed is given more consideration rather than growth percentage.</p> <p>Retail Needs 5.1.31 Developments and expansion in Small Rural Settlements such as Sutton-cum-lound will help to sustain local retail which is currently not available, and will create employment.</p> <p>5.1.36 To overcome the shortfall of land, small scale sites in village settlements, of land currently unused and unlikely to be used for any other purpose, should be part of local plans. It is asked that a small site near the church in Sutton-cum-lound is given consideration for development, reference number 281. It is currently wasteland, and should be utilised for housing development. This land is part of an old stackyard and provides potential for various developments. At the last planning review this site received a large number of responses supporting its use for housing. The shortage of land is mentioned in the plan, pieces of land currently wasteland and unable to be used for other purposes should be given consideration. The piece of land number 281 has potential for a small development, in keeping with the historical look of the old farm building conversations. Such small pieces of land should be utilised.</p> <p>Small Rural Settlements – 5.1.52 The sustainable growth of Small Rural Settlements does not recognise the significant changes to work patterns which has taken place, working from home and the provision of shared business facilities should be encouraged. The growth limit should not be constrained in Small Rural Settlements and should not have a 5% limit. A higher figure would help create a better mix of residential development and employment uses to sustain other services in those communities. The 5% growth in numbers in Sutton-cumlound will mitigate against providing starter homes or accommodation for elderly people looking for smaller housing, a larger number/percentage growth is needed to provide scope for development of more and small houses. A limit of 5% growth will drive up the building of fewer and implicitly larger houses. To keep within the growth percentage it will mean large and more expensive houses, not necessarily the right mix of housing. It is important that the mix of houses to be developed is given more consideration rather than growth percentage.</p>	<p>The Local Plan supports the use and redevelopment of redundant PDL. Policy ST2 allows for small villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Development of isolated homes in the countryside should be avoided.</p> <p>The 5% growth rate for the small rural villages was arrived at through a process which took into account the views of the local community, elected members, parish councils, statutory bodies and developers at the different stages of consultation in the selection of the preferred development options.</p> <p>Policy 32: Houses Mix, Type and Density requires a mix which is based on the most up to date evidence of need in the 2020 HEDNA.</p>
1670869	Resident	<p>paras 5.1.5. 5.1.53 and 5.1.54 "Each level of the hierarchy reflects the settlement/area's role, the range of services present, their accessibility by public transport, their infrastructure capacity and their ability to expand to accommodate the needs generated by new development" - this does not seem to be the case when considering the Cottam Power Station site. Why is Cottam village not considered a small rural settlement and therefore subject to the 5% housing growth as set out in the policy ST1? It could be considered that by discounting Cottam village as a small rural settlement, this allows for the CPS site to be identified as a site with no or minimal impact - especially ot anyone who does not know the area. Is this disingenuous...?</p>	<p>The categorization of villages is based on a methodical and robust assessment carried out. This is outlined in detail in the Rural Settlements background paper supporting the Plan.</p>
1671143	Resident	I believe that the reduction from a 20% to 5% in the requirement for new build as applied to the Small Rural Settlements is a good move and one that ought to find widespread support across those communities.	Support noted
REF024	Resident	I believe Cottam along with Bole and Sturton are small rural settlements so why are the council proposing over 700 new homes at Cottam and over 400 at West Burton? This surely goes against the Bassetlaw Plan which clearly states 5% of new builds in these areas.	The redevelopment of the Cottam Power Station site is expected to deliver housing.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			Its remediation, reclamation and redevelopment would regenerate and enhance the quality of the environment for the benefit of the economy and the local community
REF109	Resident	<p>5.1.36 The land adjoining Worksop and Retford may be able to sustain the majority of the houses required for the area, but by allocating only two main areas, this will put additional pressure on the local infrastructure as the already busy roads currently struggle to cope during peak times.</p> <p>5.1.38 & 5.1.44 Nearly a quarter of the Retford housing will be located in the Trinity Farm plot after phase 2 is completed, this will have a serious impact on the road infrastructure. The revised plans show each house has been allocated 2 parking places so potentially an additional 880 cars could be using North Road in Retford which could cause major traffic issues on a regular basis.</p> <p>5.1.43 The businesses which have moved into the new employment premises off Randall Way, Retford, have provided little or no additional employment as they have relocated. Public transport is not an option for many people due to the location of where they work to where they live.</p>	The impacts of development would need to be mitigated, and there would be developer contributions to improve capacity and flows.
REF110	Resident	<p>It appears that the "The Draft Plan" proposes house-building at a rate almost double what is required using the current government's recommended method of calculation. Should they use the current standard method there should be a reduction of at least 600- 800 homes.</p>	<p>The objectively assessed housing need of 591 dwellings per annum has been set at a level to support the full extent of the jobs growth (11,236 jobs) identified by the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment Update November, 2020.</p> <p>The Standard Method calculates a minimum housing need for Bassetlaw of 288 dwellings per annum for the period 2020-2037. This is not a housing requirement figure rather it is the minimum starting point.</p> <p>The increase in housing need above the standard method figure is a reflection of changing economic circumstances and growth strategies in the District. It also reflects market signals where over the past few years 64,045sqm floorspace has been completed on the General Employment Sites, 70.9ha has been granted planning permission since April 2018.</p> <p>This higher figure would also help delivering infrastructure and there is support for it from the D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF134	Resident	<p>I feel I cannot really add to this but would ask that my general development comments be regarded for the specific site and for the general policies of the Plan:</p> <p>e.g. Open countryside should be developed as a last resort, with urban and brown field sites developed first.</p> <p>If developed, landscape corridors should be required and stipulated in planning permissions, together with detailed landscape requirements and open spaces for the site itself. The Local Plan must give specific detailed requirements so a later Planning Permission can include and enforce such requirements.</p> <p>Suitable houses, in keeping with an area, should be allowed for the local district residents, including affordable housing, not just for commuters to outside areas/Cities, like Sheffield.</p> <p>Villages should be allowed to remain and not swamped or taken in by urban expansion.</p> <p>Un occupied houses in the Towns should be brought into use to help housing waiting lists, or their area redeveloped, in preference to more development in the countryside. Section 106 Agreements with Developers should be required in detailed planning policies so Planning Permissions can include and hold Developers to account.</p>	The objective is to locate new development in sustainable locations that respect the environment and support a balanced pattern of growth across urban and rural areas, and makes best use of previously developed land and buildings and minimises the loss of countryside.
REF136	Resident	<p>I fully support the plan to build on areas outside Retford.</p> <p>Retford has seen too much development over the last 10 years. We have lost too many of our green spaces to building plots. We have seen that these areas are vital for people to exercise and enjoy open spaces close to the Town. By building further away i.e considering the Cottam Power station site for building is an excellent proposal. Provided the infrastructure is there to support the community this should offer residents the opportunity to thrive outside what is now becoming an increasingly populated area.</p> <p>Retford has now become a dormitory town where people sleep here but work away in Gainsborough, Doncaster etc. At times during the day this extra traffic causes gridlock around the town. Building outside would give easy access to main roads without struggling to get through the town.</p> <p>I strongly support the Council's attempts to free up the town.</p>	Support for the redevelopment of the Cottam Power station site is noted.
REF140	Resident	I approve of the draft local plan and the site allocations for Retford & Ordsall	Support noted

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF144	Resident	<p>As a resident of Carlton in Lindrick I have followed up the request to comment on these plans but do find it rather difficult to find any particularly constructive statements presented after those issued previously !.</p> <p>I, amongst other residents, did make various contributions (both at the meetings and to the relevant documents, etc.) regarding the future plans for our village but there does not seem to have been any really constructive feedback since then. [We do also have our own residents Internet site but I am not aware of any feedback being presented by yourselves on there]</p> <p>One of the issues raised on the Internet was that of the land available at previous mining site in Costhorpe (which many of us thought should have been part of the original development plan - rather than using the farming land that was eventually utilised !) but since then there has been no constructive statement(s) about any future plans for that site, so I am very surprised that I can still find no reference to that issue in the Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>If there is any intention to permit this site to be redeveloped then surely this should be allowed for in your planning as clearly it will have rather a major affect on various aspects of this village, such as transport, schooling, medical facilities, shopping, etc. [but hopefully also ensuring that we remain as a separated village and are not ever incorporated into the residential growth that is currently spreading in our direction !]</p> <p>One aspect about the evolving growth of Worksop and its surrounds is that much of the housing development has been occurring on the North of the town, whereas the major traffic route is the A57 which itself is supporting many of the major employment facilities on the South of the town - resulting in the need for a large number of local residents to travel across town each day ! This is not an easy task as there is no well developed route for that traffic (and even the Ashes Park Road was not constructed as a suitable dual carriageway to help alleviate that growing problem !).</p> <p>The allocation of land on the A57 opposite the Wilko factory for industrial use is surely going to add to that problem but is it not possible to include some residential housing on the triangular plot of land between the B6079 and the railway line (with possibly a railway station and a suitable footpath), thus providing local accommodation for staff working at those factories ?</p>	<p>The Council has assessed all available sites – see Bassetlaw Land Availability Assessment. Most suitable sites including brownfield sites have been taken forward as allocations where they are developable and deliverable.</p> <p>The Local Plan is informed by the Bassetlaw Transport Study Parts 1, 2 and 3 which identifies the impact of the allocations on the highways network and recommends highway improvements to aid traffic flow around the town including to the A57 and a new road between Blyth Road and Carlton Road. The Council continues to work with Nottinghamshire County Council Highways and Highways England on the Local Plan. This ensures proposed allocations are suitable and deliverable in highways terms.</p>
REF150	Harworth and Bircotes Town Council	The Harworth & Bircotes Town Council is supportive of the vision statement for Harworth & Bircotes, as shown in the Draft Local Plan. The Town Council values the decision by Bassetlaw to restrict the allocation of new housing development sites up to the year 2037; this allows the Town Council to work with the agreed developments, and accordingly meaningfully review the Neighbourhood Plan and the complete the Town Centre Masterplan.	Support noted
REF176	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	It is important to note that the Local Plan is a statutory requirement set by the government, however it has been raised that the Draft Local Plan is twice that recommended by the government to allocate housing need. This is justified by the predicted (and desired) employment growth, however in light of the Covid-19 Pandemic and the subsequent impact, it is likely that growth won't be as what has been ambitiously predicted. With this in mind, are the larger developments required on that scale?	The Covid-19 is considered a short-term set back to growth. According to the Halifax the property market showed a 1.3 % jump in the cost of homes in May 2021 in the UK.
REF183	Resident	While there are fine ambitions there must be doubt cast on the scale of housing proposed which does not seem to follow the method required by government. Population growth figures used now and previously suggest any housing growth will not be near the scale being proposed. There is no justification for exceeding the minimum required under the government's method. You seem to base housing growth on employment growth but show no clear link to job creation. It looks as if Retford gets houses but no jobs.	The objectively assessed housing need of 591 dwellings per annum has been set at a level to support the full extent of the jobs growth (11,236 jobs) identified by the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment Update November, 2020. The Standard Method calculates a minimum housing need for Bassetlaw of 288 dwellings per annum for the period 2020-2037. This is not a

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
			<p>housing requirement figure rather it is the minimum starting point. The increase in housing need above the standard method figure is a reflection of changing economic circumstances and growth strategies in the District. It also reflects market signals where over the past few years 64,045sqm floorspace has been completed on the General Employment Sites, 70.9ha has been granted planning permission since April 2018.</p> <p>This higher figure would also help delivering infrastructure and there is support for it from the D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership</p>
REF189	NHS Bassetlaw CCG	<p>It is important to understand further when there are any proposals/developments that include increase in residential care home/specialist housing as this will clearly need to be profiled against increasing health needs, whilst the plan sets out the expected growth, understandable it's not clear when this will be delivered. This is particularly pertinent given the existing projections for increases in population over 65 and aged over 80 year (43.1% increase in over 65's and 83% of over 80's) over the plan period.- and any additionality resulting from the developments in this regard. We would welcome support from BDC in the development of a standard formula or approach to support our shared understanding of the correlation between demographic characteristics and demand on health services. For example, the Plan identifies: 'There is a need for around 900 extra care units in the District over the plan period. A starting point will be a new scheme at HS13: Ordsall South' this would clearly directly impact Retford and Villages Primary Care Network, similarly the development at Peaks Hill would impact Newgate PCN and Larwood and Blyth PCN. We would also encourage any new housing growth to be based on the concept of adaptability and fully incorporate the 'Internet of Things' so that all new housing offers flexible adaptation for residents as they transition throughout their life rather than creating additional demand for specialised housing in the future.</p> <p>Primary Medical Services and Community health provision is vital to ensure services are provided close to home, primary care is increasingly working across primary care network footprints to deliver more services in the community, population increases inevitably increase the number of people registered at a GP practice that requires additional GPs and space from which to deliver services. As previously mentioned there is already considerable pressure on this space. We would be keen to ensure any new housing scheme took full consideration of the impact on demand for services and welcome the Council requirement for 'All schemes of 50 or more dwellings will be required to submit a Rapid Health Impact Assessment Matrix as part of the planning application' which is fantastic, we would welcome any shared input we may have in reviewing the Health Impact Assessment Matrix .</p> <p>Welcome the recognition throughout the plan for the health infrastructure financial contributions and look forward to working with the BDC as plans develop locally.</p> <p>As referenced above, we would welcome more information as each of the development progress locally to further understand the anticipated changes to demographic profiles and assess the full impact on NHS services, to further understand the nature and extent of services that will be affected. An increase in population would clearly increase demand it would be useful to model the likely scenarios when further information about the type of developments becomes available.</p>	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan sets out what additional infrastructure will be needed to deliver the development identified in the Local Plan including for health services. For key infrastructure it sets out cost estimates, timings, funding sources and those responsible for delivery infrastructure financial contributions</p> <p>Policy ST28 details the plan's requirements for specialist housing and thus the requirement of care homes as well. The policy details a requirement on schemes of 50 or more dwellings to provide at least 20% accessible and adaptable dwellings.</p> <p>The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment 2020 updates the need for older people. The Local Plan includes numerous strategic housing sites. The majority of these will contribute towards the supply of further specialist housing in the District. The scale of these strategic development sites will also enable further funding to health care provision in the District as well. Discussions will continue with the CCG to ensure that there is a clear understanding of the location of specialist housing, as well as agreeing an approach to securing developer contributions from new development for primary and Hospital facilities</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF206	Derbyshire County Council, Economy, Transport, and Environment	<p>As you will be aware, the County Council engages in collaborative and joint working with Bassetlaw District Council on a number of officer working groups, particularly the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw Local Plan Liaison Group and Sheffield City Heads of Planning Group, which also involve officers within the three district councils in Derbyshire including Bolsover District Council, Chesterfield Borough Council and North East Derbyshire District Council. In this context, the County Council has been a signatory to a Statement of Common Ground with all the Sheffield City Region Authorities, including Bassetlaw District council, that sets out a range of agreed principles for the preparation of Local Plans in the constituent authorities, particularly regarding housing provision requirements and agreement amongst the constituent authorities that each authority will meet its own housing needs in full without the need to rely on other neighbouring authorities to meet any unmet housing need that might arise in any adjoining authority area.</p> <p>In this context, it is noted and supported that the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan has set out a proposed housing requirement for the District of 10,013 dwellings (589 dwellings per annum) for the period 2020-2037 and identifies sufficient land within the District to meet this need in full without the need for any of this total requirement to be met in neighbouring districts, particularly in Derbyshire. This should ensure that the housing provision level identified should not have any significant adverse impacts on housing delivery in nearby Bolsover, Chesterfield or North East Derbyshire Districts. It is considered that this level of need has been soundly justified and based on the Government's Standard Methodology for Calculating Housing Need with an additional allowance to be included to support the full extent of planned jobs growth in the District of 11,236 jobs identified by the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment Update 2020. This is considered to provide for a balanced and sustainable level of housing and employment growth in the District.</p> <p>In terms of distribution, it is noted and considered that the Draft Local Plan seeks to provide for a sustainable pattern of housing growth focussed on the main towns of Worksop and Retford and larger settlements of Harworth and Bircotes. This proposed distribution of housing is considered unlikely to have any significant impacts on housing delivery in Derbyshire or any significant impacts on existing strategic infrastructure in Derbyshire or need for proposed new infrastructure, for which the County council has a statutory responsibility.</p>	<p>Support is noted.</p> <p>Under a duty to cooperate Bassetlaw Council is collaborating with other prescribed bodies, neighbouring authorities in the housing market area including Derbyshire County Council on strategic matters that cross administrative boundaries, which they need to address in their plans</p>
REF227	Resident	<p>Having exhaustively read through and considered the Plan I can only in general terms bemoan and decry the complete lack of any emphasis or direction in relation to the rest of the county of Nottinghamshire and in particular to the areas and districts immediately to the south and east of the district in the approach to Newark, Edwinstowe and Ollerton, for example. A number of the planning, development, housing and most especially transport needs of the district can be much more effectively and appropriately met by a realignment of the district's focus towards and relationships with adjacent districts within Nottinghamshire rather than with the Council's obsession with rendering Bassetlaw a mere siphon and servant of the needs of Sheffield and South Yorkshire to the extent of the Bassetlaw district merely being rendered a subservient satellite of those areas. No wonder there is so much "out-commuting", with more and more of that, very sensibly, going south and east.</p>	<p>Under a duty to cooperate Bassetlaw Council is collaborating with other prescribed bodies, neighbouring authorities in the housing market area including the County Council on strategic matters that cross administrative boundaries, which they need to address in their plans.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF181	Rural Solutions on behalf of Foljambe	<p>Draft Policy ST1 (Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy): Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy categorises Sturton-le-Steeple as a 'small rural settlement'. It also aims to support the growth of the eligible Small Rural Settlements by about 1,500 dwellings on appropriate sites within the development boundaries, or on site allocations in Neighbourhood Plans by up to 5%.</p> <p>Policy ST1 as drafted is unjustified and unsound. Development in small rural settlements is capped at 5%, inclusive of sites within development boundaries, or on-site allocations in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>We note that the policy wording has changed quite considerably since the January 2020 version of the Local Plan was issued for comment. The January 2020 edition of the Plan specified that up to 20% of the existing number of dwellings in the Parish up to 2037, would be acceptable in rural settlements, including Sturton-le-Steeple. This allows much more flexibility, than the suggested 5%, for the rural settlements to grow, and to ensure that they remain as sustainable settlements.</p> <p>The Council have not provided any clear justification for this revised figure or its cap in the evidence base. The housing requirement in the Small Rural Settlements has not decreased, it has actually increased from 1,090 as stipulated in Draft Policy ST1 (January 2020 version) to 1,500 in the Publication Draft version.</p> <p>Each application should be determined on its own merits based on the principles of sustainable development and the future sustainable growth of rural settlements should not be restricted because an arbitrary cap of 5% has been reached.</p> <p>Policies ST1 and ST2 are currently unsound with an unjustified cap on sustainable growth in the Rural Settlements. The wording of these policies should be updated to reflect our comments made above on the restrictive percentage but to also allow sustainable development to come forward, regardless of the identified housing requirement. The purpose is to ensure the vitality and viability of all settlements and to provide local communities with a choice of new homes.</p> <p>Policy ST1, Policy ST2To ensure the soundness tests of Policies ST1 and ST2 are met, we respectfully request change the wording to allow for a greater level of housing growth in the Small Rural Settlements. Furthermore, there should be no cap on sustainable development to be in line with national policy. It is important that the smaller rural settlements such as Sturton-le-Steeple are able to make a meaningful contribution to the future housing land supply in the Bassetlaw District and to ensure that they can maintain a healthy population within their local communities.</p>	<p>Considering the large number of settlements in the Small Rural Settlements category it is expected that about 15% (over 1800 dwellings.*) as at 1 April 2021 of the District's housing need will be delivered from this category of the settlement hierarchy. Some settlements have exceeded the 5% growth.</p> <p>Rural settlements should retain their identity and distinctiveness, built form and character in keeping with each settlement's size, scale of services and infrastructure capacity.</p> <p>*This figure also includes areas defined as countryside.</p>
REF195 PHF	Freeths on behalf of Hallam Land Management	<p>Our clients recognise and support the strategic objective of meeting housing needs of the Borough over the plan period and in particular note and support the references in para. 5.1.9 of the Draft Local Plan in relation to facilitating a step change in the District's economy and aligning economic growth with the housing offer in the Borough by providing the right type of new homes, in the right places.</p> <p>Further, our clients also support the statement in para. 5.1.20 of the Draft Local Plan which recognises that pursuing a housing target based purely on Government household projections, would mean the plan would provide an insufficient number of dwellings to support economic growth in the District.</p> <p>We consider that these statements of intent are all the more important given the impact of the Covid 19 pandemic, through which it has become apparent that a permanent change in the way people work, with more home working, is likely in the future. It is even more important therefore to ensure that housing numbers and housing sizes reflect the economic growth target of the District and this likely change in working patterns.</p> <p>Our clients support proposed Policy ST1, in particular ST1B, and the provision of land for a minimum of 10,013 dwellings at an annual delivery of 589 dwellings per annum. They also support ST1B1 in terms of the settlement hierarchy identified. Our clients further support Policy ST1D, in terms of the provision of at least 168 hectares of general employment land in the plan period.</p>	Support - noted

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF099	Consultant, Trustees of H S Wallis Lanowner	<p>Para 5.1.2 draws special attention to what is seen as a step change in the District's economy in seeking to reflect new priorities. The paragraph draws attention to one of these priorities - the growth zone associate with the A1 strategic corridor - (this approach derives from the 2019 Spatial Strategy Background Paper in which the value of the A1 corridor associated with Harworth is recognised as a "logistics corridor").</p> <p>The following paragraph then summarises the aims of Draft Policy ST1 - to encourage the effective use of greenfield land "....where this will bring social, economic and environmental benefits....". This in turn derives from the Background Paper para. 1.3 in setting the scene for the Local plan to look for "...sustainable housing growth particularly in rural parts of the District."</p> <p>There are few sites better placed to achieve these objectives than the site the subject of these representations fitting so well as it does into the local landscape and the built forms of "North Blyth", proximity to the A1 and close relationship with substantial areas having permission for employment uses.</p> <p>Subsequent paragraphs set out the process by which the PSatial Strategy has emerged. They refer to the wish to retain the Main Town, Large and Small Rural Settlements hierarchy. However, no where in the document is there any indication that the distinctiveness of "North Blyth" is recognised or where it might fit into this categorisation.</p> <p>Whilst being within the parish of Blyth the area could not be more distinct and separate (not least by the A1) from the core of the more historic core of Blyth.</p> <p>There is an argument for suggesting it is a settlement in its own right but equally it could be argued that it is better for all planning purposes to see it as being "clustered" with the main town of Harwoth/Bircotes just to the north.</p> <p>Paras 5.1.24-5.1.26 briefly describe Harwoth/Bircotes in part in the following terms "Harworth & Bircotes is' a strategically advantageous economic location and is expected to deliver significant employment growth (see Policy ST6)... reflecting its easy access to the A1(M)"</p> <p>Paras 5.1.27-5.1.31 then set out the approach to be taken with Large Rural Settlements (LRS) of which Blyth is one of five. Having noted that the rural settlements of Bassetlaw vary considerably Para. 5.1.28 goes on to state about the LRS's that they :- "...are the most sustainable due to them having the largest populations habing higher numbers of journeys made to employment, shops and services and having the most frequent and commercially viable public transport services to nearby larger towns and cities. All serve both the settlements themselves and the surrounding rural area. Focusing rural development there will help support existing facilites and provide a focal point for use by residents of the surrounding small villages and hamlets."</p> <p>In earlier para. 5.1.9 the Draft Plan in referring to future housing states that the largest towns would see the largest growth (a not uncommon approach) but it then goes on to state "...but rural settlements would be able to increase their populations by up to 20%..."</p> <p>Nothin in the text indicates that this the approach is to be applied to LRS's</p> <p>When the Draft plan later sets out its approach to Small Rural Settlements (SRS) it again refers to a 20% maximum per parish justified briefly on the basis of the need to sustain those villages which often have greater environmental contraints.</p> <p>It is only in the actual Draft Policy ST1 that the Draft Plan clearly identifies that the 20% limit will only apply to SRS's. LRS's are to be planned in the same way as the Main Towns.</p> <p>The Draft policy ST1-B2a refers to land allocations and appropriate forms of development within their settlemnt boundaries. However although nominally part of Blyth the area lossely referred to as "North Blyth" does not have any development boundary.</p> <p>Given the very speical and strategic advantages attaching to this part of the District and the planning permissions that have already been granted this is something of an anomaly.</p> <p>In appearing to totally ignore this area the Draft Local Plan appears here to be diverging not only from what is set out above but also from the "Vision for Bassetlaw 2037" set out in the Background Paper where at para. 4.12 it states "4.12 The district will a diverse and thriving economy with Worksop, Retford and Harworth and Bircotes and the Large Rural Settlements acting as employment and service centres for the surrounding rural areas..."</p> <p>In Draft Policy ST1-C1 it indicates that a minimum of 1764 dwellings are to be permitted in the LRS's on "...sites allocated or to be allocated in Neighbourhood Plans..." So a clear statement that allocations in the Local Plan will be made thus followingg through on the importance the Draft Plan is attaching to LRS's</p> <p>However, later in the Draft Plan (Section 7) under the heading "Housing Distribution" at paa. 7.1.6 it states:- "7.16 In the early plan perioud more development will be believerd by commitments in Worksop, Retford, and Harworth & Bircotes; in sustainable locationsin accordance with Policy ST1. Similarly housing development will take place in the Large Rural settlements either through Neighbourhood Plann allocations or via commitments...."</p> <p>So now there to be NO Local Plan allocations for the cities in LRS's?</p> <p>Then the Draft Plan sets out its Policy ST2 under the heading "Rural Bassetlaw". Under ST2-B the policy approach seems to be 'let's leave it</p>	Blyth is included within the Large Rural Settlements due to its size and function as a local service centre. North Blyth is not identified as an eligible settlement because the location is not considered to be sustainable in that location.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
		<p>entirely to the Neighbourhood Plans' to which a 20% cap will be applied.</p> <p>Without further explanation LRS's now seem to have acquired a much reduced status in the hierarchy and are to be treated just like the SRS's.</p> <p>The Draft policy at sub-paragraph B then in tabulating how the 1764 dwellings (the total in the table in the Plan is actually 1747 - the difference being half of the number of dwellings the subject site in "North Blyth" could provide) are to be distributed between the LRS's the text contains the following sentence - "Most of the growth will be delivered through existing planning permissions or through allocated sites made in Neighbourhood Plans or this Local Plan as identified on the Policies Map"</p> <p>There is a clear conflict between not only Draft Strategic Policies 1 and 2 but between what the Draft Plan states to be its broader ambitions.</p> <p>As far as "North Blyth" is concerned not only does it appear that the Local Plan will remain ambivalent, but in abdicating its role in favour of the Blyth Neighbourhood Plan, which is (in the context of Draft Policy ST1) seeking wrongly to apply a 20% cap, the strategic advantages of the area are to be wholly ignored.</p> <p>This seems to be a serious error and entirely contrary to the sentiment expressed in the earlier paragraphs 5.1.27-5.1.28 under the heading "Large Rural Settlements".</p> <p>THERE SEEMS TO BE LITTLE POINT IN EXPLAINING AND THEN ADOPTING A SETTLEMENT HIERARCHY HAVING THREE DISTINCT ELEMENTS AND THEN FOR THE HUGELY IMPORTANT FUNCTION OF PLANNING FOR HOUSING 'LUMPING' TWO OF THEM TOGETHER.</p> <p>In passing it is noted the degree of reliance the Draft Plan is placing on developing a new settlement on the Cottam Power Station site. Given the challenges such a site presents not least in terms of clearance, contamination and flood risk and the inevitable timeframe, over which the Planning Authority has no control whatsoever, the site should surely not feature as a formal allocation but be regarded as a laudable ambition but in planning policy terms somewhat more as a windfall site.</p> <p>There is even a greater argument for it to be seen as an employment site rather than housing.</p>	
REF187	iba Planning on behalf of several clients	<p>The Council has amended the approach to housing growth in the Small Rural Settlements in the latest version of the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan and we have serious concerns regarding these changes.</p> <p>First, the Council has reduced the permitted growth level for Small Rural Settlements from 20% as in the previous version of the plan to just 5%.</p> <p>The Council's rationale for this is purported to be to achieve a 'more balanced distribution of growth' (paragraphs 5.1.37 and 5.1.38 of the Local Plan); the Council also suggests that many of the Small Rural Settlements would struggle to accommodate 20% growth due to constraints such as flood risk and the availability of suitable land (paragraph 5.2.4 of the Local Plan).</p> <p>However, it should be noted that the previously proposed 20% growth cap for Small Rural Settlements was a maximum housing growth figure not a minimum requirement, and so permitting all Small Rural Settlements to grow by up to 20% would not obligate the Council or local communities to accept housing on unsuitable land such as that at risk of flooding, or in settlements without the capacity to accommodate additional development.</p> <p>This being so, there was no harm in permitting all Small Rural Settlements to grow by up to 20%.</p> <p>By decreasing the cap from 20% to just 5%, the Council appears to be painting all Small Rural Settlements with the same brush by assuming that they are all incapable or unsuitable for accommodating 20% growth due to constraints and land availability, which is surely not the case.</p> <p>Such an approach prevents those settlements without constraint (and with capacity) to grow at a level proportionate to their size.</p> <p>The Council says that it has reduced the cap for Small Rural Settlements to 5% in an attempt to balance the distribution of housing, but it is important to note that retaining a 20% cap for both Large Rural Settlements and Small Rural Settlements would also achieve this. This is because, with a 20% cap applied to all rural settlements, each Small Rural Settlement would inevitably provide a smaller number of houses due to their smaller starting size, ensuring all the rural settlements see a level of housing increase proportionate to their size and status and maintaining a balance in housing provision across the rural area.</p> <p>Whilst both strategies could result in a suitably balanced distribution of housing, the 5% cap restricts growth in many smaller settlements which have both the capacity and desire to grow, stifling their ability to thrive and continue to support a diverse community, and preventing them from making a contribution to the housing growth at a scale proportional to their size, in contrary to the aspirations of paragraph 78 of the NPPF.</p> <p>To address this issue, we submit that the cap for Small Rural Settlements be returned to the 20% previously proposed to ensure a balanced distribution of growth and to prevent these important rural communities from stagnating.</p> <p>Our second cause for objection to the latest version of the Local Plan relates to the Council's reduction in the number of Small Rural</p>	<p>Currently more than 15% of the contribution to the housing land supply will come from the Small Rural Villages. These are commitments on sites with planning permission, or allocated in neighbourhood plans. Many of the villages have therefore already met or exceeded their need.</p> <p>Policy ST2 has been amended in terms of its structure to deal with the growth requirement and then to manage any additional residential development in areas. Additional residential development over and above the identified requirement will only be supported where it is planned through a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>A 5% cap for small rural settlements is therefore considered to be justified and would help reduce the potential impact of development on the character and identity of the village and on local infrastructure.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
		<p>Settlements.</p> <p>The Council has altered the criteria for defining Small Rural Settlements (increasing both the number of homes and the number of services required in order to qualify) and this has resulted in a decrease in the number of Small Rural Settlements from 42 (as in the previous version of the plan) to 34.</p> <p>There is no explanation as to why the Council has altered the criteria in either the Local Plan or the background documents and it is unclear what the rationale behind this is.</p> <p>As with the Council's reduction in the housing cap from Small Rural Settlements, this amendment is again considered inconsistent with the aspirations of paragraph 78 of the NPPF.</p> <p>The Bassetlaw Rural Settlement Study 2020 states that those settlements which do not meet the new criteria "are considered too small ... or are too constrained to receive any planned growth and will be treated as countryside as per Policy ST1". We disagree with this - even very small settlements can contribute to housing supply at a scale proportionate to their size and status whilst benefitting the existing community, a point made in our previous representations.</p> <p>As an example, 4-5 well-designed dwellings located in a suitable location in a settlement with, say, 70 dwellings (which falls just below the revised criteria for being a small rural settlement but previous would have been allowed to grow by up to 20%) would not result in an overburdening of the settlement's infrastructure or any notable change in its size or rural character, but would necessarily help support services and facilities in the settlement and surrounding area.</p> <p>Given the above, there is no sound justification for preventing those settlements identified in the previous version of the Local Plan for up to 20% growth from accommodating a small amount of development proportional to their size.</p> <p>The Council's amended approach appears particularly unfounded given that Bassetlaw is a predominantly rural District.</p> <p>We submit that the previous criteria for defining Small Rural Settlements more accurately identified those settlements suitable for growth and therefore ask the Council to reinstate the previous criteria in light of these comments.</p> <p>In amending the list of Small Rural Settlements, the Council has also omitted Welham, Mattersey Thorpe, Hablesthorpe and Woodbeck from being considered as Small Rural Settlements alongside a neighbouring settlement.</p> <p>There is no explanation of this within the Local Plan or supporting documentation and this omission makes little logical sense. All these settlements are part of the same parish as a neighbouring settlement still identified as a Small Rural Settlement and are socially and functionally connected to that neighbouring settlement.</p> <p>Moreover, both Welham and Mattersey Thorpe are covered by made Neighbourhood Plans which implicitly link these settlements to their neighbouring settlements²; Woodbeck is also covered by a well-advanced Neighbourhood Plan (simply awaiting referendum) which seeks to plan for this settlement alongside the neighbouring village of Rampton.</p> <p>Similarly, Hablesthorpe is physically connected to North Leverton and the two settlements have historically been considered as a group and referred to collectively as 'North Leverton with Hablesthorpe'.</p> <p>As such, it makes little logical sense for part of this settlement to no longer be included within the defined Small Rural Settlement.</p> <p>Excluding Welham, Mattersey Thorpe, Hablesthorpe and Woodbeck from the defined Small Rural Settlements represents a further way in which the latest version of the Local Plan restricts the growth of small settlements so vital to their long-term survival as affordable, diverse and thriving communities and prevents such settlements from making a contribution to the balanced distribution of growth desired by the Council at a scale proportional to their size, undermining the Council's purported goals for the Local Plan, the vitality of rural Bassetlaw, and the emerging Local Plan's conformity with national planning policy.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF200	Savills on behalf of land owners	<p>Draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy</p> <p>We have no issue in principle to the overarching spatial strategy of Bassetlaw given it focuses on delivering sustainable development throughout the district which reflects the NPPF.</p> <p>We also approve of the growth directed to villages given that the NPPF (2019) clearly recognises the importance of rural housing in enhancing and maintaining the vitality of rural communities and requires planning policy to identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive.</p> <p>It is important however that rural settlements such as Elkesley are correctly labelled within the settlement hierarchy to allow manage growth in a positive way through allocating deliverable sites to meet their needs. In allocating the correct level of housing commensurate with their size will help sustain a critical mass and ensure key facilities and services continue to thrive and expand what they can offer as well as ensuring that younger generations are able to afford new homes and remain vibrant, attractive places to live.</p> <p>We therefore have reservations on the mis-categorisation of Elkesley, which is discussed in greater detail as part of our comments on draft Policy ST2, which focuses specifically on rural Bassetlaw.</p>	<p>Elkesley does not meet the criteria, as identified within the Rural Background Paper, to be classified as a Large Rural Settlement. Although the village does have some services and facilities, and is located adjacent to the A1 it is rural in character and has slowly grown over the last 20 years. The settlement's role is generally to provide for its residents and it doesn't provide a role to support other settlements' needs.</p> <p>This approach has been supported through the production of the Elkesley Neighbourhood Plan, which is currently being reviewed where smaller sites are favoured over larger developments</p>
REF198 Bevercotes	Gladman Developments Ltd,	<p>With regard to housing, The Standard Method was introduced by the Government to simplify the process of defining housing need, and avoid significant delay and debate experienced in plan preparation and at planning appeals. Revisions to the PPG on the 20th February 2019 confirmed the need for local planning authorities to use the 2014-household projections as the starting point for the assessment of housing need under the standard method². The most significant of these updates was the confirmation of the need for local planning authorities to use the 2014-household projections as the starting point for the assessment of housing need under the standard method. It is also vital to consider the economic impact of COVID-19 and the long-term role that housing will play in supporting the recovery of the economy, both locally and nationally. In this way, Gladman encourage Bassetlaw to fully consider the merits of planning for a housing figure beyond the minimum requirement of 288 dwellings per annum. For instance, an increased housing figure would enable Bassetlaw to capture a larger proportion of the £7 billion yearly housebuilder contributions⁴. With 218,000 homes predicted not to be built due to COVID-19 from now to 2024/255, it is also imperative that Bassetlaw Local Plan identifies sufficient land to support the delivery of homes. In order for the housing needs for the whole plan period to be met, it will also be essential to provide sufficient headroom within the housing supply. In this regard, Gladman supports the Home Builders Federation's recommendation that local plan should seek to identify sufficient deliverable sites to provide a 20% buffer between the housing requirement and supply.</p>	<p>The Council is providing for a requirement of 591 dwellings. As of April 2021 there is an 18 % buffer or contingency in the supply of land for housing, which is considered to be sufficient to protect against non-delivery on some site, and to meet potential unexpected need arising from neighbouring authorities.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF198 Bevercotes	Gladman Developments Ltd	<p>4.3.1 Gladman broadly support the Council's proposed spatial strategy which seeks to deliver sustainable development and growth in line with the Council's ambition to achieve a 'step change' in the local economy.</p> <p>4.3.2 The spatial strategy will be delivered through a range of sites in sustainable locations including a Garden Village and a Priority Regeneration Area. Gladman support the exploration into the delivery of a Garden Village and Priority Regeneration Areas, we are however of the view that the spatial strategy should be modified to acknowledge the scope for further sustainable development at Bevercotes Colliery over the course of the plan period 2020-2037. The inclusion of Bevercotes Colliery, as an additional Priority Regeneration Area for employment development, aligns with the overall spatial strategy for the district which seeks to prioritise the regeneration of previously developed land and strives for a step change in economic growth.</p> <p>4.3.3 Gladman consider that Policy ST1 criterion A1 would also benefit from a modification which makes clear that development, in addition to the areas identified within B2(A), should be directed towards sites on previously developed land which can be made sustainable through their re-development, namely Bevercotes Colliery.</p> <p>Housing Requirement</p> <p>4.3.4 As set out in Section 2 above, in accordance with the NPPF and PPG, the starting point for the minimum housing requirement will be determined using the standard method for assessing local housing need unless exceptional circumstances exist to demonstrate that an alternative approach should instead be followed.</p> <p>4.3.5 Applying the NPPF standardised methodology based on the 2014 household projections results in an objectively assessed need of 281 dwellings per annum for the plan period.</p> <p>Gladman welcome the fact that the Council continues to recognise the need to deliver housing to meet the population and economic growth needs of the district and that the evidence concludes that an uplift against the 2014 household projections is required in order to align with the Council's economic growth ambitions.</p> <p>4.3.6 Policy ST1 seeks to deliver a minimum housing requirement of 10,013 dwellings over the plan period 2020-2037, or 589 dwellings per annum (dpa). The addition of 308dpa exceeds the minimum starting point identified through the standard method and will help to secure the economic objectives and affordability needs of the District Settlement Hierarchy.</p> <p>4.3.7 Criterion B of Policy ST1 sets out the settlement hierarchy for Bassetlaw. Gladman note that the Bassetlaw Garden Village is identified as a 'new settlement within the hierarchy, while Cottam Garden Community, which was listed as a 'large rural settlement' in previous iterations of the Plan has been removed from the settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>4.3.8 Gladman propose that Bevercotes Colliery should be identified within Policy ST1, alongside Cottam, as a Priority Regeneration Area. As demonstrated at Section 5, the former Bevercotes Colliery Site represents a suitable site for identification as a Priority Regeneration Area, an approach that would promote the re-use of previously developed land and be in-keeping with the proposed objectives and spatial strategy of the Plan.</p>	<p>The former Bevercotes Colliery is covered by Local Wildlife Sites and is identified by the Bassetlaw HRA as having the potential to host breeding and foraging protected bird species associated with the Sherwood Forest ppSPA.</p> <p>Allocating the site is therefore contrary to legislation and national planning policy. However, the site has planning permission for employment development which is considered to be deliverable as a mitigation package has previously been agreed.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF117 (Ordsall South Rep)	Barton Wilmore on behalf of land owners	<p>Both of these sites have been identified as potential allocations in the Draft Local Plan. Our client welcomes this and as the Council is aware, Howard Retford Limited has been in regular discussions with the Council in respect of both of these sites. Our client wishes to highlight that they welcome the opportunity to collaborate with Officers and Members to deliver these two allocations, a summary of which is provided below.</p> <p>1.4 These representations express our client's comments on the emerging policy approach and site allocations set out within the November 2020 Draft Local Plan, with particular emphasis on the delivery of housing and employment land. Our client seeks to provide a commentary on the "soundness" of the Local Plan's approach in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and in a positive manner as required by the NPPF.</p> <p>1.5 It is noted that our client is generally supportive of the Council's economic aspirations for the district. However, it is our client's position that the current drafting of the Local Plan does not deliver the right homes in the right places across the district to support the stated ambitions and objectives set out in the Local Plan, including supporting the rejuvenation of the district's main centres. 1.6 We consider that the Local Plan still fails to direct sufficient growth to its main towns, in particular towards Retford, and consider the level of housing growth proposed to be directed towards the rural areas to be excessive and not based on sound planning principles. In addition, we consider the proposal for a 'garden village' within the parish of Babworth to be unsound and without an adequate evidence base regarding deliverability, which is overstated.</p>	<p>The Council considers that the Spatial Strategy set out in the Submission Local Plan, based on the sub-area distribution of growth to be justified as being the most appropriate strategy when considered against all the reasonable alternatives. It is also positively prepared in order to deliver the required housing, business, retail and other development based on effective joint working on strategic cross-boundary matters with neighbouring authorities, including within the Housing Market Area.</p> <p>Retford will be taking 17% of the growth with a large number of sites already committed commensurate with its place in the settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>The new Garden Village is looking to the future, beyond the Local Plan period. The NPPF is very clear that we must plan for a minimum of fifteen years and look beyond this where possible.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF117 (Ordsall South Rep)	Barton Wilmore on behalf of land owners	<p>HOUSING NEEDS AND REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>5.1 Our client supports the 'step change' approach and employment led growth strategy for the District. Paragraphs 5.1.9-5.1.16 set out the employment changes and jobs growth, referencing land that is already consented (our client controls one of those consented sites at Harworth South EM007 and confirms that discussions are well advanced with developers and occupiers).</p> <p>5.2 Our client notes the reference at paragraph 5.1.18 that the Government's Standard Method calculates a minimum housing requirement of 288 dwellings per annum in the period 2020-2037. Since the production of the Plan, the Government has reconfirmed this figure as accurate in its December 2020 Written Ministerial Statement. As such, the strategy advanced by the Council for housing does not need to be adjusted at this stage.</p> <p>5.3 Accordingly, having regard to the 'new' standard methodology and the Council's position in achieving a step change in employment provision, a process which is already well underway, our client supports the statement at 5.1.21 that the Housing Requirement for Bassetlaw needs to be at least 589 dwellings per annum to support the full extent of jobs led growth. Uplift for affordable housing.</p> <p>5.4 Notwithstanding the case for an uplift in housing numbers to account for the economic conditions within Bassetlaw, we consider that there is a case to be made for the level of housing provision to be further increased to account for the need to provide affordable housing within the District.</p> <p>5.5 The newly revised PPG notes that the SMOAN makes an 'affordability adjustment' to ensure that the standard method for assessing local housing need responds to price signals and is consistent with the policy objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. This specific adjustment in this guidance is made in response to the 'affordability' of housing rather than to meet the needs for 'affordable housing'. The adjustment is made only to ensure that housing provision is set at a level to ensure that the minimum housing need "starts to address the affordability of homes". As a minimum, this policy requirement of a Local Plan is only that it does not make the affordability of homes worse.</p> <p>The above makes no requirement on the solving of affordable housing shortfalls within Districts. 5.6 The Council's 2017 Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) identifies affordable housing needs for the District separately, which the SMOAN does not. That affordable housing need shows a need of 134dpa for affordable homes between 2014-2035. The Local Plan (at paragraph 7.13.5) shows that, taking into account current under delivery of affordable housing, there is a residual requirement for 2,578 affordable homes to be delivered within the plan period.</p> <p>5.7 The Local Plan suggests that the above affordable housing needs will not be met due to viability issues. Whilst the ability of the open market to deliver affordable housing is an issue which must be addressed, including allocation of Sites in more buoyant market areas, the main contributing factor to the lack of affordable housing that can be delivered is the lack of housing proposed overall.</p>	The council considers that there is a sufficient uplift over and above the standard 288 calculation to account for affordability as well as affordable housing provision. This is justified in the evidence as contained in the 2020 HEDNA prepared by G L Hearn in accordance with PPG Guidance.
REF117 (Ordsall South Rep)	Barton Wilmore on behalf of land owners	<p>HOUSING SUPPLY AND TRAJECTORY</p> <p>5.8 Paragraph 5.1.23 onwards address the supply of land for housing and include a Local Plan Trajectory (base date 1st April 2020). As part of this section, reference is made to the Council's background paper on Land Availability Assessment (LAA - November 2020).</p> <p>5.9 Our client would generally agree with the main finding of the LAA which is that the district has enough land to meet the overall housing requirement. Bassetlaw does not have significant environmental constraints or Green Belt policy that might otherwise prevent delivery of a higher housing requirement. The findings of the LAA (Table 9) are that there is land available for some 6,678 homes to be provided, against a residual housing requirement of 2,848 dwellings.</p> <p>5.10 We welcome the Council's transparent approach to understanding the existing housing supply. However, we would question whether the residual figure of 2,848 is correct, which appears understated for the following reasons.</p> <p>Developable Area</p> <p>5.11 Firstly, the development area assumptions of achieving 80%, 90% and 100% coverage on a site is unrealistic. Even on the smaller sites, the Council's own policy requires infrastructure and open spaces to be provided. We would recommend the Council uses 70% (max) site coverage across the board.</p>	<p>The development area assumptions are a general guide and every site is different depending upon the constraints and location.</p> <p>The Council has undertaken an assessment of historic windfall delivery on small sites. It considers that the evidence justifies the 100 windfall allowance. There will be no windfall allowance for the first 5 years of the.</p> <p>In relation to Worksop Central Area the Council is currently undertaking consultation on a Regulation 18 DPD, which contains the proposed sites to meet the 700 dwellings. This will contribute to meeting the requirement and forms part of the overall supply.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
		<p>Windfal</p> <p>5.12 Secondly, the Council's justification for the windfall rate is unclear. The Council accepts that all development over the last 10 years has been windfall due to the lack of any previously Local Plan allocations. However, many of these sites have been greenfield locations which would not normally have been permitted if a Local Plan with allocations and development boundaries had been established. It is therefore unclear how the suggested windfall of 440 homes has been calculated. It does not appear to be based upon any robust assessment.</p> <p>5.13 Further, the Council is suggesting an additional 'windfall' of 660/700 dwellings to be provided from the Worksop Town Centre regeneration area. This is unjustified (see below).</p> <p>5.14 Therefore, to assume the continuation of windfall under an adopted Local Plan scenario, at a rate of 1,100 dwellings combined seems optimistic. Further, there seems little point relying on windfall when both the new Local Plan and Central Worksop Development Plan Document are both mechanisms to allocate land for homes.</p> <p>Capacity of Worksop Central Area.</p> <p>5.15 Policy ST6 and the LAA state that the Worksop Central Area will deliver at least 660 homes during the plan period (700(?) homes required under Policy ST1). It is unclear how these figures have been derived. The Council is currently consulting upon a "Call for Sites" exercise for Worksop Central Area which closes on the 11th January. As such, that process is ongoing at the time of writing and it is therefore unclear whether there are landowners who are keen to put their land forward.</p> <p>5.16 In addition, the LAA provides the Council's methodology for assessment of available land. Based on 100% coverage and a density of 40 dwellings per hectare, the Council would need around 16.5 hectares of land within the Central Area. This is clearly unachievable.</p> <p>5.17 Further, the Council appears to have exhausted all possibilities already. Cross referring the Central Worksop Area DPD boundary with the LAA, there are only a very small number of sites identified as having any potential at all. We refer to an extract from the LAA below.</p> <p>5.18 Based upon our review of the Council's LAA, only the following sites lie within the Central Worksop Area - LAA422, LAA426, LAA427, LAA465, LAA467.</p> <p>5.19 It is our firm belief that unless there is a wholesale redevelopment of Worksop Town Centre planned, there is no prospect of the Town Centre delivering anything like 660-700 homes within the Central Area DPD boundary. 5.20 For the reasons above, we consider that the Council has underestimated the residual amount of housing to be allocated through the Local Plan by around 1,000 dwellings. This level of growth needs to be provided for in the main towns of Worksop and Retford, which has proportionately less housing growth than other areas.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF117 (Ordsall South Rep)	Barton Wilmore on behalf of land owners	<p>6.0 POLICY COMMENTS</p> <p>6.1 The Local Plan includes a housing distribution model at paragraph 5.1.38. This has been derived from the Spatial Strategy background paper contained in the evidence base (as updated in November 2020).</p> <p>6.2 The Housing Distribution model has evolved over the last 3 years and the latest is provided on page 24 of the Background Paper. The slight change in focus towards the urban areas of Worksop and Retford is welcomed by our client. However, the Tables provided on pages 23 and 24 of the Background Paper do not include the respective percentage splits. We have taken the liberty of preparing this accordingly which demonstrates that the housing distribution is still unduly skewed towards the Rural Areas.</p> <p>6.3 As set out above, we have significant concerns with how the spatial strategy has proportioned growth across the District; specifically, in relation to the low level of housing requirement proposed for Retford, the overstated requirement for rural settlements and the proposed Garden Village.</p> <p>6.4 Despite the three Main Towns being placed at the top of the proposed settlement hierarchy, we believe the growth required for the District to meet its economic aspirations has been underestimated and the subsequent development requirements have been understated.</p> <p>6.5 Retford has a population of over 22,000 residents and boasts a wide range of services, facilities, shops, employment opportunities and transport links. As well as being designated as a Main Town at the top of the settlement hierarchy, Retford is a good location for development.</p> <p>6.6 As illustrated above, Retford, as the District's second largest town, has been proportionally allocated the least amount of housing development among the existing settlements despite its position in the settlement hierarchy. This is despite, as set out later in these representations, Retford having suitable sites for development and a proven track record of delivering housing where other settlements within the District have been less successful.</p> <p>6.7 The above allocation will lead to the undue restriction of development towards the end of the plan period and leave no reasonable flexibility in the supply of housing land through the plan period to respond to change. This is completely at odds with the economic aspirations of the plan.</p> <p>6.8 We consider that a sustainable approach to planning for the rural area and its settlements is to establish the development needs of those villages and apportion an appropriate level of development where those needs arise. We do not support the level of growth apportioned to the villages and rural area which has simply not been evidenced based on what levels of growth are actually required to support the rural area. Such an evidenced based approach is vital to understanding, and planning for, the future health of rural settlements.</p> <p>6.9 In relation to the Garden Village, the strategy is predicated on first delivering infrastructure in the form of a new railway station as well as road improvements and community facilities. As such, there are serious questions as to whether this site can deliver any housing growth in the remaining plan period to 2037. Whilst we respect the long term aims of the Council, we consider that the contribution from the GV is limited at this stage. 6.10 As such, we propose an alternative housing distribution model for Bassetlaw.</p>	<p>This strategy seeks to provide a more balanced distribution of growth by ensuring that the needs of the entire District are met.</p> <p>The Council considers that the Spatial Strategy set out in the Submission Local Plan, based on the sub-area distribution of growth to be justified as being the most appropriate strategy when considered against all the reasonable alternatives</p> <p>The distribution is considered to be justified and takes into account existing commitments some of which were granted following appeals.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF117 (Ordsall South Rep)	Barton Wilmore on behalf of land owners	<p>LOCAL PLAN POLICY ST1: BASSETLAW'S SPATIAL STRATEGY</p> <p>6.11 We consider that Policy ST1 of the Local Plan should be re-drafted at part B to reflect our comments above. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased housing growth towards Retford; • Removal of proposals for a new Garden Village; and • Reduction in the development directed towards the Rural Area. <p>6.12 Although we are supportive of Policy ST1 directing development to appropriate locations in accordance with the settlement hierarchy, we suggest that a greater housing requirement should be proportioned to support growth and development in the Main Towns in line with our alternative housing distribution provided for above.</p> <p>6.13 Criterion B introduces a new, previously unseen strategy in relation to Worksop, splitting the housing requirement to the Worksop 'Outer' and 'Inner' Areas. We are aware that in parallel, the Council is consulting upon a Worksop 'Town Centre' Development Plan Document. It is unclear whether the defined 'Town Centre' areas is the same as the 'Inner' area. We refer to our comments above regarding the availability of land for housing within Worksop Town Centre having regard to the Council's own Land Availability Assessment. There is not enough land in the town centre to meet the stated housing requirement.</p> <p>6.14 Part B of Policy ST1 should therefore be re-written to reflect our amended housing distribution model which more closely align with the stated Strategic Objectives of focusing on the three main urban areas of Worksop, Retford and Harworth & Bircotes.</p> <p>6.15 We also suggest that the policy is amended to change the words 'about' to 'at least' in Criterion B. This better fits the Council's statement that the housing requirements are minimums.</p> <p>6.16 We support criteria D and E which relates to the district's economic development strategy and the focus of sustaining and enhancing the existing town centres. The latter will only be achieved if the housing distribution model is amended.</p>	<p>The policy has been re drafted to take into account some of the comments made.</p> <p>In relation to Worksop Central Area the Council is currently undertaking consultation on a Regulation 18 DPD, which contains the proposed site to meet the 700 dwellings. This will contribute to meeting the requirement and forms part of the overall supply.</p> <p>The use of the word about in the Policy is considered to represent a better reflection of the housing supply position.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF177	Axis PED Limited on behalf of FCC Environment	<p>Policy ST1 – Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy</p> <p>1.3.1 Policy ST1 sets out that the Council's spatial strategy will focus on delivering sustainable development and growth, this is supported as it is in accordance with the provisions of the NPPF which seeks to support sustainable development and economic growth.</p> <p>1.3.2 As set out above, FCC's site lies to the north of Worksop and adjacent to existing development and employment sites. Worksop is identified as the most sustainable location for significant growth and provides the best opportunity to deliver the objectives of regional and local industrial strategies.</p> <p>1.3.3 FCC support paragraph A1 of Policy ST1 which promotes the efficient and effective use of land and the re-use of previously developed land in sustainable locations. In accordance with the NPPF this will help to achieve sustainable development including economic growth in the appropriate locations. FCC's site is previously disturbed land, has historically been subject to quarrying activity and part of the site is previously developed. The proposed employment uses are an efficient use of the currently underutilised site. Therefore, paragraph A1 would provide support for the development of the site, subject to demonstrating that there are no overriding amenity, biodiversity or heritage matters that would preclude the development.</p> <p>1.3.4 Whilst the site is located outside of the settlement boundary, the entire Site is well connected to the existing settlement and the adjacent allocation (HS1 and EM005). Once the allocation is fully developed, there would be continuous development from Worksop to FCC's site, it is therefore suggested that the settlement boundary should be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.1.9 confirms that the spatial strategy promotes a 'step change' in the District's economy to: retain employment locally; provide better paid, higher skilled jobs; and increase productivity. The Council's strategy seeks to align economic growth with the housing offer, by providing homes in the right places, this will ensure the sustainability of the area in the future as a place to both live and work. The delivery of employment uses at FCC's site would therefore align with this strategy as it is sustainably located adjacent to an existing residential allocation.</p> <p>1.3.5 The previous version of this policy within the January 2020 draft Local Plan set out at paragraph B2 that development would be directed to appropriate locations in accordance with the Council's settlement hierarchy. Given that FCC's site is located outside of the settlement boundary, the site falls within a 'countryside' location. This policy wording has now been revised and stipulates that housing development must come forward in accordance with the settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>1.3.6 Paragraph D confirms the intention to create at least 11,200 jobs through the provision of at least 168ha of general employment land to accommodate future local employment growth and at least 118ha of employment land to accommodate future significant indigenous employment growth.</p> <p>1.3.7 It is considered that additional wording should be provided within Paragraph D to direct economic development to the most sustainable locations. Greater support should be provided within the spatial strategy for sites within the rural area, but outside of rural settlements that are sustainably and well located to contribute to the Council's employment land supply.</p> <p>1.3.8 FCC's site is well related to the existing settlement of Worksop and is suitably located to deliver sustainable economic development in line with the aspirations of the Local Plan and NPPF.</p>	<p>Planning permission exists for part of the site and an occupier is in place to develop the remainder in 2022.</p> <p>On that basis, there is no need to allocate the site as a tenant is lined up to occupy. Therefore there is no need to allocate this land. The planning permission and development management process is addressing the needs of the site.</p>
REF225	Sheffield City Council	<p>Paragraph 5.1.11 recognises the difference between employment land need and the proposed supply in the district that was picked up in the Strategic Employment Land Appraisal (SELA) referred to above. However, the identified disparities are far greater now than at the time of the SELA. The employment need of 68 hectares (translating to 5,550 additional jobs) recorded in the January 2020 draft Plan is compared to a "significant" employment land supply of about 287 hectares. This is an oversupply of 211 hectares rather than the 40 hectares identified as an issue in the SELA. The draft plan recognises that "it is important that this is accurately reflected in this Plan".</p> <p>As an illustration of the level of over-supply, paragraph 5.1.15 recognises that a proposed Strategic Employment Site, at Apleyhead will, on its own, provide 3,857 - 5,358 jobs, therefore being sufficient to meet most of the identified employment needs of the whole District. Given that other employment sites are more than sufficient to meet local needs, this additional allocation can only serve to provide for additional demand over and above the calculated local needs.</p> <p>The draft Plan attempts to justify this approach by suggesting the site has the potential to also meet "significant indigenous growth and/or national and regional investment to meet exceptional, unanticipated strategic needs over the plan period. This site would bring significant economic benefits to the District and region both in terms of jobs, including higher skilled jobs, and gross value added, and is being actively promoted." This would be a reasonable approach were the site part of the identified supply required to meet the needs of the area, but does not justify its inclusion as an additional element of supply – other sites are more than sufficient to meet that need.</p>	<p>Apleyhead Junction (118.7ha) will be allocated to accommodate sub-regional and/or regional employment growth.</p> <p>An important part of planning for strategic investment is consideration of the functional economic market area (FEMA). The FEMA reflects the way the economy works; it is not constrained by administrative boundaries, but by the relationships between where people live and work.</p> <p>The site is in line with the growth strategy of the area and will deliver a range of key benefits to Worksop, Bassetlaw District, and the wider Sheffield City Region, and potentially for the residents of the future Garden Village.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
		<p>When the Apleyhead site was proposed in the January 2020 draft plan, we did not object to its inclusion, but suggested that it should be promoted solely to meet city region needs over and above the local need and where alternative sites elsewhere in the city region would be unable to meet such a level of inward investment.</p> <p>Whilst the draft plan recognises at paragraph 5.1.17 that the Council will work with neighbouring authorities to undertake additional work to further consider the impacts of the strategic employment site, no discussions as part of Bassetlaw's statutory Duty to Co-operate engagement has been undertaken on this matter following the concerns expressed in relation to the January 2020 draft. As part of Sheffield's production of its own Local Plan we intend to produce a Statement of Common Ground with other SY and SCR authorities. A series of meetings is proposed and Bassetlaw will be invited to take part in those.</p> <p>Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy</p> <p>Housing</p> <p>We note that the Local Plan housing requirement of 589 homes per year (Policy ST1 B) is higher than the Local Housing Need Figure produced using the Government's standard method, in order to reflect the need to support economic growth in the district. This is welcomed in supporting economic growth in SCR and providing flexibility in relation to overall housing delivery across SCR. This flexibility is critical in ensuring that increased housing needs across SCR are able to be met. We note that the document confirms (paragraph 5.1.38) that Bassetlaw will meet all of its housing requirement within the district through a balanced distribution of growth. On this basis we assume that Sheffield is not required to meet any of Bassetlaw's housing needs, and also acknowledge that Sheffield falls outside Bassetlaw's Housing Market Area.</p> <p>Employment</p> <p>This policy in ST1 D proposes "Contributing to the creation of the development of at least 11,200 jobs through the provision of at least 168ha of general employment land to accommodate future local employment growth and at least 118ha of employment land to accommodate future significant indigenous employment growth and/or strategic employment needs." 11,200 jobs is over twice the 5,550 jobs need identified and the proposed land allocation of 287 hectares is four times that needed. The first question here is why a jobs target of twice that identified in the evidence base is justified and, secondly, why this translates to a further doubling in the amount of employment land needed? This represents a huge over-supply that has the potential to damage the economic aspirations of nearby local authorities by tapping in to and diverting economic demand in those areas.</p> <p>Given this, the policy wording and supporting text should better reflect the needs identified in the borough's own evidence and the SY authorities continue to have concerns that the amount of strategic employment land proposed does not appear to be sufficiently justified by the evidence base. There are ongoing concerns at the significant difference in the job requirements identified between the demand and supply led approaches.</p> <p>6.0 Delivery Economic Prosperity [sic] - 6.1 Promoting Economic Growth</p> <p>There are references to the D2N2 (Derby, Derbyshire, Nottingham and Nottinghamshire) regional approach to economic development but no mention of the Sheffield City Region and the findings of the Strategic Employment Land Appraisal referred to earlier.</p> <p>The justification in paragraph 6.1.20 for the identification of the Strategic Employment Site in policy ST8 is that it is "capable of accommodating significant indigenous growth and/or national and regional investment to meet exceptional, unanticipated needs over the plan period". Given that the supply of General Employment Sites on its own represents an oversupply in terms of meeting the borough's needs, there is no justification for an additional allocation, unless it is solely to meet wider, regional and national investment opportunities. The wording of the policy must, therefore, reflect this. The policy wording itself only refers to "sub-regional and/or regional employment growth", not national or regional investment, so does not reflect the justification / supporting text for the policy.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.1.24 recognises that a Statement of Common Ground has been signed with the Sheffield City Region Combined Authority that acknowledges each Council is responsible for identifying employment needs and land supply to meet their own economic needs. We believe that the allocation of the Strategic Employment site and the policy as drafted fails to adhere to this Statement. We understand that this is also the view of the SCR and the other three South Yorkshire local authorities.</p>	<p>the SCR Combined Authority Joint Sheffield City Region Strategic Employment Land Appraisal. The SELA identified Bassetlaw as a district which could meet these needs, due to the availability of suitable land, access to suitable local employment, and proximity to the strategic road network. And that by providing space for such uses in Bassetlaw, SCR could then protect existing high value manufacturing areas and maximise the use of such land to meet advanced manufacturing ambitions in other districts.</p> <p>The evidence recognises that parts of Bassetlaw are strongly related to the Sheffield City Region.</p> <p>Although not allocated specifically for logistics the approach to Apleyhead Junction is consistent with national planning practice guidance which recognises that the logistics industry has distinct locational requirements that should be considered separately from those relating to general employment land.</p> <p>Discussions with the D2N2 LEP revealed that Bassetlaw has a key role in achieving their strategic objectives. Key sectors in Bassetlaw include the warehousing and logistics sector, along with low-carbon energy through the existing decommissioned power stations within the district. The logistics sector in the future could also be positioned to integrate with other sectors, such as robotics, information technology and analytics.</p> <p>In light of the above it would be unreasonable to restrict the wording in the Policy to Logistics sector only. It is likely to support transport / logistics or possibly manufacturing employment.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
		<p>The evidence provided in the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA) demonstrates that the Apleyhead site will generate a significant level of commuting into the District from neighbouring areas. This likely draw of employment from outside of Bassetlaw to the Apleyhead site supports the previous concerns that this site could have a detrimental impact on economic development within other authorities, and the stance previously requested by South Yorkshire authorities that the policy ensures that delivery of economic development on employment allocations within other boroughs is taken into account.</p> <p>This potential negative impact on Sheffield and other authorities is compounded by the change in emphasis between the previous and current draft Policy ST8. The previous draft identified Apleyhead for logistics uses; whereas the current draft widens this to allow employment uses within key sectors identified in the D2N2 Local Industrial Strategy (LIS). It is unclear from the policy which sectors this includes, however footnote 13 of the LIS identifies priority sectors as creative and digital, transport equipment manufacturing, visitor economy, transport and logistics, professional and scientific services, construction, and food and drink manufacturing.</p> <p>In light of the above the authorities remain concerned that there is insufficient justification to support the significant allocation of a strategic employment site and that outstanding cross boundary and strategic issues have not been appropriately addressed through the Duty to Co-operate.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that previously suggested policy changes were not supported and that in response Bassetlaw had concerns that requiring consideration of other sites within D2N2 or Sheffield City Region prior to development on the strategic allocation would amount to a sequential approach which is not evidence based or justified. However, the South Yorkshire authorities remain of the view that given the significant potential cross boundary impact of the site, and the fact that it is proposed as a strategic site accommodating development which would not normally be accommodated within general employment allocations, then the policy should provide significantly more certainty than in its current format.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.1.25 of the draft Plan is welcomed, which states that: "The Council will continue to work collaboratively with neighbouring authorities to ensure any benefits associated with this policy are not lost at a strategic level to D2N2 or Sheffield City Region, and at a local level do not adversely impact upon the economic growth strategies of the District or any other authority." However, the policies as currently drafted do not provide an appropriate mechanism for the impact on the economic strategies of other authorities to be taken into account.</p>	
REF091	Consultant on behalf of land owner	<p>The Policy proposes delivering sustainable development and growth appropriate to the size of each settlement and this is generally supported.</p> <p>Specifically, the Policy ST1 at Section A1 promotes the efficient and effective use of land and the re-use of previously developed land in sustainable locations, unless there are overriding amenity, biodiversity or heritage matters that preclude such use.</p> <p>The Policy at Section B3 supports growth of eligible Small Rural Settlements for about 1,500 dwellings on appropriate sites within the development boundaries, or on-site allocations in Neighbourhood Plans by up to 5%.</p> <p>Hayton is defined as a Small Rural Settlement within the Bassetlaw Local Plan. The proposal at Church Farm, Main Street, Hayton is for 20 dwellings on previously developed land, it is in a sustainable location within Hayton as it is within walking distance to existing facilities such as a primary school, church, local convenience store, pub, village hall, sports pitch and open space areas. It is also on a regular bus route with connections to Retford.</p>	Although the housing requirement has reduced for Small Rural Settlements, communities can plan for additional growth through the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF185	iba Planning on behalf of Carlton Forest Partnership	<p>I refer to the above public consultation and set out below the formal representations on behalf of our client, the Carlton Forest Partnership.</p> <p>Carlton Forest Partnership represents the owners of the Carlton Forest Distribution Centre and surrounding land adjoining the existing Worksop settlement boundary which is identified on the draft Policies Map for Worksop as forming part of a wider housing and employment allocation under Draft Policy ST16, Policy 17:HS1 (Peaks Hill Farm Worksop) and Policy ST8 (EM005) respectively.</p> <p>Our client, as they did with the previous draft, fully supports the inclusion of their land as part of the aforementioned Peaks Hill Farm housing and employment land allocations.</p> <p>More particularly, our client supports the increased annual housing requirement of 589 dwellings to support economic growth in the District and to meet local housing needs – and considers the increased percentage of all new housing to be directed towards Worksop to be sound given its place at the top of the settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>Whilst necessarily ambitious, our client considers the draft Plan (and the increased annual housing requirement for Worksop) to be realistic – and acknowledges the importance of the Peaks Hill Farm allocation in delivering housing and employment development in such numbers.</p>	Support - noted
REF180 Trinity Farm	Fisher German on behalf of Avant Homes	<p>1.3 Policy ST1 sets the housing requirement for Bassetlaw during the period 2020-2037. The Council have followed national policy and guidance utilising the Local Housing Need (LHN) as a starting point for establishing its housing requirement. It is noted that in December 2020 the Government published further changes to the Standard Method for assessing LHN, however, for Bassetlaw this results in no change from the existing method, albeit the LHN significantly increases for Sheffield.</p> <p>1.4 The Planning Practice Guidance is unequivocal that “the standard method for assessing local housing need provides a minimum starting point in determining the number of homes needed in an area. It does not attempt to predict the impact that future government policies, changing economic circumstances or other factors might have on demographic behaviour” [our emphasis]. In this context, it is worth remembering the LHN is predominantly demographic led, and as such policy-on considerations such as delivering infrastructure, increasing the supply of affordable housing or as in this case, ensuring economic growth and prosperity cannot always be achieved using this base figure. In this regard, the Council’s approach to increase the Housing Requirement to 589 dwellings per annum is supported and has been effectively justified in the supporting Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (Update 2020). Without suitable increases in housing, the Council’s employment and economic goals are likely to be restricted due to lack of available working population, or alternatively will lead to large patterns of unsustainable movements as residents commute out of the District to access jobs.</p> <p>1.5 Increasing the Housing Requirement also reflects Government ambitions to boost significantly the supply of housing (NPPF Para 59). The Council’s approach to increasing the LHR above the figure derived from the Standard Methodology is considered sound and is supported,</p> <p>1.6 Notwithstanding the above, it should be noted that the recent changes to the Standard Method significantly increase the housing requirement for Sheffield City. It is therefore considered that additional flexibility should be built into Bassetlaw’s emerging Plan so in the event that Sheffield City confirm it is unable to meet its own needs, any share of the unmet need can be accommodated by Bassetlaw ahead of any review of the Plan.</p> <p>1.7 The proposed Spatial Strategy, which promotes a hybrid approach to meeting the District’s development needs, is broadly supported. The role of Retford as a ‘Main Town’ reflects the town’s role and sustainability credentials. Retford benefits from significant service provision and excellent transport connections and as such it is considered sound for the town to be identified for future economic and residential growth.</p> <p>1.8 With regards to spatial distribution, the Council intends to locate 65% of its housing requirement in the Main Towns of Retford, Worksop and Harworth. The approach to locate the majority of the District’s growth to the towns is supported as it focuses development in the most sustainable locations, whilst still enabling suitable rural growth which is essential for ensuring rural communities can support essential services and ensures their long-term vitality.</p> <p>1.9 Concerns are however raised in respect of the proposed Bassetlaw Garden Village (Policy ST3). The Garden Village allocation is intended to make a contribution of 5% of the total requirement over the Plan period. Whilst the contribution of the Garden Village to the</p>	<p>The supply provides for a total of 12,201 dwellings during 2020-2037. This is above the requirement of 10013 dwellings or 591 dpa providing an 18% contingency.</p> <p>This allows for future circumstances affecting the land supply, and provides flexibility to account for future unmet housing need which may come from within neighbouring areas in accordance with paragraph 60 of the NPPF.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
		<p>supply of housing over the Plan period has been reduced since the Plan was last consulted on it is still considered that assumed delivery from the site is ambitious and may result in the Council not meeting its housing need over the Plan period. To ensure a deliverable Plan, it is imperative that the Council's delivery assumptions for the emerging sites are realistic.</p> <p>1.10 In addition to the above, approximately 1,400 dwellings (14% of the housing requirement) are to be delivered by Local Plan allocations, Neighbourhood Plan allocations and windfalls in the Large Rural Settlements.</p> <p>1.11 Policy ST1 seeks to deliver a further 1,500 dwellings (15% of the total requirement for the Plan period) through Neighbourhood Plans and non-allocated sites, across the 34 Small Rural Settlements delivering new homes. There is a significant quantum of development across numerous settlements being delivered through as yet unmade and not-guaranteed Neighbourhood Plans. This has the potential to risk the delivery of the Plan if Neighbourhood Plans are not made in a timely manner. The quantum of development to be delivered in this tier is an increase of 3% from the previous draft Plan, with 8 fewer settlements in this tier. This increases the notional delivery target for each village, and as such the Council must be satisfied that there is latent capacity to deliver such a requirement, in the absence of guaranteed allocations.</p>	
REF209 Apleyhead	NJL Consulting on behalf of Caddick	<p>6.1 Caddick continue to support the overall ambitions in ST1, particularly that of enabling the release of suitable employment land. However, this support is predicated on the importance of ensuring this ambition is not frustrated by site specific policies being misaligned with this strategy in terms of their detailed wording and content. Policy detail</p> <p>6.2 The inference of a release of land at Apleyhead Junction (which follows in Policy ST8 and ST10) to meet employment needs is welcomed and logical. Fundamentally, without an intervention of this nature, it would not be realistic for the Local Plan to achieve the desired economic and social step change as referred to throughout the plan and its visions and objectives.</p> <p>6.3 However, it is essential that the plan enables delivery of the full quantum of employment land envisaged, in order for this step change growth to be realised. If any part of the employment need is not delivered, and particularly the 'strategic' release at Apleyhead Junction, then the overall vision and economic growth objectives for Bassetlaw would be unfulfilled. Indeed, the plan evidence base20 recognises the importance of all sites in the overall employment land offer.</p> <p>6.4 For example, the stated ambition to deliver at least 11,200 new jobs21 is entirely reliant on proposed employment land allocations being delivered in full, as demonstrated in the local plan evidence base22. The aforementioned evidence base does not distinguish between strategic and non-strategic sites when concluding on the quantum of land needed to achieve the 11,200 jobs target. Hence, the employment land requirement figure in ST1 must follow the evidence base and be expressed, in spatial strategy and objective terms, as a single target of 286ha.</p> <p>6.5 Policy ST1 would then require further minor changes to reflect this updated position regarding the scale and delivery of employment allocations overall, and a later amendment to ST8 is also necessary.</p> <p>6.6 Therefore, in summary, Caddick consider Policy ST1 should be amended to refer to the full provision of employment land as a single figure, for the reasons noted above. Further consequential changes are then made to the wording of ST1 to reflect the local plan vision. Suggested policy changes</p> <p>6.7 Caddick suggest the following amended wording to Policy ST1. ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy A. (no changes proposed). B. (no changes proposed). C. (no changes proposed). D. Creation of at least 11,200 jobs through the provision of at least 286ha of employment land which can enable economic growth by maximising the opportunities for significant levels of indigenous employment growth and meeting strategic employment needs. E. (no changes proposed).</p>	<p>It is appropriate for Policy ST1 to recognise that difference between the two categories of employment land.</p> <p>The Housing and Economic Development needs Assessment 2020 clarifies the approach taken to Apleyhead. It provides the justification for a strategic employment need: to address the regional/sub regional investment needs</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
1671323	William Davis	<p>Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy</p> <p>Overall, the spatial strategy continues to be supported. Worksop is considered to be the most sustainable settlement and provides a good range of services/facilities and employment opportunities. It is noted that the housing target has now increased to 589dpa (a minimum of 10,013 dwellings over the plan period). Paragraph 5.1.35 indicates that there is a supply of 11,214 dwellings during the plan period. No breakdown of this by site is provided; this should be done so that the figure can be interrogated to ensure that the sites are deliverable/developable during the plan period.</p> <p>Worksop Town Centre is to the location of some 700 dwellings. However, as indicated by no allocation are proposed in the Local Plan as these will be allocated by a separate Development Plan Document. At present only 40 dwellings currently have planning permission with Worksop Town Centre and the potential for the town centre to make up the difference is unclear. This is also likely to require a substantial number of flats which may not be deliverable given the post Covid demand for larger houses with private garden space.</p> <p>Overall the housing supply represents a 11% buffer over the identified housing target of 589dpa. While an increase in the housing target is welcomed the scale of the buffer has reduced since the previous draft of the Local Plan (January 2020) when it was 13%. It is our view that, in line with the Local Plans Expert Group recommendation a buffer of at least 20% to provide flexibility; providing this would be consistent with national policy (specifically paragraph 59 regarding the need to significantly boost the supply of housing).</p> <p>This is especially important for Bassetlaw given the proposed allocation of a new settlement which may not deliver housing as anticipated, the assumption that some growth will be allocated through Neighbourhood Plans and the approach to Worksop Town Centre. As such the supply of housing should be increased to a minimum of 12,015 dwellings that are deliverable/developable during the plan period; this would necessitate the allocation of an additional 800 dwellings. As the most sustainable settlement, Worksop represents the most appropriate place to make these additional allocations.</p>	<p>The breakdown of the supply by site was provided in the trajectory which was included as an appendix to the November 2020 LAA. A trajectory will be included in the Submission Plan. As at 1 April 2021 there is an 18% buffer in the supply above the requirement which is considered to provide sufficient flexibility.</p>
REF204	Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning on behalf of land owner	<p>ST1A- We lodged objections to this policy on behalf of our Client Mrs Jubb at the previous consultations stage. The policy remains unchanged and our objection is therefore repeated with the same background information/justification. Please see our letter of 26th February 2020 and attachments which set out the basis of our objection.</p> <p>We continue to object to the non-allocation of our Client's land as identified and for the reasons set out in our letter of 26th February 2020 and appendices.</p> <p>In the alternative we seek a more generous policy for the development of land for business purposes outside areas defined in the Plan where there are no overriding technical or environmental objections – also as set out in our letter. This would be consistent with the NPPF which confirms that all forms of business are acceptable in rural areas (subject to the specially protected areas identified in the Framework).</p>	<p>The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment 2020 provides the basis for defining a Strategic Employment Site. It states that there is only one site in the District capable of meeting these needs.</p> <p>That does not include Markham Moor.</p>
REF170	A&D Architecture	<p>2) Policy ST1 should be modified by adding new paragraph F as follows:</p> <p>f) No less than 60 pitches will be allocated for static caravan development.</p>	<p>Local Plan policies must be evidence led. The Gypsy and Traveller Needs Assessment 2019 provides no evidence to support this approach.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF230	Chesterfield Borough Council	Support the housing requirement of 478 d/p/a (Policy ST1) as this would not result in a shortfall across the HMA. It is acknowledged that this is higher than both the LHN (307 d/p/a) and the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw Strategic Housing Market Assessment OAN Update 2017 (374 d/p/a including affordability uplift and to support baseline economic growth). It is suggested that the implications of such a higher level of housing growth are carefully monitored and discussed as part of regular Local Plan Liaison Meetings to highlight any unintended adverse effects on other districts housing delivery within the HMA and to inform the next round of Local Plan reviews. It is suggested that this could be included within the Monitoring Framework.	The Council will continue to positively engage with neighbouring authorities and authorities with the HMA to ensure that the implications of the spatial strategy are understood and impacts managed appropriately.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW			
REF001	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Thank you very much for your presentation ..., it was very interesting and very clear. I just wish we could turn back the clock for Beckingham. Everyone keeps telling me we should have done a NP but they don't listen to me as to what happened. We started a plan but we could not encourage people to join us. We had 6 people and two of those were a couple so that was not good. Meanwhile about 5 planning applications had been put in at this time, all outside the village envelope, but because Bassetlaw did not have a five year building plan, it had not reached its quota, the applications were approved. I did my best, I spoke to the planning committee and most of them went to Bristol but we lost them because of the reasons above. Each time the Inspector said "because Bassetlaw do not have a five year "etcetc I wanted to scream!! If I can I am going to make a list of dates showing our NP meetings, name the planning applications, list the times I spoke to the Planning Committee, find the dates when the plans were approved usually by the Inspector in Bristol and see if we had managed to do a Neighbourhood Plan when it would have been finished. I think it would not have been finished until late 2019 or early 2020, much too late to have any weighting against the plans. They had been approved much earlier! Sorry to ramble but people do not really listen, they just say you should have done a NP!! All the sites for planning had gone and we had done our best to stop them. One of them, was started July 2019 and is nearing completion, 2 others are starting soon. The NP would not have added any weight to these, the Plan takes over 2 years to write. Oh dear, we feel we are having another village built around us, over 200 houses when we have just over 600 before it all started! Thanks for reading this and thanks again to you.	Thank you for comment. If you, or the Parish Council require further assistance or information about the Neighbourhood Planning process, then please contact the Neighbourhood Planning Team.
1645938	Resident	It is vital that when development is considered it is in keeping with the needs and resources of the area. For example the approval of apartments in a rural location with no similar developments and poor public transport, where parking provision is inadequate seems to be totally lacking in understanding or common sense.	Development proposals are considered alongside relevant planning policies such as design and character. Infrastructure need is also a consideration and where required, then is agreed through the Section 106 process.
REF040	Misterton Parish Council	Particularly, Misterton Parish Council and the Misterton Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group commend the importance attached to neighbourhood plans throughout the document. Once made, neighbourhood plans hold legal weight and their inclusion in this Local Plan (and the finished document) is important: inclusion recognises the efforts the community has made to develop a neighbourhood plan and, in Misterton, with over 91% of the votes supporting the Neighbourhood Plan in the September 2019 referendum, it really does have popular backing.	Thank you for your comment.
REF041	Retford Civic Society	Rural/Urban split of housing provision. In its comments on the January 2020 Draft Plan the Society expressed concern about the proposal to allow almost all villages to expand by up to 20%. We are pleased to see that this proposal has been dropped in the latest Draft Plan. Questions remain about the use of a standard 5% for all small villages – some might want more. We would hope for flexibility if villages aim for a larger increase through their neighbourhood plans.	The requirement for Small Settlements has been reduced. However, if individual settlements wish to plan for more growth, then they can do this through the Neighbourhood Planning process.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW			
REF057	Clarborough and Welham Parich Council	The Parish Council welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Plan and the various changes which have been included in response to previous consultation exercises. 1. The changes implemented in the Local Plan, which reduce the impact of the housing requirements on the smaller villages and parishes are particularly welcomed. The reduction in that housing growth requirement from a 'cap' of 20% to one of 5% is a much more realistic figure in order to retain character of the smaller settlements. 2. Further, the facility for a Parish Council to chose to exceed that cap if it is felt that this would benefit the community and the community want it, is also welcomes in establishing true local control over the scale of development in a Parish.	Thank you for your comment.
REF060	Notts County Council	B Due to the absence of any transport choice most travel to/from the proposal at Cottam is likely to be made by private car. Based on the scale and mix of development a significant increase in peak period traffic flows are expected on rural roads through local villages with consequential negative effects in terms of vehicle emissions, air quality, noise, traffic capacity, road safety and local amenity. It is difficult to see how this could be effectively dealt with through rural villages without bypassing them due to land constraints. There are also likely to be a number of junctions requiring improvement. That would be prohibitively expensive requiring land and would do nothing to improve the site's sustainability credentials.	The former Cottam Power Station is now identified as an 'Opportunity Area'. This means that the site is available for redevelopment, but further work is needed to identify what forms of development are considered appropriate in that location. This will consider the level of constraint, including highways and public transport.
1665415	Resident	Neighbourhood plans should be updated ie every few years eg 5 or they go out of date and do not reflect the community. Will this be required going forward? East Markham classed as a small rural settlement but meets the criteria for large settlement, school, shop, pub, village hall etc. Will this be reclassified to large. Policy is against development on agricultural land but this is unfair if land is unproductive and unsaleable for agricultural use. Building should be allowed on agricultural land or if not allowed the Council should purchase it at full commercial value. Plan requires additional building to have community support. This is unrealistic as people oppose building for selfish regions. In East Markham there is for example a very vocal individual who opposes planning. He has been reported the Council for harassment, bullying and basically lying. He has implied that Council officers are corrupt and take bribes and people are to scared to ever say if they support housing. There need to be policies in place to stop people like this from holding public office. Overall I think there needs to be more investment in village expansion to ensure they have better infrastructure. I also think the Council planners should revisit the SHLAA and identify landowners who are happy for land to be put forward for social housing, traveller sites or to allow open space to be purchased from them. Where sites have been refused there should also be a right to reply for landowners where wrong assumptions made. More modern housing should be allowed, energy efficient sustainable housing and things like earth sheltered housing should be encouraged it just red brick and panties. Action should be taken to stop any further building of fake farmhouses. In East Markham have overpriced large houses where owners convert lofts and garages and add in velux windows in a conservation area. They should not be then permitted to object to planning on land they overlook as they should not have windows overlooking in the first place. The conservation officer should be required to work with landowners who seek permission not just refuse it and then say he will not work with them e.g. recent refusal of houses at Plantation Road.	The requirement for Neighbourhood Plans to be reviewed every 5 years remains in place. A review of a Neighbourhood Plan provides an opportunity for the community to produce robust planning policy against the latest legislation and local policy context. East Markham is considered a Small Rural Settlement where there is capacity for the village to grow by up to 5%. This can include smaller homes and affordable homes if required.
1666840	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	I welcome the new figures (and the backdate to 2018) and believe this is a much fairer distribution of housing within Bassetlaw. It will also allow our rural communities to grow at a more appropriate rate which will hopefully be in line with resources.	Thank you for your comment.
1668141	Resident	With the objective of increasing the size of the 5 villages by 20% - how will the facilities & services be expanded especially school size. The current schools have limited ability to expand and oversubscribed. How do you propose to offset the carbon footprint you are creating by increasing the villages by 20%.	The education authority are a consultee through the preparation of the Local Plan. The information they provide helps us identify where there are deficiencies in education provision. Where there is a need for additional capacity, this is included as part of the infrastructure requirements to support the growth identified within the Local Plan.
REF061	Resident	The changes which reduce the impact of the housing requirements within the new Draft Plan on the smaller viilages and parishes are particularly welcome. The reduction in that housing growth requirement to a 'cap' of 5% from the original proposal of 20% is a much more realistic figure in order to retain the character of the smaller settlements. Allowing a Parish Council to chose to exceed that cap if the community want it is a good idea as it allows the community to have control over the way their village or Parish grows if that is what the community want to happen.	Thank you for your comment.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW			
REF068	Ranskill Parish Council	The blanket approach taken to housing allocation (Policy ST2) in the “smaller rural settlements” is not fit for purpose and fails to consider or reflect the needs of individual communities. While acknowledging in section 5.1.52 that “the sustainable growth of Small Rural Settlements will help to sustain those villages in the long term”, in adopting a one size fits all policy the Plan fails to support this aim. The ever-changing percentage of housing required in smaller rural settlements from 10% in the 2019 draft Plan, to 20% in the early 2020 version to 5% in the latest version reinforces the Parish Council’s concerns over a lack of consultation. As we understand it the 20% figure has (we are told) been “tweaked” to 5% because some settlements were physically unable to find sufficient land to fulfil the 20% requirement (as acknowledged in para 5.2.4.), evidence that more consultation should have been carried out and that a one size fits all policy does not work. Please also note that the Parish Council does not consider a 75% change to a figure as a “tweak” but a considerable change which as noted above has big implications for Ranskill in terms of its Neighbourhood Plan.	The blanket approach to rural growth provides consistency among the majority of villages that are similar in size and scale. Where communities wish to plan for more growth, then they can do this through a Neighbourhood Plan if there is reasonable justification. The justification could include the need for affordable homes, a new community facility or infrastructure.
1661414	Planning With People	The number for 5% growth does not reflect the dwellings allocated in made Neighbourhood plans eg Cuckney 8 - but the NP allocated a sit for approx 31 on 3 sites. By providing the 5% growth figure for each settlement without identifying where some settlements have already allocated more, you create confusion within these communities about the status of the NP allocations. This needs to be clarified somewhere in the ST2 explanatory text or in the ST2 text box	Policy ST2 provides the mechanism for communities to plan for more growth if they wish to do so. The allocations within the Made Cuckney Plan remain in place.
REF078	Clayworth Parish Council	Thank you for the opportunity to comment further on the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan. Clayworth Parish Council have previously submitted comments on the 10th March 2020 to the previous Bassetlaw Local Plan consultation. These comments on the latest version of the Bassetlaw Local Plan are consistent and build on those previously submitted. We are encouraged that the Council has listened to our concerns, and no doubt the concerns of other Rural parishes across Bassetlaw, and reduced the housing requirement for small Rural settlements to 5%. As we understand that there are sufficient existing planning permissions already agreed across Rural Bassetlaw to meet this 5% target, this means that Clayworth would not be required to accommodate further housing growth in the plan period. Given Clayworth’s conservation area status, we believe this is the right approach. We would however like to reiterate a point made in the previous response, which we feel still requires clarification. Whilst it is encouraging that the Draft Local Plan states that robust, proportionate pre-application community consultation will be required as evidence of community support. In all cases, support of the Parish or Town Council will be required if Developers wish to exceed the 5% target. However, it is unclear how this community support should be demonstrated. Could the District Council provide clarity as to the role it expects Parish Councils to play as part of Policy ST2 and whether in a Conservation Area obtaining the Parish Council support will be essential prior to development being granted. We understand the Parish Councils position on each application would need to be consistent with the policies set out in the Local Plan and adhere to relevant planning legislation. A standing offer remains for a member of the Local Plan team to attend a future meeting to discuss the implications of the plan on the Village.	Where communities have met their individual growth requirements as identified in the Local Plan, additional growth may be supported through the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan or through needs base such as rural exception sites, accommodation to support rural business and agriculture, replacement dwellings and the conversion of existing suitable buildings within existing settlements.
REF101	East Markham Parish Council	At the last census, (2011) East Markham had 490 dwellings, this had increased to 524 by August 2018 representing a rise in Housing stock of 5.7%. Since August 2018 a further 16 houses have been built making the total housing stock 540 properties by 2020. In addition there are an additional 54 houses in construction and planning permissions for a further 21 houses or conversions. When these buildings are developed the housing stock in the village will have increased by 125 houses (a staggering 25%) since 2011. The increase in dwellings over the last 9 years has produced a lot of pressure on our narrow village roads. Recent construction of dwellings on Beckland Hill and High Street have seen significant increases in congestion on the village’s roads. The Parish Council would also request that BDC review access to the village. At the time of writing, there are only two entrances left for traffic to the village, whereas there used to be four. This is funnelling traffic onto Askham Road, Farm Lane and Beckland Hill. We believe that this increase in traffic represents a danger as is evidenced by three car crashes on this stretch of road during the past 12 months. East Markham Parish Council requests that the access from the village from the A57 to High Street (Western Entrance) be reinstated to take pressure off traffic around the School on Askham Road, and also for the Priestgate to West Markham road over the A1 to be repaired and reopened as a matter of urgency’. Another area where the infrastructure of the village has not kept pace with development is with regard to drains and sewers. In February 2020 the village suffered from the discharge of raw sewage from drains close to the school. This was attended by Severn Trent Water but the problem recurred twice again since. Church Street has also experienced raw sewage flowing across the road in front of the actual Church. In addition there has been repeated flooding of residential properties in both York and Low Street. The Village’s neighbourhood plan has a specific policy NP7 relating to this (see below). There is little evidence that BDC have considered this in recent decisions. POLICY NP7: Reducing the Risk of Flooding 1. All development proposals other than residential extensions and other minor development within East Markham village will be required to demonstrate that; a) the development proposals will not have a detrimental impact on the foul and surface water drainage infrastructure; and b) the development does not increase the rate of surface water run off or increase flood risk in the area; and	The Council has recognised existing planning permissions in East Markham since 2018. When considering these against the 5% growth requirement, recent monitoring suggests that this requirement has already been met. This means that any additional development will only be supported if it complies with parts 2 or 3 of Policy ST2 within the Local Plan. If any of the sites with planning permission are not completed or lapse, then those numbers can then be re-added to the growth requirement and planned for accordingly. One of the reasons why the requirement had been reduced from 20% to 5% was the potential impact on infrastructure and the character of settlements.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW		<p>c) the scheme is designed and constructed such that it does not increase the level of flood risk in the area, and where appropriate can contribute to the reduction of flood risk; and</p> <p>d) the scheme protects existing watercourses and land drainage systems. In circumstances where this approach is impractical the developer will be required to propose a reasonable alternative in accordance with the most up to date local policy; and the scheme incorporates sustainable drainage techniques into their layout and design. In circumstances where this approach is impractical, the developer will be required to propose a reasonable alternative in accordance with the most up to date local policy.</p> <p>For the above reasons the Parish Council is of the opinion that East Markham should be classified as a village not suitable for further development from 2020 and for the life of this plan.</p> <p><i>Following section refers to January 2020 DLP:</i> East Markham Parish Council believes that recent development already has had an adverse impact on the character and amenity of the village. The proportionate cap of 20% has been in existence for some time but there is little evidence that BDC has taken character and amenity into consideration. The 5% proportionate cap is not Government policy but is BDC policy. In the event of a conflict between BDC 5% cap and the Governments no upper limit EAST MARKHAM PARISH COUNCIL seeks clarification as to what takes priority.</p>	
REF122	NNLCRP (North Notts & Lincs Community Rail Partnership)	We note that among the large settlements, Misterton is allocated an additional 194 homes. There is already a desire expressed by residents for a railway station which would enable Doncaster to be reached in 20 minutes and Lincoln in 30 minutes. Train travel from Misterton would meet the Government's Greening Transport desire to reduce emissions that add to global warming.	The Local Plan is not planning for a new Railway Station at Misterton, but this is something the Parish Council can proceed with through other channels if they wish to do so.
REF120	Barton Willmore on behalf of land owner	<p>The spatial strategy has been revised from the previous version of the draft Plan in January 2020. We have no objections with growth being directed to the main towns, providing there is sufficient infrastructure to support it and the allocations are backed up by evidence around deliverability; we have no specific comments to make at this stage. One of the key changes is a revision to the way Small Rural Settlements are dealt with. The previous 20% growth cap on all of these lower order settlements has been replaced with a 5% cap. The number of settlements which will see housing growth has been reduced following a review of their relative sustainability, as detailed in the Settlement Sustainability Matrix within the Bassetlaw Rural Settlement Study Update (November 2020). We support this approach, as it more clearly differentiates between the Small and Large Rural Settlements, and acknowledges that some Small Rural Settlements are not appropriate locations for growth. However, the revised housing distribution at Policy ST1 then goes on to direct 1,502 dwellings towards Small Rural Settlements compared to the January 2020 version's 1,090. Large Rural Settlements are reduced from 1,764 to 1,402 to reflect the removal of Cottam. This results in a total increase in rural development from 2,854 to 2,904, which is delivered by a reduction in development to Large Rural Settlements and a 38% increase in housing going to Small Rural Settlements, despite the cap being reduced from 20% to 5% and the overall number of settlements being reduced. It is difficult to understand how this follows from the findings of the Bassetlaw Rural Settlement Study Update and Spatial Strategy Background Paper (Update November 2020), which clearly set out the distinction between Small and Large Rural Settlements and their comparative capacity for growth. We appreciate there are a larger number of smaller order settlements, but it is not clear why a reduced growth cap across a reduced number of settlements results in a higher overall figure. The Bassetlaw Rural Settlement Study Update (November 2020) acknowledges at page 4 that an out-of-date Plan in the past has: "contributed to the inconsistent management of rural growth across Bassetlaw. Some settlements have grown by hundreds of houses and others have had none, contributing to a growing conflict between the balance of sustainable growth and the benefits that generally accompany new development. In Bassetlaw, these conflicts are translated – most apparently – into a lack of infrastructure being delivered to support a growing population and a large oversupply of residential planning permissions (or commitments) in areas – particularly those that, perhaps, do not have an adequate level of services and facilities to support such a high level of growth." If there are significant commitments at a number of Small Rural Settlements which result in the increased overall figure, then this should be factored into the target for net new dwellings at Policy ST2. The policy only sets out the new housing requirement for each of the settlements (collectively 473 dwellings), rather than how the overall target of 1,502 is made up. In our view it would be much clearer if the policy text provided a table which set out the existing commitments of each settlement (and how this has been reduced to reflect the lapse rate, where appropriate). This should inform whether the additional housing on top of this is justified in light of the issues around an imbalance of services, infrastructure and oversupply of housing. A percentage cap will just perpetuate this imbalance and unsustainable growth that has been created in a policy vacuum. Instead, further growth should be directed to Blyth, which is a higher order settlement that has a higher capacity for growth than the arbitrary 20% cap allows. Part B of the policy raises concerns given the strict adherence to the arbitrary 20% cap, when the policy should instead recognise that the housing target is a minimum (referred to as such in both Policies ST1 and ST2), to ensure consistency with the NPPF's objective to significantly boost the supply of homes (paragraph 59). We continue to object to Part E, which is the only mechanism to exceed the 20% cap. Whilst the opinions of the</p>	<p>The Spatial Strategy provides an appropriate rural/urban balance in housing distribution. The majority of growth is directed to the larger settlements as they are considered more sustainable. However, as Bassetlaw is a largely rural District, it is reasonable to enable some of the more sustainable rural villages to expand. Policy ST2 has recognised that the villages across the District do differ in size and local service provision. Therefore the split of 20% growth for larger villages and 5% for smaller villages seems an appropriate split and distribution across the area. Where communities wish to plan for additional growth then this can be undertaken through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Additional housing growth in these settlements will be supported if it can be demonstrated that there is a local need.</p> <p>Made Neighbourhood Plans should be reviewed every 5 years so that they provide the most up to date policy context for the area. Where allocated sites do not deliver, then this can be dealt with through a Neighbourhood Plan review and reallocated elsewhere if deemed appropriate at the time.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW		<p>local community are important to consider through the planning process, there are a wider range of material considerations that should also be appropriately assessed. It is considered that this element should be removed and replaced with a more specific set of criteria to which applications should be assessed. This is particularly important given the points we raise above in relation to Policy ST1 and the potential for Neighbourhood Plans to allocate sites which may not be ultimately deliverable or developable. Policy ST2 should also include a reference to the need for ongoing monitoring of delivery and supply within the Parishes. It should make provisions for instances where Neighbourhood Plan allocations (or permissioned sites) are not being implemented, and the 20% growth not being achieved (see LAA which states a historic lapse rate of 24% for such sites). The policy should state that in these circumstances a review of those allocations will be necessary and additional supply will be brought forward ahead of such reviews via a reasonable criteria-based policy, so as to ensure an ongoing supply of housing (in accordance with NPPF paragraphs 73-75) The criteria-based policy could reflect that of the current Bassetlaw District Core Strategy (2011) Policy CS1 and approach of the Council in relation to developments outside of the settlement boundaries (as stated in the Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) 2016/17 in relation to Indicator H5: Number of houses built and permitted outside the settlement boundaries). We therefore continue to object to Policy ST2 as it is inconsistent with the evidence base around relative sustainability of settlements and will fail to deliver the required housing in the right places. This is contrary to the NPPF and the draft Plan's own Vision, as noted in our objection to Policy ST1. Suggested changes: 1. The Policy should set out clearly what the breakdown of housing supply from Small Rural in terms of commitments (including reductions for lapse rates) and new housing. 2. The draft Plan should revisit the arbitrary 20% cap applied to Large Rural Settlements and should clearly account for lapse rates. Additional growth should be directed to more sustainable settlements such as Blyth. This should consider the relationship between employment and housing growth. The Sustainability Appraisal needs to assess this as a reasonable alternative. The policy should remove reference to the weight to be afforded to local community support in determining applications as this could undermine the assessment of an application on its merits. This should be replaced with a more appropriate set of criteria (see 4 below also). The policy should incorporate an ongoing monitoring of delivery and supply within the Parishes, with a policy basis to support additional supply in the event Neighbourhood Plan allocations are not being delivered.</p>	
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Area Plan	<p>Pages 34 and 35, Para 5.2.2 to 5.2.5, 5.2.7 and 5.2.9 – It is welcome to see some appearance of “common sense” now being applied to Rural Bassetlaw, the separation of Large and Small Rural Bassetlaw is welcomed as is the reduction in the housing requirement to 5%. It was always the case that most of Small Rurals would be significantly and unnecessarily affected to the extent that the nature of the settlement would be changed irrevocably. Additionally, the inclusion of the Neighbourhood Plan Process as a key part of the District’s planning procedures are more than welcome and to be applauded. Page 36, Para C. – Of the Small Rural settlements listed in the Scrooby area are Ranskill and Scrooby. However, there is no mention of Torworth. Please clarify if Torworth is one of the “unallocated” small rural settlements. Page 37, Para D. 3) – This prioritises the use of Brownfield land over agricultural land. This MUST be strictly adhered to and policed, agricultural land must not be lost to “money”.</p>	Thank you for your comment. Torworth is not considered a Small Rural Settlement as it did not meet the necessary criteria.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW			
REF156	Babworth Parish Council	<p>We consider that the Council's wider approach to planning for the rural area is also flawed. We consider that a sustainable approach to planning for the rural area and its settlements is to establish the development needs of those villages and apportion an appropriate level of development where those needs arise. We do not support the level of growth apportioned to the villages and rural area which has not been evidenced based and does not reflect the levels of growth which are actually required to support the rural area. Such an evidenced based approach is vital to understanding, and planning for, the future health of rural settlements. With specific regard to the Parish of Babworth, the Parish is a large rural parish comprising predominantly a farming based community. The parish has circa 250 homes within the parish boundary and the largest settlement is Ranby. Policy ST2 of the Local Plan subsequently seeks to allocate 13 dwellings towards Ranby on the basis of that comprising a 5% uplift to the settlement's size, this is factually incorrect, as Ranby Village has c.89 Dwellings which would total 4.5 dwelling uplift at 5%. It is the Parish's view that proposed allocation is entirely unjustified and does not reflect the size or function of the village. It is not an appropriate level of growth for such a small, rural village. The development needs of each individual village should be properly assessed, evidence-based and then carried out sustainably. Building another 13 houses in Ranby village would be disproportionate. Ranby village has green fields and open spaces amongst the houses, and the character of the village would be severely compromised by inappropriate levels of growth. BPC feel very strongly that any housing requirement imposed on Babworth/ Ranby should be absorbed within the Garden Village. Whilst some Rural Settlements will require small-scale and sensitively located development to support local needs and to support local services and facilities, we consider that the level of development being proposed across both the large and small rural settlements is arbitrary (in particular a proposed 5% growth target for the small rural settlements) and will cause harm to the overall sustainability of the district. We object to the approach taken by the planning strategy for the rural areas of Bassetlaw. As set out above, we have significant concerns in relation to the overall quantum of development that has been directed towards the District's rural villages. Policy ST2 sets out the housing requirements for Bassetlaw's rural settlements to grow appropriately in order to maintain rural vitality whilst retaining distinctiveness. Whilst we support the need to maintain the viability and vitality of rural services, this needs to be planned for by understanding the health and hinterlands of those services and the level of development that is needed to support them (and through locating that level of development in a location accessible to those services). The fundamental flaw of the Local Plan's proposed approach is that many of the 73 rural villages identified in the Local Plan for growth do not have any notable services to meet their day to day needs. It is not sustainable to encourage more households to live in remote locations where they are encouraged to travel in sporadic patterns to access remote facilities. It is much more sustainable for those villages to be sustained by their rural hubs (the main settlements) where trips can be linked, and journeys made by public transport, such as Retford. For example, if more houses were built in Ranby village, it would be necessary for more car journeys to and from Retford, Worksop and the surrounding area to access services and facilities, therefore producing more carbon and increasing the carbon footprint. We consider that the Council should abandon its proposed policy of allocating a minimum level of development across the majority of its rural villages and should, instead, target a modest level of growth to villages with existing suitable services and facilities that require support to maintain their existing levels of vitality and viability.</p>	<p>Policy ST2 provides a reasonable approach to rural development according to the size and level of services and facilities within each community.</p> <p>The District is largely rural and therefore some future growth is necessary to support the needs of those communities.</p> <p>The majority of the District's growth requirements are located within or around urban areas or along key infrastructure links such as the A1/A57 or on large brownfield sites.</p> <p>The Council has incorporated the 5% requirement for Ranby into the Bassetlaw Garden Village housing requirement. However, if the community wish to plan for additional growth, then this can be undertaken through the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW			
REF157	Resident	<p>Ranby village has approximately 89 dwellings. Those dwellings are spread out and separated by lots of green, open fields and spaces. Our very small village contains 4 listed buildings/monuments (a bridge, memorial, public house, dwelling). These also span from one end of the village to the other. The village has the Chesterfield canal running through the middle of it. There are many old, large trees, hedges and wooded areas. In my view, the village is one of the most rural and characterful villages you could get. There are no real services. There is only a tiny rural church (which has a service at most once a month), village hall, small school and public house. We have poor internet, a very skeleton bus service and nothing else. The villagers who live here like it like that. We choose to live here because we want to live in a very rural small village. The “blanket” proposal to build 5% more houses in every village is unfair and inappropriate, as some villages will want and can sustain (with their facilities and services) more houses, and other villages will not want as many, or any, and cannot sustain “servicing” more houses. Even if, as you propose under your “blanket” approach, to build another 4-5 houses, for a village like Ranby that is unsustainable and unsupportable, and would significantly and detrimentally alter the village. It is unfeasible, and you would be destroying its character. Your “broad brush” approach to all villages does not afford each village the specific attention to making a decision on development that they deserve. These development decisions and policies should be based on actual evidence about each village to determine the appropriate level of growth, if any. You cannot apply a “one size fits all” approach, because villages as small and as rural as Ranby would be more affected by a 5% increase than other larger villages. Any number of more houses built in such a small village will have much more of an impact than more houses built in a village of already 500. It would be disproportionate in its effect to Ranby Village. The increased houses would increase the traffic within the village and to/from the village. The road junctions from Ranby onto the busy, fast A620 and A1 are already very busy at certain times of day, and verging on dangerous at peak times. The “ruralness” of the village would be lost. Ranby does not have the services to support, or sustain any more houses being built. It would massively affect the village to have another 8 cars or more, coming to and from the village. It would also severely affect the village’s carbon footprint, congestion on the surrounding roads, and the green environment/added pollution generally. There is only a very skeleton bus service and so everyone would have to drive. The carbon footprint would be increased significantly, as there would be more residents to have to drive to access nearly all services. In my view, the council should look to develop areas closer to the main towns of Worksop, Retford and Harworth. If other larger villages, like Carlton in Lindrick have the ability and desire to grow and can do sustainably, the council should focus developing these areas. In relation to Retford, more housing should be built closer to where there is already services that can support and need support from more residents. Transport networks already exist. Many existing services in the towns, especially Retford could be upgraded and extended if needed, with much less disruption and cost. Ordsall is on the outskirts of Retford, which could be further extended. North Road, London Road, and towards Welham similarly. Retford’s footprint should grow, and could grow sustainably and in a more “measured” way. The town centre would be enhanced.</p>	<p>The spatial strategy in the Local Plan classifies rural settlements into three tiers:</p> <p>Large Rural Settlements; Small Rural Settlements; Countryside.</p> <p>The classification is based on a settlements size and the level of services and facilities they contain. This enables us to direct the majority of growth to those settlements with services and restrict growth in those that have few or none at all.</p> <p>Although Ranby is considered a Small Rural Settlement, the Local Plan has now incorporated Ranby's requirement into the growth figures for the Garden Village (which will be located within the Babworth/Ranby Parish area). Therefore, the growth requirement for Ranby in Policy ST2 is zero. Any growth proposed in the village will need to comply with parts 2 or 3 of Policy ST2.</p>
REF165	Dunham-on-Trent with Ragnall, Darlton and Fledborough Parish Council	We are pleased that the Council has agreed to reduce the housing growth figure in Small Rural Settlements from 20% to 5% with the flexibility to provide a greater number of houses with community support, evidenced through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Dunham is the only community within our Parish Council that has an allocation and we could foresee problems with a 20% growth because of potential flooding issues.	Thank you for your comment.
REF027	Resident	I would sincerely hope that any further significant development in Beckingham village itself is heartily refused since we are now enduring many more times the number of properties we were meant to have in the original quota. In effect, that has changed the character of the village scene and only feeds landowners rather than preserves rural life. Some development has been needed and positive, but large scale estates such as we now have do not enhance the overall appearance of the village. Balance & proportionality have a sacred place in planning decisions in order to ensure parity across the rurality whilst providing homes fit to live in.	Thank you for your comment.
REF132	JVH Planning on behalf of Kilner Estate	We object to Policy ST2, it is not clear if the figures on page 35 are a new requirement or include existing permissions Pages 36 and 37 lists the smaller rural settlements which collectively accommodate 1,502 of the housing requirement, again it is not clear if these figures include existing commitments.	An updated supporting text and background paper provides the necessary information on the housing monitoring framework.
REF135	Pegasus Group on behalf of land owner	Policy ST2 refers directly to Langold as a Large Rural Settlement and the housing requirement of 227 dwellings. As discussed above, it is considered that this housing requirement should also be considered to be a minimum figure as per the case made for Policy ST1.	Policy ST2 provides a mechanism for additional growth based on the needs of the community. This can be through the Neighbourhood Plan process or through justifying there is a local need for a particular type of accommodation i.e. affordable housing.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW			
REF137	Pegasus Group on behalf of Sunnyside Dairy Farms Limited	<p>Policy ST2 Rural Bassetlaw confirms that the Small Rural Settlements will collectively accommodate a minimum of 1,502 dwellings of the District's housing requirement. For Normanton on Trent, a housing requirement of 8 dwellings is included. The table at Policy ST2 C) confirms the eligible Small Rural Settlements and the associated housing requirement for each. This totals 473 dwellings and appears to be based on a 5% uplift of existing settlement sizes (at August 2018). We would suggest that sub clause C) is amended to refer to additional sites being identified, rather than additional settlements, as follows: 'Residential development in the following eligible Small Rural Settlements will collectively accommodate a minimum of 1,502 of the District's housing requirement, unless other additional sites are identified through a Neighbourhood Plan.' Subsection D confirms that proposals in the Small Rural Settlements will be supported where four criteria are met: 1) Proposals should not exceed the number of dwellings in the eligible settlement(s) in their Parish by more than 5% individual or in combination with other housing developments with planning permission (granted since April 2020) or through site allocations in Neighbourhood Plans; 2) The proposal does not conflict with the character and built form or that part of the settlement; 3) The proposal prioritises the use of brownfield land and avoids the use of the most versatile agricultural land; and 4) The design positively responds to design principles identified at Policy ST37, and any relevant characterisations studies as part of a Neighbourhood Plan. Policy commentary at paragraph 5.2.4 states that the policy framework has evolved following the January 2020 Local Plan consultation; 'recognising that the Large Rural Settlements are identified by Policy ST1 as being more sustainable than the Small Rural Settlements, so growth should reflect that. Equally, many of the Small Rural Settlements would struggle to accommodate the required percentage of growth due to constraints, such as flood risk, and the availability of suitable land.' The growth percentage for the Large Rural Settlements remains at 20%, whereas for the Small Rural Settlements this has been reduced to 5% growth. From a review of the January 2020 Consultation Responses, it appears that this change in approach is in part as a result of a large number of representations from residents of one of the Small Rural Settlements, in relation to that particular emerging Neighbourhood Plan. The table at C) should be amended to include 10% growth for Small Rural Settlements, which for Normanton on Trent would be 16 dwellings. The overall minimum figure of 1,500 dwellings should also be revisited as necessary in the context of a 10% growth requirement for the Small Rural Settlements. The Draft Local Plan January 2020 included a growth requirement of 20%, and this reduction in requirement to only 5% is not appropriate and does not support rural settlements or take advantage of opportunities for small scale sustainable growth; 10% growth is therefore considered more appropriate. Subsection E) confirms that where the percentage housing requirement for an eligible settlement has been met, additional development will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that it has the support of the community and Council through the preparation, or review, of a Neighbourhood Plan. The Council is therefore reliant on the remainder of the minimum housing requirement being delivered through Neighbourhood Plans. Paragraph 5.2.7 advises that 'the Neighbourhood Plan is the most appropriate mechanism to demonstrate community support to justify a different level or distribution of growth within their designated area based on local circumstances and local needs.' Whilst the encouragement given to local communities in progressing Neighbourhood Plans to allocate sites to meet their housing requirement themselves is supported, this should not preclude the delivery of sustainable sites in Small Rural Settlements where a Neighbourhood Plan is not being produced, such as Normanton on Trent. Policy ST2 D 1) should be amended as follows: 'Proposals should not exceed the number of dwellings in the eligible settlement(s) in their Parish, by more than 10% individually or in combination with other housing developments with planning permission (granted since 1 April 2018). Paragraph 5.2.9 advises that the delivery of growth in eligible settlements is being monitored monthly in order to provide the community, Neighbourhood Plan Groups, Parishes and housebuilders with an up-to-date account of the demand for development and the remaining requirement in each settlement going forward. It is confirmed that the base date for rural monitoring is April 2018 for Policy ST2, and planning permissions granted from that date are deducted moving forward. It is important that this monitoring information is made publicly available on a regular basis. Figure 7 provides a housing trajectory; however, this is not considered to be sufficiently detailed to demonstrate how the Council intends to maintain a five-year supply of housing in accordance with the NPPF. The Local Plan should include a detailed trajectory to help identify if there are any delays in the delivery of sites.</p>	<p>Policy ST2 has been amended in terms of its structure to deal with the growth requirement and then to manage any additional residential development in areas. Additional residential development over and above the identified requirement will only be supported where it is planned through a Neighbourhood Plan or it is proposing to need a local need.</p> <p>The 5% requirement for small rural settlements provides a baseline for each settlement and was reduced from 20% due to concerns about impact on infrastructure and character. In addition, both large rural settlements and small rural settlements were proposed to grow by 20% which made the strategy unclear as there wasn't a distinctive difference between the two tiers.</p> <p>Due to the high volume of existing housing commitments within the rural area, a reduction of 5% for small rural settlements would help reduce the potential impact of development on local infrastructure.</p>
REF186	Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England	We welcome the addition of D. 3. (use of previously developed land and protecting good quality agricultural land). We do not understand why January 2020 D. 5. (preventing coalescence) has been removed given that D.5. was an important policy tool for protecting open countryside.	A reference to preventing coalescence between settlements has been added to the Policy criteria.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW			
REF151	Guy Taylor Associates on behalf of the land owners	<p>Policy ST2 confirms the allocations for the various tiers of rural development and in section C sets out the position for the smaller rural communities. Whilst the plan recognises the need to support rural communities via growth and allocates a minimum of 1,502 houses to be delivered over the plan period, it is clear that there is insufficient allocation within the table provided within ST2. In fact the table only allocates some 473 houses to the parishes named which represents only a third of the requirement. 260 dwellings have been permitted in the period 2018-2020 which contribute towards the trajectory, however it cannot be expected that the remaining 769 houses can be found via windfall sites. The policy indicates that the various parishes named in the table, identify the locations for these allocations but should not exceed the target figures by more than 5% unless allocated via a Neighbourhood Plan. It would appear that the figures presented are suggesting that the fixed position is only a third of the requirement and each parish is expected to identify and provide the excess to achieve the minimum target for the tier. Effectively each parish should be seeking to generate an allocation 3 times larger than the allocation via a Neighbourhood Plan if Bassetlaw are to achieve their minimum targets. As per the previous section, it would also be prudent to re-visit the allocation based upon the December version of the Standard Method of Housing Need as this has increased the housing requirement across the plan. Whilst the figures are under review, Bassetlaw should reconsider how Parish Targets are set as they clearly don't achieve the minimum target delivery as issued within the table contained within ST2. A worked example would be Treswell which has a base number of dwellings of 99 from August 2018. Within the Jan 2020 version of the plan the 20% allocation was set at 20 new dwellings. within the November variant this is set at 5 dwellings effectively 5% this is diminished by an extant planning consent (commitment within the 2018-2020 timeframe) which reduces the allocation to 4 dwellings within Treswell over the plan period. The reality is that the requirement is 15% growth across the 31 parishes which are not washed over by flood zones and can deliver capacity in order to meet the min 1,502 target set within Policy ST2. This would require the Treswell allocation to be set at 15 new houses in order to fulfil the Local Plan trajectory minus the commitments from 2018-2020 which is one house giving an allocation of 14 new homes for the plan period, not the 5 contained within the table in ST2.</p>	<p>The distribution of Rural growth has also accounted for existing commitments, completions and made neighbourhood plan allocations. This reduces the number to roughly around 400 homes for the small rural settlements which is then delivered as part of a requirement for the identified settlements. These figures have been updated to reflect a more recent position and a monitoring framework provides the latest figures on the Council's website.</p> <p>Further information is explained within the Spatial Strategy Background Paper and the Rural Settlements Background Paper.</p>
REF151	Guy Taylor Associates on behalf of the land owners	<p>Within the Bassetlaw district 30 parishes are at various stages of the Neighbourhood Plan process with over half adopted and forming planning policy. Many of the Made plans are under review and those yet to be Made are in the development stages. The Neighbourhood Plans which have been adopted were created under the previous Bassetlaw Core Strategy 2011 and responded to the policies it contained. With reference to Rural Settlements the general rule contained within the Core Strategy was no development in 'other settlements' within Policy DM9. This position denied any parish within the definition any opportunity of growth other than replacement dwellings or conversion of existing buildings within Core Strategy policies DM2 and DM3, or those developments which would meet a local need for affordable housing. For parishes creating a new Neighbourhood Plan or those under review, the nature of the emerging policy has been problematic. Until the January 2020 edition of the Bassetlaw Part II Plan, all rural parishes knew there would be no allocation. The January 2020 Draft Plan asked them to consider a 20% uplift in housing. This being the case a number of Neighbourhood Steering Groups were facing the position of substantial growth figures to accommodate within their Neighbourhood Plans and as such started the process of considering site allocations. Committees have been formed and calls for sites issued. As a practice we are working for a number of clients in this position where emerging policy dictates that a client has professional representation in its site submissions as the stakes are high for this type of opportunity. On this basis both Parish Steering Groups, the District Council and professional representatives have been working to promote sites through the whole of 2020. This work however has been abortive for all parties with the publication of the November draft which removes allocation for a significant number of parishes and reduces the targets to a figure where an allocation is unnecessary for the majority. Based on the November draft, it would appear that only 22 parishes have allocations into double figures which may require the Neighbourhood Plan to consider the location of development. However, as is reported in our section relating to Policy ST2, only a third of the housing requirement is contained within the tabulated figures within Policy ST2, and it is therefore the expectation that Parish Councils find the remaining housing to hit the minimum targets during the plan period. As reported previously, our quick calculations identify that across the 31 parishes capable for accommodating additional housing, the 1,502 target would result in a target of 15% uplift (not including an increase as a result of the December amendments to the New Standard Method of Housing Need), for each eligible parish not the 5% contained within the table within ST2. On this basis, it would appear that Parishes have been misled by Policy ST2 into a position where the stated target is minimal and would not be worthy of allocation, however the target shortfall cannot be delivered without Neighbourhood Plans allocating three times the figures represented within the table. On this basis, we would encourage Bassetlaw to clarify its position on the Parish Allocations and in particular the requirement for Neighbourhood Plans to generate allocations far in excess of the Parish allocation within the table contained in Policy ST2, in order to deliver the targets contained within the Draft Plan and those increases generated by Government which are yet to be considered.</p>	<p>The Council is working closely with Neighbourhood Planning groups on how the Bassetlaw Local Plan could impact their plans.</p> <p>Some communities who had undertaken "call for land" consultation and site assessment to accommodate the proposed 20% were struggling to find enough suitable sites to accommodate their growth requirements. This was one of the reasons why the percentage requirement for small rural settlements was reduced in November. This reduction forms a baseline for communities to work to, but Policy ST2 also provides the mechanism for communities to deliver more growth through the neighbourhood planning process where there is reasonable evidence.</p> <p>This approach allows flexibility and gives more control on additional growth to the community affected. There are several communities who are currently planning for more growth through their Neighbourhood Plans to support local services or provide a particular housing type.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW			
REF164	Fisher German on behalf of land owners	<p>Part C of Policy ST2 (Small Rural Settlements), sets out that these settlements will deliver “a minimum of 1502 of the District’s housing requirement, unless other settlements are identified through a neighbourhood plan”. A table in Part C of the policy sets out housing requirements for each of the Small Rural Settlements, based on allowing no more than 5% growth. For Treswell, a requirement of 5 dwellings is identified (the previous Draft Plan identified 20 dwellings). Whilst the overall target for the Small Rural Settlements is approx. 1,500 dwellings, the housing numbers assigned to the Small Rural Settlements through the 5% cap process and detailed in the table within the policy would only deliver approx. 473 dwellings (less than a third of 1,500). It is therefore clear that the Council needs to increase the housing requirements for the Small Rural Settlements, in order to enable the Plan to deliver the number of homes assigned to these communities. Without ensuring that the minimum of 1,500 homes is delivered, the Bassetlaw Plan will fail to be “positively prepared”, as required by national planning policy. In the supporting text to Policy ST2 (paragraphs 5.2.3 to 5.2.5) the following explanation for the 5% growth of Small Rural Settlements is set out: “In the January 2020 draft Local Plan the target for growth was set at 20% for each settlement in the rural area, both Large and Small Settlements. In response to that consultation, the policy framework has evolved: recognising that the Large Rural Settlements are identified by Policy ST1 as being more sustainable than the Small Rural Settlements, so growth should reflect that. Equally, many of the Small Rural Settlements would struggle to accommodate the required percentage of growth due to constraints, such as flood risk, and the availability of suitable land. In some cases, this has been demonstrated through the site allocation process of neighbourhood plans. On that basis, growth of eligible settlements listed in Policy ST2 is identified as a percentage based on the existing Parish dwelling number (as of 13th August 2018 - when the data was collected). The growth percentage for the Large Rural Settlements remains at 20%, whereas the Small Rural Settlements is now 5%”. It is not clear why the 5% cap has been chosen. It is not evidence based and as illustrated above will not enable the Council to meet its housing need. It is suggested that the Small Rural Settlements would struggle to accommodate additional growth; this is not the case. In the case of Treswell, the two sites promoted through the Plan making process at Cocking Lane and Town Street are not constrained by flood risk, heritage or ecological designations. Moreover, they are edge of settlement sites which are available for development now and therefore should be considered as being able to assist in delivering the housing numbers assigned to the Small Rural Settlements. The availability of these sites in Treswell demonstrates why it is entirely appropriate to allocate a higher housing requirement to the village and increase the growth cap from 5%. It is recognised that Part E of Policy ST2 seeks to address the shortfall which is created by the cap. It states that “Where the percentage housing requirement for an eligible settlement has been achieved, additional housing development will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that it has the support of the community and Council through the preparation, or review, of a neighbourhood plan”. This effectively leaves it with Neighbourhood Plans to decide how to deliver the remaining circa 1,000 dwellings across the Smaller Rural Settlements. As practice shows, it is very unlikely that Neighbourhood Plans will choose to allocate more than the percentage housing requirement assigned to them. To seek to ensure that the housing need is met across these villages that the policy should be updated to reflect a minimum housing target that the individual Neighbourhood Plans should meet. This addition to the policy is needed to provide a clear framework for emerging Neighbourhood Plans.</p>	<p>Small Rural settlements should deliver 1500 new homes over the plan period. The majority of this is already committed through existing planning permissions. Any remaining part of this requirement will be delivered by the proposed 473 or 5% requirement for each of the identified settlements. In some cases, the 5% has also been committed or it has been planned within a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Policy ST2 provides a mechanism for individual communities to plan for further growth if they wish to do so through the production of a Neighbourhood Plan if it can be justified. Justification for an increase in growth could be to support local services and facilities or to regenerate a vacant or brownfield site.</p>
REF171	Lichfields on behalf of land owner	<p>As part of our earlier submissions to the draft Bassetlaw Local Plan, we have set out our objection to draft Policy ST2 on the basis that it unjustifiably stifles housing growth (and the socio-economic benefits associated with this) in sustainable, rural settlements such as Ranskill. Our previous objection to draft Policy ST2 still stands and particularly so, now that it proposes even fewer new houses in Ranskill. Alongside the draft Local Plan, we note that responses to the consultation that was undertaken in January 2020 have been published on the Council’s website¹. With regard to draft Policy ST2, only the overall conclusions of our previous letter (dated 26 February 2020) are responded to in the officers comments, rather than the issues we identified regarding the detail of the draft policy itself. In the absence of these issues having been addressed, we do not consider draft Policy ST2 to be justified, positively prepared or consistent with national policy in terms of its approach to delivering new housing in rural Bassetlaw. Thus, we consider the policy to be unsound. Overall, Ranskill is an appropriate location to accommodate future growth, with earlier drafts of the Local Plan explicitly recognising it as one of the district’s “sustainable rural settlements”. To this end, new housing development would help support the longevity of shops, services and community infrastructure that are currently provided in the village, whilst also providing a critical mass of new residents with which to attract new facilities.</p>	<p>Ranskill is considered a small rural settlement and therefore it can accommodate some limited development. The reason why the requirement had been reduced for Small Rural Settlements is that there was previously no distinction between large rural settlements and small rural settlements as they were both set at 20%. In addition, some communities could not accommodate a 20% requirement due to the lack of available or suitable land. However, if a community does want to plan for more than 5% growth and has enough available or suitable land to do so, then this can be undertaken through the Neighbourhood Plan process if justified.</p>
REF213	Treswell with Cottam Parish Council	<p>Members present note growth % for small Rural Settlements, such as Treswell with Cottam, reduced to 5% but welcome the opportunity to increase this % when supported by resident aspirations as documented in the Neighbourhood Development Plan and review. There is becoming an urgent, growing need in our communities to meet affordable housing needs of our young residents and families.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW			
1669649	Resident	<p>One size doesn't fit all. Residential development in some small rural settlements of 5% may still be undesirable. In Lound the village was previously protected because it lacked basic infrastructure and amenities. E.g. no school, problems with sewage and poor transport links. Also the village is adjacent to an SSSI. This land is a nationally recognised habitat and any development in greenfield adjacent to this is putting this site and links with Idle Valley nature reserve at risk. The council should continue to protect this significant contribution to nature and also recognise its contribution to health and wellbeing which walkers and cyclists etc enjoy. The village also has historic links to the natural habitat with the willow being used as wattle for wattle and daub building of the past. The unique character of this village should be preserved and housing development not encouraged.</p>	<p>The proposed growth requirement of 5% for Lound is currently being planned for within the emerging Lound Neighbourhood Plan. This has identified sites to accommodate this development that have been through a series of public consultation events. Once this requirement has been met, then any additional development will require community support or be justified in terms of its local need.</p>
REF220	Resident	<p>I am writing in response to the publication of the proposed Bassetlaw Local Plan. I live in Carlton in Lindrick and as part of the Bassetlaw Plan we were allocated a number of properties to be built in Carlton in Lindrick as were most of the villages around us. The number of houses required will greatly increase the size and population of the village. This applies to all the villages allocated housing quotas. People understand that some new housing is required but the amount of properties allocated is changing the villages, in some cases very dramatically. As many of the new houses being built does not fit in with the surrounding properties. In Carlton people are concerned about the number of properties being forced upon us and how it will affect the village as 150 of the properties allocated to the village are being built on the field opposite the Co-op. This field is a flood plain and was given planning permission despite objections from the local people and the Parish Council. In fact signs advertising this development were erected even before our Local Plan was voted on. The people of Carlton voted for our Local Plan because we understood that if we didn't then we could have even more development forced on us and that the Local Plan meant only the housing and other development we had agreed to in the plan would go ahead.</p> <p>I would like to know if Bassetlaw Council takes any notice of the Local Plans or if they can just be revised as the Bassetlaw Plan is being and overwritten as appears to have happened in Shireoaks. Do these Local Plans actually carry any weight? I am also concerned about the amount of development proposed for Worksop. In particular Peaks Hill Farm site. Houses are already being built on this site and some appear to be lived in. So the council is conducting a Public Consultation on housing already built. The proposed site is a very large area of farmland which slopes quite steeply down to Blyth Road and Carlton Road. The area of Carlton Road that runs along were the development would be gets a lot of water on it in heavy rain and does flood across the road near Red Lane. Has any consideration been given to how concreting over such a large area of steep farmland could cause more significant flooding along Blyth Road and Carlton Road? I am also concerned about new access road that is being built running from Blyth Road through to Carlton Road. The area of Carlton Road where the through road would have to exit has had several accidents, some of them fatal, over the years and there is no clear line of sight where traffic would be able to see vehicles pulling out onto Carlton Road. I think this will be quite dangerous. I am also concerned about how close this development will come to Carlton, both on the Carlton Road and Blyth Road ends. We are already being advanced upon by the rapidly growing Ashes Park/Eddison Park development. The houses there can now be seen from Owday Lane and Carlton Road. How many more houses are going to be built there on farmland and how close to Carlton are they going to come? Is Carlton eventually going to be swallowed up by Worksop and stop being a separate village? With housing developments being planned in Langold as well it won't be long before Carlton, Langold and Oldcotes are all joined together. Also, most of the housing developments in Worksop are being built on greenfield or farmland. As I mentioned before the Ashes Park/ Eddison Park development is already huge and still growing, the new housing at Tollbar (which is going ahead despite residents objections) is being built on farmland. The Peaks Hill site is Farmland. The housing being built at Shireoaks is on greenfields. The housing being built in Carlton opposite the Co-op is on a floodplain. The proposed development in Langold would be on Greenfields. Once the current development in Carlton is completed what's to stop developers just carrying on? They could just keep going and going as far as the eye can see. How big does a village have to get before it ceases to be a village?</p>	<p>The Bassetlaw Local Plan has identified Carlton in Lindrick as a large rural settlement. This means that it can grow by 20% over the plan period. However, when considering housing monitoring data and the recently made Neighbourhood Plan, it shows that Carlton has exceeded a 20% increase in development. This means that any new development will be subject to a stricter criteria and policies identified within the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The land to the North of the new development off Doncaster Road is proposed to be designated as a Green Gap due to its landscape character and openness. In addition, land between Carlton and Worksop has also been designated a green gap to prevent the two settlements from merging. These designations will help maintain local character and landscape quality.</p>
1670232	Resident	(Relates to Policy 17: HS1 Peaks Hill Farm Page 81) Further development within Carlton parish boundaries can only erode its village character and blur the distinction between Carlton and Worksop. Carlton residents voted for the village plan having been led to believe that doing so would limit development within the village to less than we have already seen since.	The Local Plan is proposing a Green Gap between Carlton in Lindrick and Worksop to maintain the physical separation between the two settlements.
1670589	Resident	D - Proposals in the Small Rural Settlements will be supported where all of the following are met: 1) Proposals should not exceed the number of dwellings in the eligible settlement(s) in their Parish, by more than 5% individually or in combination with other housing developments with planning permission (granted since 1 April 2018) or through site allocations in respective neighbourhood plans; This proposal is not supported. Sites for consideration in Sutton-cum-lound to come in scope are 276 and 281. This land is not appropriate.	Thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW			
1670869	Resident	the criteria and definition for determining large and small rural settlements should be set out clearly in this section of the plan. most of us do not have the time (evein if we have the inclination!) to keep looking up different and separate documents to work this out. This plan, and the assumptions behind it, must be clear to all. Again I refer to Cottam village, which is missing form the list of small rural communities yet proposals for this village include the potential for some 1600 homes to be added. how does this square with the policy?	The criteria for determining Large and Small Rural Settlements is defined and explained within the Rural Strategy Background Paper. Cottam doesn't classify as a Small Rural Settlement due to its size and lack of services and facilities.
REF049	Resident	We would like to add our comments again to the proposed Bassetlaw Plan, specifically that part which affects our local community in Tuxford. Tuxford is deemed as being able to accommodate a significant increase in dwellings without any reference to any additions, improvements or additional funding in infrastructure, schools or doctors. We would suggest that these dwellings would put an additional, serious strain on these services. Even during the pandemic crisis the traffic situation at peak times is dangerous -particularly between the junction of Ollerton Road and Eldon Street. The environmental impact on pedestrians has not been taken into consideration which has been exacerbated during the pandemic as people are queuing outside shops and the post office. HGV's meeting each other in the centre of the village often brings all vehicles to a standstill and endangers other road users and pedestrians alike. The impact of the additional dwellings between Ollerton Road and Long Lane is particularly problematical. Newcastle Street is bottlenecked at peak times with cars going to the school, vehicles coming off the A1 northbound, and vehicles and pedestrians accessing the Coop supermarket with street parking on both sides of the road. This would be increased by the number of new vehicles that additional dwellings would bring. We understand that the plan for the extra dwellings in Tuxford does not take into account the existing residential development that has been ongoing since 2018 as part of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. This should be looked at as part of the Bassetlaw Plan. May we also ask why our previously submitted opinions and comments cannot be considered at this juncture?	Although Tuxford is considered a sustainable settlement to accommodate additional development, it is also recognised that there are significant constraints within the town such as highways. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will need to provide suitable access points of Ollerton Road and a new footpath at the front of the site to connect with the existing one outside The Pastures. In addition, a footpath will also be provided from the site onto Long lane. Where mitigation measures to the existing highway network are required as part of the development, then these will be detailed through a Transport Assessment.
REF034	Nether-Langwith Parish Council	The Parish Council has no objections to the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan as it currently stands	Thank you for your comments
REF085	Resident	I would like to submit the following response to the Bassetlaw Local Plan consultation. They specifically relate to Clayworth. I note that the Council has chosen to reduce the housing requirement for small rural settlements, such as Clayworth, to 5% from the original 20% growth proposed in the 2020 draft Local Plan. Whilst this is welcomed, it still raises concerns about how the Council has factored in Conservation Area status when allocating these. Whilst 5% is a much more achievable figure in most rural settlements, it is still of a significant enough amount to potentially impact negatively on villages with Conservation Areas such as Clayworth. Further clarification is therefore required in the next Local Plan draft to set out appropriate safeguards to ensure the planned housing growth targets do not contravene policies designed to protect these types of villages. Not least, as the option remains for developers to seek to exceed the 5% figure if 'community support' can be demonstrated. It is unclear at the moment from the draft Local Plan how this community support should be demonstrated in areas, such as Clayworth, which do not have a Neighbourhood Plan in place. I suggest this should be demonstrated by the support, or not, of the Parish Council. If the Parish Council does not support exceeding the 5% growth target, then the application should be refused. I hope the Council will consider these comments when publishing the next, and potentially final, version of the Local Plan.	Heritage, including Conservation Area designations, are important factors when determining the location of growth or making a decision on a planning application. A conservation Area doesn't automatically preclude development, but any proposals will need to demonstrate how they preserve and enhance the areas historic qualities. This is generally done through the planning application process.
REF090	Resident	At the moment Misson Mill is the preferred site for housing in Misson by Parish Council and may be Bassetlaw Council but at the moment the owners of that site 1. Do not seem interested in developing it for housing, so while they sit around knowing they are the preferred site other sites around the village are at a disadvantage So a policy where a preferred site has a time limit on it (3 years) to start would make it fairer for other land owners to have their sites considered if they wanting to start applying for planning permission.	The community can look at these issues through a review of their made Neighbourhood Plan. If the community wish to see alternative or additional sites being development, then this can be done through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
REF077	Carlton in Lindrick Parish Council	The Parish Council is now generally supportive of the Draft Local Plan and acknowledges the additional measures included to create the open space area adjacent to the A60 highway, the retention of an established natural boundary inbetween Rural Carlton in Lindrick and the Urban Environment of Worksop and to protect from any further development in a northerly direction on both side of the A60 – North of the proposed new road and North of the developed Gateford Area in Worksop. It is also acknowledged that those proposals compliment a significant feature of the Parish Neighbourhood Plan representing strong community views that the rural and agricultural environment be maintained in and around the village.	Thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW			
REF138	Resident	<p>Firstly, we would like to say how pleased we were to see that Small Rural Settlements, in the spirit of Localism and with a recognition that local residents usually know their villages better than most, have been given more sensible control over housing development than in previous versions of your Plan. Your minimum Housing Requirement of 5% of the existing number of houses in the Parish, equivalent to 10 new dwellings in Lound, is generally recognised as a reasonable contribution to the national housing shortage, given the very limited facilities in the village and our very narrow streets. Paragraph E says strongly and unequivocally "Where the percentage housing requirement for an eligible settlement has been achieved, additional housing development will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that it has the support of the community and Council through the preparation, or review, of a neighbourhood plan." This statement is also reinforced in a number of other places, for example at paragraph 5.1.53. However, a recent conversation with your Dr Will Wilson has thrown some doubt on this, when he said that only settlements without neighbourhood plans could regard 5% as a maximum as well as a minimum. For other settlements, such as Lound, which is in the process of producing a neighbourhood plan, we do understand that, while the neighbourhood plan can direct development towards particular sites, it cannot define exactly how many houses should be built on specific sites. A developer may apply for permission to build more houses than those envisaged on a neighbourhood plan site and, when a good case is put forward, these may be approved. While understanding this, we cannot really accept that the overall level of development of 5% for Lound could be breached, against the wishes of the community. This seems to directly contradict the words in Paragraph E on page 37.</p>	The Local Plan sets a requirement for Lound at 5% any additional residential development beyond this figure will need to be justified through a local need (i.e. affordable housing) or through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
REF141	Lound Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	<p>In response to the consultation we support the recent change in the minimum requirement for development in Small Rural Settlements. The requirement for 5% of the existing housing, equivalent to 10 houses in Lound, has received substantial support in the village, and has been generally accepted as achievable. We are concerned, however, that the planning process may over-rule this 5% requirement in that a developer of one of our identified sites may apply for more houses than was initially allowed in the Neighbourhood Plan, despite opposition from the local population. We feel that this is in conflict with one of the reasons for developing Neighbourhood Plans.</p>	The Local Plan sets a requirement for Lound at 5% any additional residential development beyond this figure will need to be justified through a local need (i.e. affordable housing) or through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
REF189	NHS Bassetlaw CCG	<p>Given the development plans in some of the more rural locations it is vital that infrastructure is in place to support delivery of health services and would therefore welcome the digital infrastructure plans for connectivity for our communities. Wi-Fi/connectivity to enable remote health care management is key in the current new ways of working and essential in some circumstances. It is important in respect to ill health prevention and wellness promotion that we also support our residents who are lonely or socially isolated (whatever age) to remain as connected as possible to supportive networks which may often be through digital channels of communication. Where there are wider developments in more rural locations consideration needs to be given to the provision of pharmaceutical services and we would welcome consultation with local pharmacy providers as part of individual consultation on developments in the area(s) as they come on board.</p>	Thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW			
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	<p>Undue competition for rural housing with the provision of so many on Apleyhead site. Most existing villages rely upon the "little and often" principle of development but this means land and construction costs are generally greater than larger scale developments. The garden village is to provide 500 new homes in this plan period, the equivalent of a village the size of Ranskill or East Markham and with this size comes the "economy of scale". Dwellings would be cheaper and people will gravitate to these cheaper homes. This will mean that the only dwellings built in all villages will be large expensive homes, not what the mix requirements suggest. Villages will therefore not be able to retain services nor attract any new ones, they will become "dormitories" and not provide family homes for rural workers or workers at the new employment node points. This form of large scale residential development will have effects on the rural area for generations to come and it is having its effect already with the housing cap on smaller villages now being proposed at 5% rather than 20% which has been used by several Parish Councils in the preparation and adoption of Neighbourhood Plans. The establishment of a new large housing allocation will affect the following:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Equal provision of housing around the district given that economies of scale will provide much cheaper homes. b. Reduce further the amount of smaller family homes or senior citizen accommodation in villages. c. The amount of larger more expensive dwellings in villages will increase as these will be the only market that can afford these costs. d. Reduce the ability of villages to retain and attract services. However, numbers will less need for the shop, public house, village hall and, most importantly the nursery/primary school. e. There will be no investment or increase in the frequency of the rural bus services. People who buy large rural properties do not utilise the bus service. f. Once this process is put in place and homes start to roll off the construction line then it becomes irreversible, therefore all the negative effects on the existing rural area will last for generations. g. Much in the same way "out of town retail" was resisted, this form of "out of town residential" should also be resisted. Evidence for out of town development does have a major negative effect is clear when one looks at both Retford and Worksop town centres, both are shadows of their former selves. There is a glut of charity shops and what has been recently classified as non-essential shops but the vast majority of footfall traffic heads to the supermarkets given that many of these now stock clothes, household goods, furniture, tools, equipment etc. The need therefore to enter the town has diminished. The same will happen with housing although this time it will be villages and communities that suffer. If the number of families in our villages stays static and does not increase then the schools, shops and public houses will close meaning that children, shoppers and the general community will need to travel, it defeats the object. <p>Evidence for the need of a garden village Other than the general shortfall of housing in the district and in particular affordable housing I do not see evidence that suggests a garden village is the way to resolve this. It is correct that it will provide houses, employment and services. The employment requirement is clear but the only reason we need services is because we are putting houses there. If we did not put houses, we would not need the services therefore if the houses can be located in existing areas the whole ethos of a garden village is unproven. Obviously a garden village can be seen as a panacea for all. All the obvious facilities would have to be provided by developers but I see little evidence of studies to investigate the impacts, either negative or positive, on surrounding villages and our rural area in general. These large scale allocations for residential development should be omitted and resisted strongly.</p>	<p>Policy ST2 doesn't seek to stifle the development of rural communities, but manage it in a sustainable way. Over the past ten years, a number of communities have seen a large volume of development or planning permissions. If all are built, then it could materially change the character of some of these villages.</p> <p>When looking at the distribution of housing, it is important to consider this and identify what is an appropriate level of development when considering the role, function and character of each area.</p> <p>The Council recognises that the more general approach might lead to some issues where certain communities need additional development to support their local services and facilities. However, the Council also believes that this should be at the discretion of the community. If there is a need or desire for additional growth within individual settlements, then this can be undertaken through the Neighbourhood Plan process.</p> <p>In addition, Policy ST2 also provides a framework to support local housing needs where appropriate through the delivery of affordable housing or rural dwellings.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW			
REF181	Rural Solutions on behalf of Foljambe	<p>Draft Policy ST2 (Rural Bassetlaw): states that residential development in the eligible Small Rural Settlements, "will collectively accommodate a minimum of 1502 of the District's housing requirement, unless other settlements are identified through a neighbourhood plan". This policy provides a further breakdown and it identifies a housing requirement for the village of Sturton-le-Steeple of 11 dwellings. The Draft Policy also states that "proposals should not exceed the number of dwellings in the eligible settlement(s) in their Parish, by more than 5% individually or in combination with other housing developments with planning permission (granted since 1 April 2018) or through site allocations in respective neighbourhood plans. Furthermore, Draft Policy ST2 states a housing minimum requirement, which would indicate that there is no cap on sustainable development but then the additional policy wording applies a cap of 5% of the total number of dwellings in the parish and its states that this figure should not be exceeded. Our commentary above is also applicable to this cap. The suggested 5% is far too restrictive and it will stifle development in the rural settlements required to ensure they remain sustainable. There should be no cap on sustainable development, as referenced in many planning appeals. Policies ST1 and ST2 are currently unsound with an unjustified cap on sustainable growth in the Rural Settlements. The wording of these policies should be updated to reflect our comments made above on the restrictive percentage but to also allow sustainable development to come forward, regardless of the identified housing requirement. The purpose is to ensure the vitality and viability of all settlements and to provide local communities with a choice of new homes. Policy ST1, Policy ST2To ensure the soundness tests of Policies ST1 and ST2 are met, we respectfully request change the wording to allow for a greater level of housing growth in the Small Rural Settlements. Furthermore, there should be no cap on sustainable development to be in line with national policy. It is important that the smaller rural settlements such as Sturton-le-Steeple are able to make a meaningful contribution to the future housing land supply in the Bassetlaw District and to ensure that they can maintain a healthy population within their local communities</p>	<p>Each of the identified Large and Small Rural Settlements have been allocated a growth requirement. This requirement is considered a reasonable level of growth to support the needs of the settlements, whilst considering the size, character and scale of the settlements. It is right for the Local Plan to distinguish between the individual settlements and their role, function and character when considering the distribution of housing across the District. Policy ST2 also provides the mechanism for additional growth if there is a need or it is planned through the Neighbourhood Planning process. There are communities that are already doing this. The Neighbourhood Plan process is considered the most reasonable and fair way to gauge the level of community support.</p>
REF196	Savills on behalf of The Henry Smith Charity	<p>Clayworth is classified as a 'Small Rural Settlement' within the Draft Local Plan. Draft policy states that development in the Small Rural Settlements accommodate a minimum of 1502 dwellings of the District's housing requirement. The previous draft of the Local Plan included a provision for 20% growth within Smaller Rural Settlements. The current iteration of the Plan has reduced this provision considerably to 5%. Paragraph 78 of the NPPF supports growth in the rural areas: "To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby." It is considered that the reduction to 5% is not sufficient to ensure the sustainable growth in many rural settlements. Clayworth is a village with local services and paragraph 78 emphasises the need for development in these particular locations to enable them to thrive. The 7 dwellings proposed is considered insufficient to maximise the potential benefits to local services both within Clayworth and other villages in the surrounding area. In addition, whilst the aspirations of criterion D.3) are supported, the requirement for a site to be previously developed in order for growth to be supported is considered unduly restrictive. It is recommended that this criteria is optional rather than a prerequisite for support. Part E of ST2 is considered to also considered to be contrary to the principles of sustainable development, particularly in Small Rural Settlements, which have facilities. Whilst there are many Neighbourhood Plans underway within Bassetlaw, not all areas are preparing these. It is important that areas are able to contribute to a higher growth target than 5% irrespective of whether or not a Neighbourhood Plan is underway. There is a significant time commitment associated with the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan and not all communities will be in a position to prepare one. It is therefore essential that the policy does not prejudice the growth potential of Small Rural Villages where a Neighbourhood Plan is not being prepared. It is recommended that part E is removed from policy ST2. The requirements of criteria 2 and 4 address the character of any proposed development and are considered sufficient to ensure that new housing responds appropriately to its context. Consideration should be given to the longer term application of policy ST2 to ensure that whilst growth takes place in suitable locations at an appropriate scale, the timescale of the Local Plan does not constrain development in the later years of the plan period. It will be important that when reviewing the Local Plan, consideration is given to the amount of housing built in the Small Rural Settlements in the previous years to ensure that villages do not stagnate once targets have been met. There may be opportunities within and on the edge of rural villages for the reuse of agricultural buildings for new activities, including residential. In some cases, these proposals can be undertaken without the need for planning permission via an application for prior approval under Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the GPDO. In other cases, these proposals would need to be undertaken via a planning application, where Class Q would not be applicable. In all instances, where appropriate buildings are converted, this should be seen as a sustainable approach to new housing growth which makes use of existing resources. For this reason, it is important that planning policy allows for this type of development to take place. It is also essential that policy views these conversions separately from new build development in villages, and additional housing created through conversions should be excluded from any growth figures set out in ST2. Conclusions. Policy ST2 which supports some development in Small Rural Villages should go further an allow up to 20% growth as a means of ensuring that communities</p>	<p>Settlements across rural Bassetlaw vary in size and scale. Their level of services, facilities and infrastructure also varies according to the location. The Council believe that it is important to support growth in the rural area, but it must be planned in a sustainable way. The feedback from previous public consultation was that 20% for smaller settlements should be reduced as it could lead to a significant change to a settlements size, scale and character. There was also concern that local infrastructure may not be able to support such growth. In addition, it was also pointed out that there was no distinction between the large and small rural settlements in terms of the percentage growth as they were both at 20%</p> <p>Therefore by reducing the percentage growth for smaller settlements is more consistent with their size and character. Policy ST2 provides flexibility where communities can plan for additional development is they wish to do so through a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Where there is a need for a particular type of residential development, then Policy ST2 provides a mechanism to support this i.e. affordable housing, First Homes and rural dwellings.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW		remain sustainable and local services supported. It is recommended that criterion E is removed as, at present it would have a negative impact on villages which are not preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.	
REF187	iba Planning	<p>Finally, we also have concerns about the amendments made to the criteria contained within Policy ST2 applicable when the percentage housing requirement for an eligible settlement has been reached. Policy ST2(E) states that where the percentage housing requirement for an eligible settlement has been achieved, additional housing development will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that it has the support of the community and Council through the preparation, or review, of a Neighbourhood Plan. This is far more restrictive than the wording of the previous version of the policy in the January 2020 Local Plan, where additional housing beyond the percentage housing target was permissible under a greater range of circumstances, including where the proposal provides affordable housing or specialist housing to help meet a local need for that community, provides a community-led housing scheme, where it is part of a wider regeneration scheme or on an existing brownfield site within or adjoining a Large or Small Rural Settlement, or where it is essential to enable the redevelopment of a heritage asset. The amended wording, with its primary focus on Neighbourhood Plans, penalises communities which do not have a Neighbourhood Plan and may prevent sites coming forward on sites in such settlements even if they have high levels of community support. It could also prevent the development of sites in Neighbourhood Plan areas which have community support but are not specifically supported in the Neighbourhood Plan, perhaps because the site was not available at the time of the drafting of the Neighbourhood Plan or because the views of the community or the perceived need for additional housing have changed since the making of the Neighbourhood Plan (Neighbourhood Plans provide a snap shot of overall community opinion at the time of their making but do not reflect changes in public opinion that arise over time). Such development could include schemes for affordable housing or specialist housing to help meet local needs (often highly valued in rural communities as evident in the HUGS Neighbourhood Plan, the Sturton Ward Neighbourhood Plan, and the Treswell and Cottam Neighbourhood Plan), community-led housing schemes, regeneration of brownfield sites, or development essential to enable the preservation of a heritage asset, all important forms of development with tangible benefits to the local community previously supported under ST2(E). Having regard to the above, we submit that the previous wording of Policy ST2(E) encompassing the greater range of circumstances where additional housing above the cap will be considered is a fairer policy which does not disadvantage communities without Neighbourhood Plans or prevent communities with made Neighbourhood Plans from deviating from their plans as a result of a change in circumstances or public opinion, and provides greater flexibility to enable settlements to react to changes in circumstances, as advocated by the NPPF (paragraph 81). As such, we would request that the Council consider reinstating the previous wording to Policy ST2(E) set out in the January 2020 version of the Local Plan. In summary, we cannot support the Council's latest approach to rural housing growth set out in the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan November 2020 which prevents growth in many smaller rural settlements in the District previously considered suitable for limited growth, and request that the Council reconsider its approach and revert back to the approach set out in the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan January 2020 (as amended to take into account our outstanding concerns to this), or even better, the 2019 Draft Bassetlaw Plan Part 1: Strategic Plan, which will result in the Local Plan which better supports the vitality of rural Bassetlaw and aligns with national planning policy.</p>	<p>The revised Policy provides a clearer criteria as to what types of residential development will be supported once the growth requirement has been met. This includes the need for affordable housing, First Homes, rural dwellings or conversions of existing buildings.</p> <p>The Council believe the Neighbourhood Planning process is the fairest way of judging the level of community support as the Plan is required to go through a strict process of public consultation and referendum.</p> <p>Bassetlaw has a number of Neighbourhood Plans that are seeking more development than the Local Plan requires due to local need or to support local services and facilities. This supports the view that this part of the Policy is reasonable and can work in practice.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW			
REF208	P&DG on behalf of Welbeck Estate	<p>In the previous stage of representation, we raised concerns over the proposed implementation of a 20% "cap" for growth in Large and Small Rural Settlements. We were concerned with the blanket cap's lack of flexibility to meeting the overall objective of the National Planning Policy Framework of promoting housing in sustainable locations. The "cap" would also severely limit the flexibility for new sustainable sites to come forward throughout the Plan Period. Should larger, more strategic sites not come forward, smaller sites in locations lower in the Settlement Hierarchy can play a vital role in providing housing across the District. A "cap" would jeopardise this ability. It is therefore disappointing to see that within draft Policy ST2, the "cap" for Small Rural Settlements has been reduced to only 5% of the existing dwellings within the settlements. This will continue to place severe limitations on the land which can come forward for development across rural Bassetlaw. We would also be concerned that the cap will prejudice the committed growth in existing Neighbourhood Plans that would already appear to exceed the cap and demonstrate significant community support. Perhaps an exemption to any final cap, if it is chosen to be applied, should be given to those commitments so as to not derail the commitments of an existing Neighbourhood Plan or force their review into a downward projection? Paragraph 68 of the National Planning Policy Framework highlights the important contribution small and medium sized sites can make towards meeting the housing requirement of an area, noting their relatively quick built-out rates. Whilst it is appreciated that the number of dwellings allocated for development across small rural settlements is reflective of their placing within the settlement hierarchy, it is the very construct of this hierarchy that is questioned owing to the inclusion of a significant number of sustainable locations in the 'small rural settlement' category when they would be better represented in all aspects of the plan through a category above. The implementation of such a small "cap" on these settlements will inhibit the ability for a sufficient amount and variety of land to come forward across the Plan period. Furthermore, we note that the Government's recently revised Standard Housing Methodology has redressed the balance and distribution of housing figures nationwide; in particular where there is not an up to date development plan, a cap will be introduced at 40% above whichever is the higher of the projected housing growth in the last adopted Core Strategy (2011) or the 10 year household projections from 2014. From our initial review of this situation in Bassetlaw, it would suggest that either scenario would place the District Council in a position where it will need to reforecast its housing requirements in the emerging plan. An inevitable consequence of this, in our view, will be that the Council cannot rely on the prospective Garden Village and its largest settlements alone. It must have to redress growth in the more sustainable settlements across Rural Bassetlaw as a key part of the reforecasting. P&DG would therefore continue to express its concerns over the application of a "cap", whether at 5% or 20%. The expectation upon significant community support to deliver more than the desired cap is also not particularly progressive to respond to the eminent housing needs that exist now; communities that may not express a wish to commence a Neighbourhood Plan or Plan Review may experience delay in preparing a plan when the settlement itself is sustainable in many regards. With the onus upon delivery and ensuring plan viability through the course of the plan period, 'under allocating' sufficient housing numbers and sites in rural Bassetlaw will only place further risk and delay to the plan and there is a risk it may not truly grasp the precedent development demands placed upon the current plan at this initial stage. In paragraph 5.2.5, it states that the figures for existing Parish dwellings are from 13th August 2018. Given that this Plan is not likely to be adopted until Mid-2022, it is vital that the dwelling figures across Parishes are updated to reflect the most up to date data available. We also wish to ask for the District Council's clarification if the prospective housing numbers for each settlement are inclusive or exclusive of the current commitments consented. The answer to this will have a particular bearing on the settlements with recent planning consents for residential development, including Nether Langwith and Cuckney. As highlighted within the previous consultation process, P&DG has reservations with the placement of Nether Langwith on the settlement hierarchy as a 'Small Rural Settlement, despite its close social and spatial relationship with Langwith and Whaley Thorns. There are far too many settlements included in this category, with varying levels of amenities that are not particularly consistent to apply an accurate judgement of their sustainability. We believe there should be a further category between those of a large and small rural settlement, to illustrate those with particular importance as a rural hub and to provide consistency with Neighbourhood Plans. In the case of Cuckney, its role in this way is well defined within the made Cuckney, Norton, Holbeck and Welbeck Neighbourhood Plan (CNHW), in supporting all of the other settlements in the plan area. Cuckney already includes a number of Neighbourhood Plan allocations that would be prejudiced by the proposed capping of growth in the small rural settlements of the emerging Plan; its pivotal role as a hub should be reflected through our suggestion towards introducing a new component of the settlement hierarchy. To reiterate the amenity offer in Cuckney includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary school; • Village hall and café; • Public house; • Place of worship; • Car garage; • Homeware/interior décor shop; • Bus service between Edwinstowe and Market Warsop; • Community garden; and • Cricket club. <p>Notwithstanding the above, because of the unique role this settlement has in its relationship with Norton, Holbeck and Welbeck, and the facilities across all four settlements, Cuckney is in proximity to a number of other amenities including the Welbeck Farm Shop, Harley Gallery and Portland Collection, Notcutts Garden Centre, Lady Margaret Hall and adjacent tennis courts. There is also a limited post office at Holbeck Woodhouse. Collectively, this is an above average range of amenities for Cuckney to be considered above a small rural</p>	<p>Growth in rural communities should be carefully controlled to enable sustainable development and resist developments where they would lead to an unacceptable impact on the environment and local infrastructure. In conjunction with Policy ST1, Policy ST2 sets an individual growth requirement for both Large and Small rural Settlements. These settlements have been divided according to their size, the level of services and facilities and their role and function.</p> <p>Large Rural Settlements are the larger settlements with key services and facilities. These settlements also provide a service centre role to nearby smaller communities who tend to use the larger settlements for shopping, health and education facilities.</p> <p>Small Rural Settlements have some services and facilities, but are limited in size and often only provides an internal function in contrast to the larger settlements.</p> <p>The distribution of growth complements their distinction within Policy ST1 and supports National Policy which encourages development within sustainable locations.</p> <p>Cuckney does not meet the necessary criteria to be classified as a Large Rural Settlement. It is small in size and only offers limited services and facilities.</p> <p>The Cuckney Neighbourhood Plan allocates sites to accommodate development and those remain available for development.</p> <p>If the community feel that additional growth is required to support their local services and facilities, then this can be planned through a review of the made Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>As individual settlements, Holbeck and Norton do not meet the criteria to classify as Small Rural Settlements. However, the growth requirement for Cuckney can be redistributed towards other settlements within the Neighbourhood Plan Area if there is reasoned justification.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW		<p>settlement, and similarly to exclude Holbeck and Norton from being considered as part of the open countryside. In the case of Nether Langwith, P&DG has raised a number of concerns with the assessments made of the sustainability of this settlement. We would suggest that such an assessment of Nether Langwith must absolutely be made in the context of the amenities that lie over the border into Bolsover, encompassing both the amenities of Langwith and Whaley Thorns. If an assessment were to be made in this way, it would undoubtedly change the category of this settlement from a small rural settlement to a large rural settlement. With the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in its early stages, it is essential that this corresponds positively with the correct definition in the hierarchy to determine the level of growth and infrastructure needs throughout the plan period. We therefore would like to ask the District Council whether this spatial relationship and level of amenities afforded to these settlements, within walking distance of the part of Nether Langwith located in Bassetlaw, has been appropriately considered in the settlement hierarchy and Sustainability Appraisal? The settlements combined provide, among others, the following amenities in walking distance of the part of Nether Langwith administratively included within Bassetlaw. This is by no means an exhaustive list, but does illustrate the significant amenity offer commensurate to a 'large rural settlement': • Railway station with an hourly service each way from Nottingham-Worksop and connections to Sheffield, Retford and Lincoln; • Regular bus services to Chesterfield, Mansfield, Edwinstowe and Worksop; • Medical centre; • Poulter Country Park; • Primary schools; • Two post offices and local convenience stores (various); • Boots Pharmacy; • Coffee shop; • Florists; • Takeaway outlets; • Hairdressers and beauty salon; • Public houses (various); • Places of worship; • Motor garage; • Sports and social club; • Heritage centre; • Village hall; • Care home; • Sports pitches and play area; • A small but important commercial offer for local businesses; and • Community allotments. The above amenity provision (when spatially considered together) suggests a very healthy provision of amenities, many of which are both in walking distance of the part of Nether Langwith located in Bassetlaw and we suggest would likely be used by households there. Alternatives would often require travel beyond the nearest settlements. P&DG suggest that the District Council reconsider their position to include Nether Langwith as a Large Rural Settlement for Growth. Within the Bassetlaw Spatial Strategy Background Paper 2020, it states that for a settlement to be considered a Large Rural Settlement, it must have a village shop, a health facility, Post Office, Primary School and village hall. When the wider settlements adjoining Nether Langwith are considered, the settlement will have all the facilities required to make it a Large Rural Settlement. Even when the wider settlements are not considered, the village demonstrates all of these facilities, and more, save for the direct inclusion of a primary school which are within reasonable distance. Furthermore the sustainability merits of this settlement have been extensively proven in favour of existing planning consents 16/01216/FUL and 20/00634/RES south of Portland Road; with Reserved Matters permission granted in October 2020 there is every intention to press ahead with this site and discharge the relevant planning conditions. It will however mean further sites need to be considered here in the plan period the context of the adjustments to the settlement hierarchy we consider essential here. When compared to other settlements within the Large Rural designation, including Misterton and Carlton in Lindrick, the combination of Nether Langwith, Langwith, and Whaley Thorns present a similar, if not greater variety of services and amenities. It is clear that, if viewed in combination with the neighbouring settlements, Nether Langwith has the amenities and services to designate it a Large Rural Settlement. In addition to this, the accessibility of the settlement is much better than other Large Rural Settlements due to its railway station, offering hourly services to Nottingham and Worksop and onward connections. P&DG also raises concerns with the omission of Norton and Holbeck in the settlement hierarchy, for reasons given throughout our representations. With our suggestion that Cuckney should be considered above that of a 'Small Rural Settlement', the role of Norton and Holbeck within the Parish's made Neighbourhood Plan includes a number of allocations for growth. The emerging plan's restrictive cap is incompatible with this shared vision across all settlements within the Neighbourhood Plan and level of growth contained within it, which is being incrementally being delivered on the ground through planning permissions and implementations. It is our view that both settlements should be included as a small rural settlement.</p>	
1671403	Resident	<p>Small rural settlements-C page 37- have provided earlier response and on reflection want to add the following relating to the sites I have referenced sites 281 and 276 in Sutton-cum-Lound. My concern is that the land will remain dormant and unused if development is not permissible. Site 281, part of the former stackyard, is not large enough for use other than a building development. Many years ago it had outline planning for a house on it and could have been included within the farm buildings conversion done a number of years ago, but for reasons which I do not know it was not. This small plot of land does not have any alternative use. It will be unfortunate if other sites are developed when this small plot is available and has no alternative use. I understand this site to come within the development plan for the village received a significant number of supportive comments in the last review. The second site 276 is a field which has previously been let for livestock but has not had tenants using it for a number of years. It has been advertised and word of mouth used to find a new tenants but no-one has been found. The field is not appropriate for cultivation because farmers who have been approached are not willing to travel to one field. This site will remain unused for other purposes and provides potential for housing if included in the development envelop.</p>	<p>Sutton cum Lound is considered a Small Rural Settlement and suitable to accommodate limited growth. Policy ST2 provides a growth requirement for Sutton. However, when considering recent monitoring data, it shows that the growth requirement has already been met by planning permissions and Neighbourhood Plan allocations.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW			
REF200	Savills on behalf of land owners	<p>As mentioned previously, while we welcome growth directed to villages in order to maintain rural vitality there are two points to make. Firstly we question the categorisation of Elkesley as a smaller village rather than a large rural settlement and disappointed this results in a housing requirement of 5% compared to the expected 20% which we understood informally from officer's was the chosen approach in autumn 2020. Secondly we would advise against the use of a 'cap' figure as it is inconsistent with the NPPF. Elkesley as a Large Rural Settlement It is understood that the categorising the villages centres around the LPA's considered 'sustainability' of the these settlements to accommodate growth (figure 4 of the Bassetlaw Rural Settlement Study 2020). However we note from page 10 that a Large Rural Settlement will: "Play a role as a 'service centre' for other settlements, have individually 500 or more dwellings and have all of the following; a primary school, doctors surgery/health centre, a community centre/hall, a convenience store, a church and a public house." (Page 10. Bassetlaw Rural Settlement Study November 2020) Taking each in turn, firstly we would also consider Elkesley's role as a local rural service centre for other settlements (such as Gamston/ Markham Moor/ Rockley and West Drayton). We note it was excluded at the time of the 2018 Functional Cluster Assessment (page 4) but it clearly performs this settlement cluster role. In terms of settlement size we would welcome clarity that the figures include committed growth (for example the recently approved application for 39 units with a flexible commercial unit – reference 20/00959/OUT) which when completed would bring it broadly in line with the same population as Blyth at c. 1,200 residents. We would add that population size is also a crude estimate as it is relative to its area and should not be relied upon as the sole reason for allocating a settlement. We note the inventory and Elkesley itself is highly sustainable and benefits from a Primary and Nursery School, coffee shop, bakery, pop up post office and a takeaway/ restaurant. Further afield there is also a tea room and School Farm shop (during summer months), making it a sustainable location for development with future opportunities to only improve the current situation. Elkesley village also benefits from direct access on to the A1, improved as part of the recently completed new Elkesley Bridge Road infrastructure project which provides additional capacity and access to both Retford and Worksop. The village also benefits from four bus services departing from High Street, while run as a rural service, provide routes to Doncaster and Retford. Commercially, the village also benefits from Elkesley Park Industrial Estate which consists of warehousing and distribution uses for employment opportunities. A new retail (village shop) opportunity is being delivered as part of application 20/00959/OUT and as part of our proposed scheme a pub would delivered within the village to build on the service the coffee shop already provides. In terms of the 'inventory', we note that one of the eligible large rural settlements listed within draft Policy ST2 is Blyth. This is very comparable to that of Elkesley. Blyth has a primary school, pub, restaurant and church and village shop and a similar population. It has no health services like Elkesley so clearly flexibility can be applied to the criteria. Given the comparisons between these two villages, it is our view that Elkesley should be upgraded to a large rural settlement. It is therefore our recommendation that Elkesley is upgraded to a large rural settlement given the village has a range of key facilities and shops and the opportunity for future facilities to generally meet the criteria (similar to that of Blyth). In the interests of effective, justified, positive and consistent plan making. Planned and Future Sustainability There is also a final factor that needs to be considered. Not restricting housing has a fundamental role to play in the sustainability of villages, such as Elkesley. In doing so it will make a contribution in meeting the overall housing targets for the area and should be recognised as a key component to the overall growth strategy within the district and in encouraging sustainable development more generally in rural areas. Paragraph 78 of the NPPF and PPG (rural housing) are clear on this. It is important that rural settlements such as Elkesley are allowed to manage growth in a positive way through allocating deliverable sites to meet the needs and help sustain the critical mass and ensure facilities and services continue to thrive and expand as it has positively done so through the Neighbourhood Plan and will seek to do so again. The site, south of Coalpit Lane could help to alleviate the housing pressures and concentration of older generations and provide 'starter homes' to help affordability and home ownership within the village whilst also safeguarding the social infrastructure of the village. The landowners of the site are also keen on maximising benefits back to the village including providing a new pub and opportunities for other onsite facilities in agreement with the residents and Parish Council such as amenity greenspace. It is clear that the village should not be restricted should they decide this is a suitable option for growth and as such the 5% 'cap' should be regarded as a minimum figure and not a maximum. In accordance with paragraph 78 of the NPPF. Recommendation: remove 'cap' of % in favour of 'minimum' percent in the interests of positive and compliant plan making. Part E of Policy ST2 We would also like to draw attention to the wording of part E of the policy, which highlights the reliance on a Neighbourhood Plan for additional housing development above that prescribed within the policy. Such a requirement would mean that we would be inadvertently tied into a new Neighbourhood Plan which could take between 2-3 years to develop and adopt. We would therefore highlight that support by residents and Parish Council would be sufficient to allow additional growth in absence of the resources and timeframe to deliver a new neighbourhood plan and to ensure urgent needs are met. Such policies are commonplace in plan making for example with South Kesteven's policy SP4 adopted 2020 which largely mirrors what is being suggested. We therefore suggest the following wording for part E: "Where the percentage housing requirement for an eligible settlement has been achieved, additional housing development will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that it has the support of the</p>	<p>Elkesley does not meet the criteria, as identified within the Rural Background Paper, to be classified as a Large Rural Settlement. Although the village does have some services and facilities, and is located adjacent to the A1 it is rural in character and has slowly grown over the last 20 years. The settlement's role is generally to provide for its residents and it doesn't provide a role to support other settlements' needs mainly do it is location.</p> <p>This approach has been supported through the production of the Elkesley Neighbourhood Plan, which is currently being reviewed where smaller sites are favoured over larger developments.</p> <p>This Neighbourhood Plan allocates a site to accommodate new facilities and some affordable housing over the plan period. The growth ambitions within the made Neighbourhood Plan generally reflect those identified in the Bassetlaw Local Plan.</p> <p>However, If the community feel that additional growth is required to support their local services and facilities or there is a need for a particular type of housing or employment related development, then this can be planned for within the review of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW		<p>community or Parish Council". In the interests of positive and effective plan making. In summary, we set out our recommendations on the Draft Local Plan as follows, in the interests of effective, justified, consistent and positive plan making Recommendation 1: Elkesley to be moved up the settlement hierarchy and be recognised as a Large Rural settlement which affords 20% growth given the facilities and shops within the village. In the interests of justified, positive and effective plan making. Recommendation 2: remove 'cap' of % in favour of 'minimum' percent in the interests of positive and compliant plan making. Recommendation 3: In the interests of positive and effective plan making, BDC should reword part E of Draft Policy ST2 as follows: "Where the percentage housing requirement for an eligible settlement has been achieved, additional housing development will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that it has the support of the community or Parish Council". Further, the land south of Coalpit Lane 'Elkesley Fields' represents an opportunity to deliver essential growth within the village of Elkesley. There are no known technical constraints (for example ecology, flood risk, drainage, ground and heritage) that would preclude this site coming forward. The landowners are willing and able to develop their land with the aim of creating a world class exemplar of rural development - maximising benefits back to the village for generations to come.</p>	
REF198 Bevecotes	Gladman Developments Ltd	<p>The above policy sets out the Council's approach to support the delivery of sustainable development to meet the needs of Bassetlaw's rural area over the plan period to 2037. Part B of Policy ST2 states that development proposals in 'large rural settlements' through site allocations, neighbourhood plans or appropriate development within development boundaries will be supported where certain criteria are met. Gladman consider that the use of settlement boundaries to arbitrarily restrict sustainable development from coming forward on the edge of suitable settlements would not accord with the positive approach to growth required by the Framework. Gladman would object to an overly onerous approach such as this if it were to preclude appropriately sited and sustainable development coming forward to meet the District's housing need, in accordance with the 'Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development'. Part C of Policy ST2 sets out that small rural settlements will be required to deliver a minimum of 1,502 dwellings over the plan period unless other settlements are identified through a neighbourhood plan. This represents a significant increase of 37.8% from the previous iteration of the Local Plan which proposed a requirement for small rural settlements of 1,090 dwellings. The updated Spatial Strategy Background Paper (November 2020) highlights that attempts have been made to rebalance housing distribution in Bassetlaw by ensuring that the majority of housing development is directed to the most sustainable settlements alongside addressing concern regarding the lack of planned growth at Retford. However, it is unclear as to how the revised housing requirement for small rural areas has been calculated when set against the overall housing requirement only increasing by 10.2%, particularly as the growth percentage for the Small Rural Settlements is now 5% to produce a more sustainable growth pattern. In addition, Gladman propose that further clarity is required between Policy ST2 C) and the corresponding table referring to Eligible Small Rural Settlements and housing requirements. Part C states that 'eligible Small Rural Settlements' will accommodate a minimum of 1502 dwellings, unless further settlements are identified through a neighbourhood plan. Yet, the accompanying table only sets a provision of 473 dwellings through the housing requirement column. It is therefore unclear where the additional 1,029 dwellings will be delivered. Part D of the policy lists criteria whereby proposals in small rural settlements will be supported. Gladman are largely supportive of the criteria listed, however we raise concerns that D(1) would set a development cap on settlements across the small rural settlement category with little regard to the site-specific sustainability merits of a development proposal. Indeed, Criterion D(1) would effectively act to preclude the delivery of sustainable development from coming forwards contrary to the explicit requirements of the Framework. Gladman recommend that this aspect of the policy is amended to ensure it does not place a cap on sustainable development. Similarly, Part E states that once the percentage housing requirement for an eligible settlement has been achieved additional housing will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that it has the support of the community and the Council through the preparation or review of a neighbourhood plan. Gladman are concerned that the proposed requirement for local community support for development goes further than that required by paragraph 40 of the Framework. This requirement may hinder and restrict otherwise sustainable development from coming forward and Gladman suggest this aspect is removed from the Plan.</p>	<p>The housing distribution tables and information have since been amended to consider the latest information. These are available within the Publication version of the Local Plan. Policy ST2 has also been updated to reflect previous comment and the criteria now includes additional references.</p> <p>It is important to give communities a clear guide on what level of growth they should be planning for. Policy ST2 aims to achieve by identifying a growth requirement for those affected settlements. Once those requirements have been achieved, then local communities can plan for this through the preparation or review of a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Other developments such as those for needs base accommodation (like affordable housing), economic development and rural tourism are covered within other policies or through the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW			
REF117 (Ordsall South Rep)	Barton Willmore on behalf of land owners	<p>We object to the approach taken by the planning strategy for the rural areas of Bassetlaw. As set out above, we have significant concerns in relation to the overall quantum of development that has been directed towards the District's rural villages. Policy ST2 sets out the housing requirements for Bassetlaw's rural settlements to grow appropriately in order to maintain rural vitality whilst retaining distinctiveness. Whilst we support the need to maintain the viability and vitality of rural services, this needs to be planned for by understanding the health and hinterlands of those services and the level of development that is needed to support them (and through locating that level of development in a location accessible to those services). The fundamental flaw of the Local Plan's proposed approach is that many of the rural villages identified in the Local Plan for growth do not have any notable services to meet their day-to-day needs. It is not sustainable to require more households to live in remote locations where they are encouraged to travel in sporadic patterns to access remote facilities. It is much more sustainable for those villages to be sustained by their rural hubs (the main settlements) where trips can be linked, and journeys made by public transport, such as Retford. It is also unclear as to how the housing requirement for each village in Policy ST2 has been derived. There appears to be no logic behind this and whilst we accept that some communities might wish to have some development, other mechanisms such as Neighbourhood Plans are available to achieve this. 6.21 We therefore object to Policy ST2. The plan as drafted will direct a significant amount of housing to the least sustainable locations within the District and will not enhance their sustainability but simply increase the number of homes which are located unsustainably.</p>	<p>Bassetlaw is largely a rural District and therefore it is reasonable to plan for growth within some of its rural communities. The strategy has evolved over time and the Plan is now proposing a tiered approach to rural growth by directing the majority of development to larger settlements and providing a smaller individual requirement for the smaller settlements. The majority of this housing requirement has already been committed through planning permissions or completed. Any remaining growth is directed to those settlements that can accommodate some development which is at a similar rate to previous growth rates. Where there is the desire, additional growth can be planned through a Neighbourhood Plan or delivered through the local needs channel within the NPPF or Policy ST2.</p>
REF091	Consultant on behalf of land owner	<p>Within Policy ST2 residential development is proposed within Hayton and the adjoining settlement of Clarborough. The Policy proposes that the housing requirement at Hayton is only 8 dwellings and 25 dwellings at Clarborough. This is a total requirement for new homes within the settlements up to 2037. In 2019 within the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan the aim was to provide proportionate growth in rural Bassetlaw to support the vitality of rural settlements and as such it was proposed that the growth would be between 10% and 20% of the existing dwellings numbers within the settlement-this resulted in a requirement of between 16 and 32 new dwellings over the life of the Local Plan. Growth within settlements like Hayton is essential to support the broader sustainability aims of the settlement, new development can play an important role in sustaining existing facilities like the convenience store, pub, village hall and church etc. The only explanation of why the Council has reduced the requirement from 20% growth to 5% growth appears to relate to constraints such as flood risk and the availability of suitable land in some villages. This is not the case in Hayton as the Church Farm site relates to a brownfield site in a central location within the settlement and the site is not at risk of flooding. Many of the buildings on the site are no longer suitable for modern farming practices and in order to achieve greater efficiencies the owners now farm in partnership with another local farmer. The redevelopment of the site will provide the opportunity to improve the aesthetics of the Main Street within the village through the removal of old and unattractive agricultural buildings which are out of scale and character with their immediate surroundings. It is proposed that Church Farm is suitable and available for limited residential development within Hayton. The attached plans show a small residential scheme of 20 detached dwellings which includes a variety of sizes from 5x2 bed homes, 5x3 bed homes, 5x4 bed homes, 2x5 bed homes. The layout also includes 3 bungalows which could be built to the very highest energy standards for elderly residents. The proposal would include affordable housing in line with the requirement set out in the Draft Local Plan. The scheme would be able to fund its CIL requirement which would go towards the enhancement of facilities within Hayton subject to the approval of the Parish Council. The site has been submitted to the Parish Council as part of its initial work on the Hayton Neighbourhood Plan. Unfortunately, the Neighbourhood Plan which was designated in 2013 has not progressed. The Parish Council did try to progress work on the Neighbourhood Plan in 2020 but this was prevented through various lockdowns due to Covid 19. Planning consent for residential development at Corner Farm, Hayton was granted in 2020-however the same site was first granted planning consent in 1991 which is 20 years ago. Planning Consent was subsequently renewed on the same site in 2011, 2016 and again in 2020. To date no development has commenced which is not surprising as the site is occupied by a successful local business. In my opinion it is unreasonable to rely on this site to deliver the growth to support the settlement up to 2037 as the site is not available and deliverable which is proven by the fact that no development has taken place for 20 years. My client is willing to take part in discussions with the Parish Council through the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan. The owners have reduced the scale of their initial plans which were presented to the Parish Council in 2019 from 42 dwellings down to 20 dwellings. The proposed development is situated on the previously developed part of the site which is occupied by farm buildings and a yard area. The range of house types and sizes has been amended to encourage a wide range of new residents from first time buyers, affordable housing, family housing and retirement living. A wide range of occupiers will help to sustain the settlement of Hayton.</p>	<p>Although the housing requirement has reduced for Small Rural Settlements, communities can plan for additional growth through the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan. These plans can look at the type and location of additional growth which might be to help deliver affordable housing or regenerate a previously developed site for example.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW			
REF170	A&D Architecture	Policy ST2 should be similarly modified and include new sub -section F as follows: "F The Council values the role the park home sector plays in the housing market offering an affordable alternative to mainstream housing for many people, often over the age of fifty, in mainly rural and semi-rural locations and will support applications for the development of new Park Home static caravan sites	This is covered through the housing mix and affordable housing section of the Local Plan

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
1647949	Resident	Reading the latest garden village plan rather confuses me, how can you justify cutting hectares of healthy trees down to promote a "green" labelled hub of employment directly looking across to a National Trust forest; please explain this contradiction as for the green village is sited next to the A1, not a good idea for our children to breathe in lorry pollution every day whilst growing up in this Green utopia. Let's think of how we will develop this area of good agricultural land, it will be with Diesel engined earth moving equipment again, the noise of this work will have a very bad effect for people and wildlife in Clumber park and the pollution to environment, the end doesn't justify the means. This shows a lack of empathy and understanding regarding the planners as to what a Village is and the word Green means. Look around outside your offices at Worksop High street (stagnant). Also, Retford town centre, all this is down to mistakes in past Planning still await a viable Plan.	The policy protects the existing woodland on site. A green buffer will be provided along the boundary to the A1 to help minimise potential impacts on future residents. The Council's Environmental Health have not raised any issues in relation to the allocation of this site. A Recreational Impact Assessment is being undertaken to ensure that any potential impacts upon Clumber Park are appropriately managed and mitigated. Natural England have agreed the approach. The emerging Worksop Central DPD and the Retford Town Centre Neighbourhood Plan promote the regeneration and growth of those town centres.
1661494	Resident	Appears to be a vanity project rather than a serious piece of planning. Building on farmland which drags the edges of Worksop closer to Retford should be prevented. Can think of villages that could benefit from expansion eg Dunham on Trent which has a school , shop , Restaurant, pub , village hall . The villages north of Retford appear to have space for development. Bevercotes is a brownfield site that could be developed. The garden village is an intrusion on the landscape and using the word ' Garden ' appears to be a bit of ' Greenwash ' to try and make this development more palatable .	There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. All available sites have been assessed and the Land Availability Assessment states that the Garden Village is suitable and deliverable to accommodate the development required. National policy does not prevent the use of agricultural land for development. Instead it requires that if considered necessary lower quality agricultural land is used. The Local Plan promotes the sustainable growth of rural settlements. The Bassetlaw Rural Settlements Study sets out the approach to identifying eligible settlements where housing could be accommodated. The majority of Dunham on Trent is within Flood Zone 3 so housing development would not be appropriate. Bevercotes has planning permission for employment use so could be developed for business use. The Site Allocations: Landscape Study shows that the Garden Village can be accommodated without adverse impacts on the landscape.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF026	Rampton and Woodbeck Parish Council	<p>The concept of the Garden Village has direct links to the late nineteenth and early twentieth century concept of the Garden Suburb which itself had roots in the Arts and Crafts movement with its rejection of the industrial revolution and the unhealthy and noxious urban environments the revolution created. It was also dependent on good and affordable public transport links between the country and the city. For those who still had to work in the industrial cities but could afford to live outside it and commute they provided an ideal solution. Pastiche of a bucolic idyll that had never existed they may be but done well, they provided good houses that are still desirable, and a solution to an industrial age problem. So why not build a new Garden Village in Bassetlaw? The first reason is that there should be no new building until we have exhausted the possibilities of conversion of redundant commercial and industrial buildings. Second, now in a post-industrial age and solutions that were appropriate to an industrial age are inappropriate and anachronistic to our current housing crisis. Third, this harks back to the old twentieth century practice of zoning places of residence separate from places of work. The environmental impact of zoning is that it necessitates both the number and length of environmentally damaging car and public transport trips residents will need to make to access work, recreation, and shopping. Electric vehicles are only a partial solution and when the report argues that the new village will be convenient for the A1 and A57 this is, in fact, a statement of a major weakness of the proposal. Most redundant buildings fit for conversion are likely to be near places of work. Our cities are no longer noxious and unpleasant places to be in and town centres are ripe for regeneration where people might be able to live in walking or cycling distance to their place of work (with incidental health benefits). For all these reasons a new Garden Village should not be built in Bassetlaw.</p>	<p>There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. All available sites have been assessed and the Land Availability Assessment states that the Garden Village is suitable and deliverable to accommodate the development required. The Garden Village identifies 10ha of employment land so that people can live and work in the same settlement, thus supporting the use of sustainable and active travel to move between home and work. The Plan supports the use of electric vehicles and the provision of infrastructure to support them. The benefit of having a new settlement adjoining the A1/A57 is that access is relatively direct reducing longer car journeys to reach the strategic highway network. The policy also promotes a new bus services to and through the site, and walking and cycling infrastructure. Further the proposal includes a new railway station which provides an opportunity to reduce the number of car journeys within the district and to South Yorkshire and Lincoln.</p>
REF040	Misterton Parish Council	<p>The Bassetlaw Garden Village provides a 'blank sheet' on which to develop many of the ideas described elsewhere in the document, e.g., quality housing, environmental benefits, healthy lifestyles, etc. Every effort must be made that these principles are not diminished over time. Misterton Parish Council is all too aware of the difficulties presented by inadequate, inflexible public transport, aged infrastructure (waste-water systems) that is not up to 21st century use, and lack of local services and facilities. Don't let this happen to the Garden Village! Page 38, para 5.3.1 This needs to refer to the adjacency of Doncaster Sheffield Airport.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Reference to accessibility to Doncaster-Sheffield Airport will be added.</p>
REF041	Retford Civic Society	<p>As indicated in response to the January 2020 Draft Plan, support the proposal for a new village at Five Lanes End. It is essential, that this development does not start until there is a mechanism in place to ensure that retail and other community facilities, including public transport services, are in place at an early stage to serve residents. This should be clearly stated in the Local Plan. There must be no possibility of the development ending up as little more than a housing estate in the countryside.</p>	<p>The Local Plan and planning application process will ensure that infrastructure is appropriately phased alongside new development at the Garden Village.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF047	Resident	<p>For many years planning policy has favoured concentrating new housing in, and adjacent to, existing built-up areas to minimise the amount of travel by car to schools, shops, jobs and other facilities. New villages have been promoted elsewhere in the country largely only where green belt and other restrictions make it very difficult to find room for development. The proposed new village in Bassetlaw is not needed as housing need can be met without it. It would lead to much more travel by car than would be the case if the same number of houses were built in or next to existing built-up areas. The Draft Plan suggests that residents of the new village would benefit from good bus and train services, but this is unrealistic. It is very unlikely that a railway station would be viable even if the new village eventually reached 4000 houses. It would not be viable within the period of the Local Plan. Many Bassetlaw's villages now have no bus services at all, and the only villages with a regular service are those on routes between larger centres such as Retford to Doncaster or Retford to Newark. The proposed new village would not be on such a route. It is suggested that services would be subsidised by the development, but this is not sustainable in the long run. It is likely that most people in the proposed village would be wholly dependent on the car for travel. The Draft Plan suggests that the new village would have extensive cultural, recreational and shopping facilities. By the end of the Plan period it would have only some 500 homes. Few Bassetlaw villages of that size can now support even a shop. For many years the village is likely to be little more than a housing estate in the countryside. During that time residents will have become reliant on travel to larger centres for shopping, education, recreation and employment. There is a very serious risk that the extensive facilities suggested in the Draft Plan will never materialise even if the target of 4000 homes is reached. The concept of a new village in Bassetlaw is unnecessary and unsustainable. It should be removed from the Local Plan. If the scale of house building proposed is reduced, this could be achieved without wider implications for the Plan as a whole.</p>	The Garden Village is economically led, needed to drive economic growth in the growth sectors. The Plan states that the Village would support growth of employment and housing over the next 30 years so provides a sustainable growth option for the long term. Evidence confirms that a railway station would be viable with 4000 homes. A new bus service would be introduced to support the Village which could support other villages as well. The Village will be plan led and there will be a requirement for infrastructure to be phased alongside new development.
REF057	Clarborough and Welham Parish Council	More generally, welcome the proposals for the garden village. Concerned that other villages in our area are not adversely affected by development in their vicinity.	Ongoing engagement with affected Parish Councils will ensure that all concerns are taken into account in the planning of the Garden Village.
REF061	Resident	<p>The route from the B6079 (Retford to Worksop road) to the A1/A57 at Appley Head, ie Mansfield Road from the Babworth crossroads is currently used by many drivers from the Retford area to reach the A614 at the Appley Head junction. This route is used to avoid the need to access the A1 between Ranby and Appley Head and the dangers inherent in large numbers of slow moving local vehicles using this stretch of a fast and busy dual carriageway road for only a very short distance. The new Garden Village planning has deliberately eliminated the B6420 (Mansfield Road) as an access to the Appley Head junction. It is important that this access to Appley Head is maintained in order to avoid the dangers of large numbers of local drivers needing to use the A1. Seen in the past the dangers of mixing local, slow moving, vehicles and long distance, high speed vehicles with the very many road traffic collisions which occurred at the old A1, A57, A614 roundabout, which was eventually replaced with the current junction. The removal of the B6420 route to the Appley Head junction would be very much a retrograde step in road safety.</p>	The Mansfield Road will remain. It will be re-aligned to travel through the development rather than bisecting it. It will be designed to ensure the safe movement of traffic.
REF071	Minerals and Waste, NCC	Paragraph 5.3.22 states that the proposed Garden Village lies within an MSA/MCA. Confirm that the site does not lie within the MSA/ MCA and so this paragraph can be removed from the Plan.	Comments noted. Reference will be removed.
1658674	D2N2	para 5.3.39 in agreement that development should be future-proofed. Covid-19 has exposed both the significant potential to drive up productivity through adoption of digital services and the development of digital skills, but also the potential risks of digital exclusion if infrastructure to enable digital working and learning is not in place. Like Bassetlaw District Council, are committed to supporting development that contributes to tackling climate change and that adopts high environmental standards. Look forward to continuing to work with the Nottinghamshire local authorities' Environmental Strategy Working Group to embed and share best practice in low carbon growth.	Support noted and welcome.
REF074	Avison Young on behalf of National Grid	<p>Have identified that one or more proposed development sites are crossed or in close proximity to National Grid assets. Bassetlaw Garden Village (ST3 and ST6) XE ROUTE: 275Kv Overhead Transmission Line. Route: High Marnham – Thurgarton – West Melton. A plan showing details of the site locations and details of National Grid's assets is attached to this letter. Please note that this plan is illustrative only. Please also see attached information outlining further guidance on development close to National Grid assets. National Grid is happy to provide guidance to the Council concerning their networks. To help ensure the continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans</p>	National Grid have been consulted on each iteration of the Plan and ongoing duty to cooperate meetings have taken place. The Policy will be amended to make appropriate reference to the transmission lines crossing the site and the requirement for mitigation.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
		<p>and strategies which may affect their assets. Please remember to consult National Grid on any Development Plan Document (DPD) or site-specific proposals that could affect National Grid's assets. National Grid is able to provide advice and guidance to the Council concerning their networks and encourages high quality and well-planned development in the vicinity of its assets. Electricity assets Developers of sites crossed or in close proximity to National Grid assets should be aware that it is National Grid policy to retain existing overhead lines in-situ, though it recognises that there may be exceptional circumstances that would justify the request where, for example, the proposal is of regional or national importance. National Grid's 'Guidelines for Development near pylons and high voltage overhead power lines' promote the successful development of sites crossed by existing overhead lines and the creation of well-designed places. The guidelines demonstrate that a creative design approach can minimise the impact of overhead lines whilst promoting a quality environment. The guidelines can be downloaded here: https://www.nationalgrid.com/document/130626/download The statutory safety clearances between overhead lines, the ground, and built structures must not be infringed. Where changes are proposed to ground levels beneath an existing line then it is important that changes in ground levels do not result in safety clearances being infringed. National Grid can, on request, provide to developers detailed line profile drawings that detail the height of conductors, above ordnance datum, at a specific site. National Grid's statutory safety clearances are detailed in their 'Guidelines when working near National Grid Electricity Transmission assets', which can be downloaded here: www.nationalgrid.com/network-and-assets/working-near-our-assets Gas assets High-Pressure Gas Pipelines form an essential part of the national gas transmission system and National Grid's approach is always to seek to leave their existing transmission pipelines in situ. Contact should be made with the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) in respect of sites affected by High-Pressure Gas Pipelines. National Grid have land rights for each asset which prevents the erection of permanent/ temporary buildings, or structures, changes to existing ground levels, storage of materials etc. Written permission will be required before any works commence within the National Grid's 12.2m building proximity distance, and a deed of consent is required for any crossing of the easement. National Grid's 'Guidelines when working near National Grid Gas assets': www.nationalgridgas.com/land-and-assets/working-near-our-assets</p>	
REF089	Resident	B13. The path and cycleway links to Worksop and are good but could there be a direct link to Retford with a shared path and cycleway along the B6420 to Babworth and the A620 to Retford. This would also provide a safe path and cycleway from Retford to Clumber Park.	A proposal for the long term is to improve the off road walking/cycling link between the Garden Village and Ordsall South currently a public right of way.
REF094	Network Rail	<p>Confirm its support for the principle of the Garden Village allocation and the provision of a station to serve the development subject to the impact of the stopping patterns on the timetable (including turnaround times at terminating stations). Think there needs to be more emphasis on the impact of the allocation on the level crossings in the vicinity. 5.3.37 for the need to improve the local highway network where the impacts are significant. However, there is no specific mention in the Policy of the level crossings affected. This is a significant omission given we have previously made reference to the crossings and the likely impacts that will occur, and that level crossings remain the highest single source of risk to the safe operation of the rail network. For information that previous advice is again given below. In terms of level crossings, advised that there are two and possibly three crossings that could be significantly affected by the proposals (see map). These would be namely Howard's No.1 (61m 11ch), Mansfield Road (62m 24ch), and possibly Rushey Sidings (62m 44ch). Starting point is that the closure of any level crossing is welcome and should be pursued wherever possible. In terms of the easiest first, Howard's No.1 is a simple occupation crossing which as far as we are aware has no right of way over it; any private rights would be lost if severance of ownership occurred through the re-development of the land but it would be our starting point that the crossing be closed completely as part of the overall scheme. Bridging Mansfield Road would also be a positive development but that would also be dependent on securing enough land on the north side of the railway to facilitate bridge and approach embankment works on that side of the railway – this will involve third party ownership and if we have a reluctant landowner the Council may have to seek CPO powers to deliver this. A thorough transport assessment would be required to assess the risk at the crossing (and also examine the opportunities for possible closure of the Rushey Sidings crossing – as this is a current half barrier crossing it is more of a risk than the others). Ask that Policy ST3 is amended slightly at criterion 13, to include an additional criterion 13 (a) v – the closure of Howards No.1 level crossing and measures to reduce the risk at, or the elimination of, Mansfield Road and Rusheys Sidings level crossings.</p>	Support for railway station welcome. Reference to the closure of Howards No.1 level crossing and measures to reduce the risk at, or the elimination of, Mansfield Road and Rusheys Sidings level crossings will be added to the policy.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF097	Gamston with West Drayton and Eaton Parish Council	<p>This proposal was considered as a more favourable focus for the development of new housing in the Bassetlaw District.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is close to the main A1 arterial road network and so will not require any major structural road works. • It combines a large residential development with a current expanding economic business development, therefore new major services can be developed without considerable disruption and can very easily form a sub-regional Enterprise Hub. • It could offer significant employment opportunities to local and incoming Bassetlaw residents. HOWEVER: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There would be a considerable negative impact on the valuable agricultural and woodland. • It would furthermore be imperative to ensure that infrastructure to support such a development included adequate access to public transport, retail opportunities, schools and health centres from the commencement of building work. • Consideration should be given to increasing the number of properties allocated to be built during the time frame of this plan to ensure it is feasible for partners to invest in the area from the start. <p>NEEDS TO RE-PHRASING – CAN'T UNDERSTAND!</p> 	The Plan identifies brownfield land for development but there is not enough suitable and deliverable brownfield land available so some greenfield land needs to be used. The woodland on site will be protected by policy. Infrastructure is expected to be phased alongside development to ensure that infrastructure meets the needs of new residents. Based on evidence it is considered that delivery of 500 homes is reasonable for a garden village site.
REF101	East Markham Parish Council	<p>Given the present financial conditions created by the pandemic consider the provision of a garden village as an expensive venture. There is little chance of either government or developer contributions. There is no indication that the railway company will provide the necessary funding for a station at this site. East Markham Parish Council considers that unless Network Rail is willing to build new railway station at the Garden Village at Apply Head it will merely become an extension of housing into the Countryside.</p>	The Whole Plan Viability Assessment 2021 indicates that developer contributions can be secured from the site. Network Rail have given their in principle support for a new railway station. It is vital that public transport and appropriate supporting facilities are put in place from an early point to ensure the development is not just housing in the countryside.
REF127	Lincolnshire County Council, Archaeological Planning Advice	<p>The site allocation for Bassetlaw Garden Village is in an area of high archaeological potential which is recognised in the Draft Local Plan. A desk-based assessment is in production and the results reinforce the need for further geophysical survey and trial trench evaluation to identify areas of particular archaeological sensitivity so that an appropriate mitigation strategy can be designed and implemented before development work commences. The results of the evaluation work would ideally be available early enough to allow it to inform the design of the development. This will have the benefit of giving the development a sense of being rooted in a pre-existing, historic landscape but will also ensure the more significant remains can be preserved. Consideration should also be given to heritage as an excellent tool for community engagement. In many new towns of the 60s and 70s the archaeology was used as a tool to generate community cohesion with big excavations (e.g. Bordesley Abbey in Redditch and Bradwell Abbey in Milton Keynes). The archaeological fieldwork can be phased with construction but should be completed (including mitigation) prior to construction activity taking place. Section B12 of the Policy should also include a note on the geophysics and trenching leading in to a robust mitigation strategy that will help inform the final master plan of each phase of the site.</p>	The desk top based assessment has been completed and agreed with Lincs Archaeology. A geophysical survey is underway. This is expected to identify areas of archaeological sensitivity so that appropriate mitigation can be put in place prior to development, and to inform the detailed masterplan for the site. The policy will be amended to include appropriate reference to archaeological works.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF120	Barton Wilmore on behalf of land owner	<p>Raised significant concerns in the deliverability of this allocation. Appendix M of the LAA sets out the housing trajectory. It assumes the Garden Village will deliver 60 dwellings in 2031-2032, and 90 dwellings in each of 2032-33, 2033-34, 2034-35, 2035-36 and 2036-37. It states: "Evidence (NLP Start to Finish, 2016) indicates the site is developable beyond 5 years. Large sites have a longer lead in period but deliver at higher rates once established. This timescale also accords with the development of Harworth Colliery which will eventually accommodate approx. 1000 dwellings". As have previously raised, it is inappropriate to draw direct comparisons between the Garden Village proposed and other large schemes in the District (namely the Harworth Colliery site) which appear to be very different in both scale and site-specific circumstances. Harworth Colliery is a site within single ownership in an established urban area that benefits from existing residents, services, facilities and public transport. The proposed Garden Village is relatively isolated from Worksop and Retford and has significant infrastructure requirements, including transport and utilities. The LAA states that the Harworth Colliery site had a lead in time of approximately 8 years. Assuming adoption of the Plan in 2022, this suggests a similar lead-in time for the Garden Village. Given it is some four times the size of the Colliery site, consider more evidence is needed to support the draft Plan's assertion that this site will deliver housing in the Plan period, particularly given the lack of supporting evidence around viability. Support the ambition to plan for growth beyond the Plan period, do not think any reliance can be placed upon this allocation, even for the reduced 500 dwellings. Continue to raise concerns around the ability to deliver sustainable housing in the Plan period in line with Garden Community Principles. The LAA acknowledges the importance of this: "The suitability of the site for development would depend on the sites ability to deliver the range of services and facilities necessary to create a sustainable settlement." The level of services, facilities and/or public transport early on in the life of the development is essential, and there is no detail to set out how this is expected to viably be delivered. This additional evidence around the feasibility of a new rail station is welcomed (Bassetlaw New Station Feasibility Technical Note 2 (November 2020)), but it is not conclusive that there is sufficient capacity on the line to allow the station to be delivered, particularly as the existing 'slack' which may currently be there may not be available at the point at which the new station is actually delivered (this will not be for some time). The estimated £8-11m cost is significant and this station is unlikely to be delivered early given there will not be any new dwellings before at least 2031/32, and even then the number of new residents will be so low that significant revenue support would be required to subsidise the service. A draft SoCG with Network Rail has only been discussed, rather than agreed. Policy ST3 is not clear when the station would be required (the IDP suggests from 2030), and what contribution the development would need to make. This needs to be carefully considered in light of the above, plus the other key infrastructure costs which could affect viability, such as access (increased cost given A1), other transport improvements (including costly A57 improvements), utilities and other social / education infrastructure and services / facilities to ensure a sustainable community is created. According to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, the transport improvements, including rail, bus and cycling, could be in the region of £45m, although it is appreciated some of these costs may potentially benefit from other sources of funding (unspecified) and pooling with other developments. These costs are significant and will need to be considered in light of phasing requirements and cashflow. The Viability Assessment (October 2019) has not been updated to reflect the known costs within the IDP (as well as other unknown costs including utilities). The Viability Assessment appears to take a general approach to development across the draft Plan, rather than looking at the very specific and significant costs and cash flow issues for a new settlement. It states that the approach to abnormal construction costs (including utilities diversions) is "based on generic tests" (page 28) and then assumes a generic cost of mitigation of £2,000 per dwelling that are "based on historic evidence of planning obligation contributions over the last five years (excluding Affordable Housing which is factored in separately) the following cost allowances have been adopted in the study" (page 30). This figure is substantially short of the real costs of delivering a development of this scale in this location. The Aecom January 2018 publication 'Garden towns and villages cost model' suggests that a new garden village in 5,000 residential units on a 350 hectare greenfield site in the South East of England would have construction costs of £53,568 per unit. The very high cost of strategic infrastructure and the impacts on cash flow (which isn't mentioned in the Council's evidence), needs to be considered in detail to demonstrate that this site will be delivered in the timescales set out. Continue to consider that there is limited evidence to justify the trajectory for the Garden Village at this stage. In the absence of this evidence the 500 dwellings should be deleted from the supply and the site should be considered an ambition for growth beyond the Plan period. Without the changes below we would object to Policy ST3. Suggested change: Address the significant concerns in relation to the viability and deliverability of the proposed Garden Village. Further detail is required to demonstrate that it can contribute 500 dwellings within the Plan period in a sustainable manner in line with the Garden Community Principles.</p>	<p>Ten years is considered to be a reasonable time period from some delivery to be expected from a large greenfield site. The position can be reviewed in 5 years time. This has been achieved with other Garden Village developments. As a former Colliery the Harworth site required extra remedial work, and the comparison is therefore not unreasonable.</p> <p>The Rail Technical Notes have continued to look into the feasibility of a new Station at the proposed Garden Village. It does look at existing capacity based on existing service provision. Additional work will need to be undertaken with our partners to further look at the level of service provision needed to and from the station in its early phase. This work will need to coincide with other planned enhancements to service provision in the future.</p> <p>We are aiming for the station to come on line during the later part of this plan period, but this will be subject to obtaining external funding. Contributions from development will be proportionate and subject to the delivery of the first phase of the Garden Village. The plan has safeguarded land at the Garden Village to accommodate the station and its associated facilities.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with rail providers through the process and will look to formalise SOCGs from Summer 2021 through to the submission of the Plan in early 2022.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF121	Harris Lamb on behalf of Muller Property Group	<p>The Bassetlaw Garden Village encompasses 216 hectares of land adjacent to the junction of A1/A57, which is intended to be developed for a mix of uses, including both residential and employment, in accordance with the principles of the Bassetlaw Garden Village Vision Statement. The Framework, at paragraph 72, states that the supply of large numbers of new homes can best be achieved through planning for larger scale development, such as new settlements or significant extensions to existing villages and towns, provided they are well located and designed, and supported by the necessary infrastructure and facilities. In light of the guidance in the Framework, MPG do not object in principle to the proposal for a Garden Village within Bassetlaw. Have concerns over the proposal mainly due to its location away from existing development. The proposal is for a new settlement on a greenfield site that is located away from existing settlements. The principal reason it appears for choosing the site is its proximity to the strategic road network, which raises issues over whether this is the most sustainable choice for a new settlement. Clearly, as the site is a completely new, there are no existing services, facilities or infrastructure to link in to and that everything will need to be created from scratch. Whilst in the fullness of time this is perfectly feasible, note that the Council are anticipating that 500 dwellings will be delivered on the site in the emerging Plan Period i.e. before 2037, but that a further 3,500 dwellings are planned for the next Plan Period. The acknowledgement that the Garden Village is intended to deliver more development in the next Local Plan is welcomed, as experience elsewhere indicates that it can take many years for large strategic sites of the scale envisaged here to come on stream. This can be due to the need to construct and implement significant new infrastructure to serve the development, which may be the case here due to the fact that this is a greenfield site with no existing facilities present on it or within the vicinity. Whilst the Council have been relatively conservative in their assessment of what the site is expected to deliver in this plan period, contend that whether the site will deliver the 500 dwellings it is anticipated to do so in this Plan Period. If not, contend that a flexibility allowance should be added to the housing requirement in case that the Garden Village site does not deliver the expected number of dwellings that have been identified for it. The Plan does not propose a flexibility allowance to take account of non implementation of any of the proposed draft allocations. Propose that a flexibility allowance of at least 15% above the housing requirement would be appropriate. This would not only provide an allowance if some of the smaller draft allocations did not come forward as expected but would provide a buffer if the Garden Village did not come on stream as quick as is hoped. By incorporating a flexibility allowance, this will enable the Council to maintain a five year supply of housing. If a flexibility allowance is to be incorporated consider that additional sites should also be allocated for development to the north of Bigsby Road, Retford is one such site that is considered suitable to meet the housing needs of the District going forward. Do not object to the intention to create a new Garden Village at the junction of the A1/A57. As this is creating a new settlement from scratch, consider that it represents a longer term development option and that it should be planned for now in terms of identifying the site but that the Council should look to the next Plan Period for any development on it to go towards meeting future housing and employment land needs. This will provide greater certainty that the site will deliver in the longer term. Consider that an alternative allocation or allocations should be identified now to accommodate the 500 dwellings that are currently planned to come forward on the site instead. As it stands, the Council have identified 500 dwellings to be delivered on the Garden Village site by 2037. In light of the inherent concerns about getting a site of this size underway in a timely manner, consider that if the Council do decide to include the 500 dwellings in its housing supply for this plan that a flexibility allowance of at least 15% is applied in case of non-delivery on this, and other allocated sites. This will guard against any shortfalls in the supply to meet the Council's housing needs over the Plan Period.</p>	<p>The Local Plan is requiring 500 homes in this plan period. That is considered to be a reasonable rate of delivery towards the end of the plan period. The housing supply also has a significant buffer to provide flexibility should the site not come on stream when intended. The site at Bigsby Road has had planning permission refused and this was upheld on appeal.</p>
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Area Plan	No specific comments as are not in this vicinity, however it does seem a bold move to deliver a simple solution.	Comments noted.
REF146	Elkesley Neighbourhood Plan Group	The garden village could have a significant impact on Elkesley and would appreciate it if there could be some direct consultation with the villagers to help decide how the communities could support each other and not leave Elkesley as a remote satellite village Develop access to the new rail and bus links for other communities. Elkesley is another community that could benefit from this, will there be extra parking available at the station to accommodate travellers from outside of the garden village?	The directly affected Parish Councils are consulted on proposals for the Garden Village and this has involved Elkesley. The delivery of a Garden Village should bring benefits to the wider community particularly by improving accessibility for the rural community to a range of services.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF153	Natural England	<p>5.3.14 - Welcome the intention to provide an extensive green/blue infrastructure network which will cover 40% of the site.</p> <p>5.3.17 - Welcome the requirement for 20% net gain on the site and the provision to provide breeding opportunities for protected bird species from Clumber Park SSSI.</p> <p>5.3.19 - pleased to note that this recognises the potential impact of the proposed Garden Village on Clumber Park SSSI as well as the Birklands & Bilhaugh SAC and Sherwood Forest possible potential Special Protection Area (ppSPA).</p> <p>Welcome the requirement for Sustainable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS) which should be established in the earliest phase of development to ensure impacts on designated sites are not adversely impacted by increased recreational pressure.</p> <p>Welcome the provision for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM). Pleased to note that the Recreational Impact Assessment being prepared will provide evidence which will inform appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>ST3 - Natural England welcomes the positive approach which this policy takes with respect to Green Infrastructure provision; the requirement for biodiversity net gain; the enhancement of woodland cover; and biodiversity-led water management.</p> <p>Welcome the requirement for project level HRA (this would be a "shadow" HRA until the ppSPA designation is confirmed).</p> <p>Welcome the requirement for Winter Bird surveys in connection with the designated sites.</p> <p>The provision for both SANGs, a GI buffer adjacent to the A1 and 20% net gain in habitat enhancements will contribute to the mitigation for the potential increase in recreational disturbance to Clumber Park SSSI and the Sherwood ppSPA.</p> <p>Support the preparation of the Recreational Impact Assessment which is being undertaken which will provide strategic evidence of the potential recreational impact on the Clumber Park SSSI, Birklands & Bilhaugh SAC and the Sherwood NNR.</p> <p>Natural England will continue to work with the Council and the RSPB as the RIA proceeds to ensure that, a satisfactory level of evidence is gathered so that appropriate management and mitigation measures can be included into future iterations of the Local Plan and HRA.</p> <p>Welcome point B10 regarding the need for a robust water management scheme and suggest that integrated water management rather than just a traditional SuDs scheme would improve resource and energy inputs to the site.</p> <p>The following link may be useful regarding CIRIA's new guidance on integrated water management which has recently been released: https://www.suds-authority.org.uk/2019/12/ciria-release-new-guidance-on-integrated-surface-water-management/</p>	Support noted and welcome. The Council will continue to work in partnership with Natural England on the Recreational Impact Assessment, the Garden Village and other projects as the plan progresses.
REF156	Babworth Parish Council	Oppose the Council's plans and vision for the new Bassetlaw Garden Village and consider the approach to be unsound, unfeasible and unviable. Consider that the Garden Village will harm the vitality and viability of Retford and will be detrimental to the community. Feels strongly that it should be the Council's priority to enhance existing larger settlements such as Retford where development can benefit from existing transport networks and support the local economy and wider rural hinterlands rather than attempting to create a new village and transport hub which consider not to be viable.	The Garden Village will be a self-sustaining settlement in its own right and will not adversely impact the viability of Retford. Rather having more people within the town's catchment may help the prosperity of the town centre. The spatial strategy promotes growth, including economic growth, in the Main Towns as a priority, because they are the most sustainable locations for growth. But to be sustainable in the long term it is considered that the Garden village provides a unique opportunity to attract employment and infrastructure improvements to the District, dependent on its location. Network Rail have provided their support in principle for the railway station. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment 2021 states that the proposal can be delivered as part of a financially viable scheme in the long term.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF190	Babworth Parish Council	Oppose the Council's plans and vision for the new Bassetlaw Garden Village and consider the approach to be unsound, unfeasible and unviable. Consider that the Garden Village will harm the vitality and viability of Retford and will be detrimental to the community. Feels strongly that it should be the Council's priority to enhance existing larger settlements such as Retford where development can benefit from existing transport networks and support the local economy and wider rural hinterlands rather than attempting to create a new village and transport hub which consider not to be viable.	The Garden Village will be a self-sustaining settlement in its own right and will not adversely impact the viability of Retford. Rather having more people within the town's catchment may help the prosperity of the town centre. The spatial strategy promotes growth, including economic growth, in the Main Towns as a priority, because they are the most sustainable locations for growth. But to be sustainable in the long term it is considered that the Garden village provides a unique opportunity to attract employment and infrastructure improvements to the District, dependent on its location. Network Rail have provided their support in principle for the railway station. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment 2021 states that the proposal can be delivered as part of a financially viable scheme in the long term.
REF156	Babworth Parish Council	Policy ST3 should be removed from the Local Plan. Disagree that there is the need for a new Garden Village and advocate that the defined Main Towns of Bassetlaw are capable of accommodating additional growth through urban extensions, which is considered to be a more sustainable option for development. The Parish is of the view that the allocation of a new Garden Village, totalling some 4,000 homes, within Babworth Parish will immeasurably change the nature of the parish forever. It will become unrecognisable as the most rural and least densely-populated parish in the area, to the most urban parish with only the large towns of Retford and Worksop having more dwellings. Such a far-reaching, enormous, single concentration of development should not be "inflicted" on the Parish of Babworth by building a "garden village" on 216 hectares of the parish. It is more important than ever, that development in rural parishes is sustainable and maintains the character of that parish. Supportive of the Local Plan's ambition to establish sustainable development for the long-term needs of the District, object to the proposed Garden Village as a matter of principle that it will not provide for sustainable development and will undermine the sustainability of exiting Main Towns which serve the needs of the rural areas of the District. Have a great deal of concern in relation to the amount of evidence there is to understand how the development would come forward and how it would be likely to impact the residents of the parish. There is an overwhelming lack of evidence to support the feasibility and viability of the proposed sustainability features required to deliver the Garden Village which consider will not be delivered. Without those features, the Local Plan runs the very serious risk of simply allocating a large proportion of isolated homes into the open countryside. To support the new Garden Village, the Local Plan proposes a new railway station, road links and public transport hub to enable access to the wider settlements. Although Bassetlaw District Council have "put more meat on the bone" when discussions have taken place about the Garden Village many questions have not been able to be answered. The time scale and funding for the Railway Station, the time scale for the School. The exact nature in which cycle routes will enter and exit the Garden Village. The total scale and proposal for the alteration of the B6420, railway crossings and junctions, including safety measures. The delivery of new homes through a Garden Village (with or without new transport links) is likely to generate additional car trips into the Main Towns such as Retford as residents will rely on its existing services and facilities. The proposed Garden Village and Apelyhead development will see an increase in traffic using the A1 which in turn will see increased noise and air pollution for the residents of Ranby Village. Paragraph 11.1.8 of the Draft Local Plan states that public funding for transport infrastructure is likely to be limited and will be largely developer funded. It is our view that this is not a realistic expectation. The financial viability of creating a new transport hub and train station alongside the Garden Village Development has not been adequately considered and it is our position that more sustainable development option is represented by development at the main towns. Any funding available should be allocated to improve existing transport infrastructure. While the development is taking place, in excess of 20 Years it is will cause massive congestion on the B6420 (Mansfield Road) into Retford which is already a very dangerous and congested road at peak times, with a level crossing, sharp corners, flooding areas and difficult junction at Babworth. The Local Plan sets out that the Whole Plan Viability Assessment 2016 states the infrastructure requirements for the Garden Village can be "reasonably sought through on site provision and developer contributions" provided that the site is exempt from a CIL charge. Lack of comprehensive consideration for the creation of a new Garden Settlement and the cost of associated infrastructure. If the viability of the	The Garden Village will be a self-sustaining settlement in its own right and will not adversely impact the viability of Retford. Rather having more people within the town's catchment may help the prosperity of the town centre. The spatial strategy promotes growth, including economic growth, in the Main Towns as a priority, because they are the most sustainable locations for growth. But to be sustainable in the long term it is considered that the Garden village provides a unique opportunity to attract employment and infrastructure improvements to the District, dependent on its location. Network Rail have provided their support in principle for the railway station. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment 2021 states that the proposal can be delivered as part of a financially viable scheme in the long term. This is a long term proposal, and as such, the detail will be added at each stage of the planning process. The Vision Statement will provide the basis for the masterplan framework and subsequent detailed parameter plans and design codes. All will involve community consultation. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan sets out the known infrastructure costs associated with the development. These will be refined as the Plan progresses. The Bassetlaw Transport Study identifies the known impacts on the highways network; the development will provide financial contributions to support their improvement. This evidence shows that the

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
		<p>scheme changes part way through there may be a number of dwellings that are completely isolated and cut off from any other services adding to pollution and disruption. Evidence provided within the Council's 2020 Sustainability Appraisal states at paragraph 6.33 that rural areas tend to have more limited access to services and facilities and as a result will have negative effects on the SA objective 7 (transport), 10 (air quality) and 11 (climate change). This is largely due to rural areas being more car dependant. Other potential minor negative impacts highlighted within the SA are in relation to objective 7 (land and soils) and 12 (resource use and waste). Paragraph 6.42 highlights the Garden Village site is located within a Source Protection Zone and will likely have a significant negative impact on SA objective 8 (water by impact water and ground quality). Emphasise the sites location near potentially regionally significant archaeological remains and as such have a minor potential negative impact on SA objective 13 (cultural heritage). It is not clear what the Local Plan's justification is for proposing such a substantial allocation of 216ha of greenfield land for the new Garden Village to support 4,000 new homes over its lifetime. Hope that any future planning will be done more interactively with our Parish, in more "normal times", when individual parishioners may have their personal opportunities to discuss matters, for example at public consultation meetings.</p>	<p>additional traffic can be safely accommodated on the transport network, in some cases with mitigation. The level crossings will be appropriately managed in consultation with Network Rail. The Sustainability Appraisal considers development without mitigation; it is considered that the impacts identified can be addressed through mitigation. An archaeology assessment is underway; this will inform the masterplanning for the site. Severn Trent have not objected to the Garden Village being located within a source protection zone provided that appropriate drainage and water quality enhancement measures are put in place.</p>
REF190	Babworth Council	<p>Parish</p> <p>Policy ST3 should be removed from the Local Plan. Disagree that there is the need for a new Garden Village and advocate that the defined Main Towns of Bassetlaw are capable of accommodating additional growth through urban extensions, which is considered to be a more sustainable option for development. The Parish is of the view that the allocation of a new Garden Village, totalling some 4,000 homes, within Babworth Parish will immeasurably change the nature of the parish forever. It will become unrecognisable as the most rural and least densely-populated parish in the area, to the most urban parish with only the large towns of Retford and Worksop having more dwellings. Such a far-reaching, enormous, single concentration of development should not be "inflicted" on the Parish of Babworth by building a "garden village" on 216 hectares of the parish. It is more important than ever, that development in rural parishes is sustainable and maintains the character of that parish. Supportive of the Local Plan's ambition to establish sustainable development for the long-term needs of the District, object to the proposed Garden Village as a matter of principle that it will not provide for sustainable development and will undermine the sustainability of exiting Main Towns which serve the needs of the rural areas of the District. Have a great deal of concern in relation to the amount of evidence there is to understand how the development would come forward and how it would be likely to impact the residents of the parish. There is an overwhelming lack of evidence to support the feasibility and viability of the proposed sustainability features required to deliver the Garden Village which consider will not be delivered. Without those features, the Local Plan runs the very serious risk of simply allocating a large proportion of isolated homes into the open countryside. To support the new Garden Village, the Local Plan proposes a new railway station, road links and public transport hub to enable access to the wider settlements. Although Bassetlaw District Council have "put more meat on the bone" when discussions have taken place about the Garden Village many questions have not been able to be answered. The time scale and funding for the Railway Station, the time scale for the School. The exact nature in which cycle routes will enter and exit the Garden Village. The total scale and proposal for the alteration of the B6420, railway crossings and junctions, including safety measures. The delivery of new homes through a Garden Village (with or without new transport links) is likely to generate additional car trips into the Main Towns such as Retford as residents will rely on its existing services and facilities. The proposed Garden Village and Apelyhead development will see an increase in traffic using the A1 which in turn will see increased noise and air pollution for the residents of Ranby Village. Paragraph 11.1.8 of the Draft Local Plan states that public funding for transport infrastructure is likely to be limited and will be largely developer funded. It is our view that this is not a realistic expectation. The financial viability of creating a new transport hub and train station alongside the Garden Village Development has not been adequately considered and it is our position that more sustainable development option is represented by development at the main towns. Any funding available should be allocated to improve existing transport infrastructure. While the development is taking place, in excess of 20 Years it is will cause massive congestion on the B6420 (Mansfield Road) into Retford which is already a very dangerous and congested road at peak times, with a level crossing, sharp corners, flooding areas and difficult junction at Babworth. The Local Plan sets out that the Whole Plan Viability Assessment 2016 states the infrastructure requirements for the Garden Village can be "reasonably sought through on site provision and developer contributions" provided that the site is exempt from a CIL charge. Lack of comprehensive consideration for the creation of a new Garden Settlement and the cost of associated infrastructure. If the viability of the scheme changes part way through there may be a number of dwellings that are completely isolated and cut off from any other services adding to pollution and disruption. Evidence provided within the Council's 2020 Sustainability Appraisal states at paragraph 6.33 that rural areas tend to have more limited access to services and facilities and as a result will have negative effects on the SA objective 7 (transport), 10 (air quality) and 11 (climate change). This is largely</p>	<p>The Garden Village will be a self-sustaining settlement in its own right and will not adversely impact the viability of Retford. Rather having more people within the town's catchment may help the prosperity of the town centre. The spatial strategy promotes growth, including economic growth, in the Main Towns as a priority, because they are the most sustainable locations for growth. But to be sustainable in the long term it is considered that the Garden village provides a unique opportunity to attract employment and infrastructure improvements to the District, dependent on its location. Network Rail have provided their support in principle for the railway station. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment 2021 states that the proposal can be delivered as part of a financially viable scheme in the long term. This is a long term proposal, and as such, the detail will be added at each stage of the planning process. The Vision Statement will provide the basis for the masterplan framework and subsequent detailed parameter plans and design codes. All will involve community consultation. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan sets out the known infrastructure costs associated with the development. These will be refined as the Plan progresses. The Bassetlaw Transport Study identifies the known impacts on the highways network; the development will provide financial contributions to support their improvement. This evidence shows that the additional traffic can be safely accommodated on the transport network, in some cases with mitigation. The level crossings will be appropriately managed in consultation with</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
		<p>due to rural areas being more car dependant. Other potential minor negative impacts highlighted within the SA are in relation to objective 7 (land and soils) and 12 (resource use and waste). Paragraph 6.42 highlights the Garden Village site is located within a Source Protection Zone and will likely have a significant negative impact on SA objective 8 (water by impact water and ground quality). Emphasise the sites location near potentially regionally significant archaeological remains and as such have a minor potential negative impact on SA objective 13 (cultural heritage). It is not clear what the Local Plan's justification is for proposing such a substantial allocation of 216ha of greenfield land for the new Garden Village to support 4,000 new homes over its lifetime. Hope that any future planning will be done more interactively with our Parish, in more "normal times", when individual parishioners may have their personal opportunities to discuss matters, for example at public consultation meetings.</p>	<p>Network Rail. The Sustainability Appraisal considers development without mitigation; it is considered that the impacts identified can be addressed through mitigation. An archaeology assessment is underway; this will inform the masterplanning for the site. Severn Trent have not objected to the Garden Village being located within a source protection zone provided that appropriate drainage and water quality enhancement measures are put in place.</p>
REF157	Resident	<p>The proposed garden village, also in the parish of Babworth and Ranby, should not go ahead. The proposed site is wholly on greenfield, agricultural land. Should be trying to use brownfield sites first, and if necessary only thereafter greenfield sites nearer town centres to reduce the impact. The proposed enormous site is isolated. It would be massive. There are no "villages" (even with uplift) in the entire district as large as this proposed. Try to justify its existence by suggesting it would be self-supporting, and have its own services- shop(s), doctors, school, train station. Note you would only build 500 homes in the short- term. In my view, 500 homes will not justify, or support building such services. There are NO existing transport links or services. Funding will be lacking, and it will be unfeasible. All those new residents will be dependent on cars. At least 1000 cars will be travelling by car to and from that isolated site to the services in the towns and larger settlements. They will be driving to the very areas that need developing, but also further afield given the proposed village's proximity to the A1. Local towns may not even feel the benefit of those residents. Hang much hope on a railway station being built. This is not feasible with 500 homes in my view. It is not guaranteed that the second phase of the other hundreds of homes will ever be built, which would underpin and undermine all the arguments for building the first phase of 500 homes. Bids would have to be made to fund the station, and other services. Do not believe this will happen, and have not seen any evidence to suggest it will, or might. Doubt very much 500 homes would justify any of the proposed services. There are already 2 local train stations at Worksop and Retford which could be developed further and used, if more houses were built nearer those towns. Retford is on the mainline, which is more useful to residents in any event, than a little station in the middle of nowhere. Developing the towns would alleviate current traffic congestion, pollution and also decrease it further if public transport was used, as it is much more accessible in the towns, and on the outskirts of towns. There will be huge disruption to the area whilst such an isolated large-scale development is being built on the greenfield site. The traffic problems will be enormous, whilst being built, and afterwards. There are infrastructure problems in your plan. The A1 traffic will be congested and further increased. Ranby village will again be detrimentally affected by the traffic on the A1 in terms of congestion (being able to join the A1), and also the noise and pollution. The A1 is already extremely noisy and an increase in traffic will only increase noise levels. It may become unbearable for us, and other residents to go outside, open windows, or be in certain rooms. By building on such a huge amount of greenfield acreage, the agricultural land is lost, there is less land to absorb the rainfall we experience (which may lead to flooding in other areas), and the environmental impact on the biodiversity is also detrimental. I have read the proposals to "offset" this, with some open spaces and trees, but this is not comparable to the established habitats and biodiversity that will be destroyed. They cannot be replaced. This whole area is being developed at a fast pace in terms of industrial developments, and if this carries on, our district will no longer be very rural. The proposed residential developments within our parish will define our rural parish then as urban.</p>	<p>The Garden Village will be a self-sustaining settlement in its own right. The plan period runs to 2037 but the development t will not stop at that point it will continue. From a planning perspective the Council plans for the whole site and then determines what infrastructure is needed and when; infrastructure will be phased with development. The spatial strategy promotes growth, including economic growth, in the Main Towns as a priority, because they are the most sustainable locations for growth. But to be sustainable in the long term it is considered that the Garden village provides a unique opportunity to attract employment and infrastructure improvements to the District, dependent on its location. Network Rail have provided their support in principle for the railway station. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment 2021 states that the proposal can be delivered as part of a financially viable scheme in the long term. This is a long term proposal, and as such, the detail will be added at each stage of the planning process. The Bassetlaw Transport Study identifies the known impacts on the highways network; the development will provide financial contributions to support their improvement. This evidence shows that the additional traffic can be safely accommodated on the transport network, in some cases with mitigation. The Plan identifies brownfield sites but there are not enough available sites to meet needs. So greenfield land needs to be used. A 20% gain in biodiversity value will be secured on site.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF157	Resident	Generally, the level and scale proposed to build in every village and the 3500 homes in a garden village will ruin our rural community. Do not want to have this proposed "urban sprawl". Want to live in a rural area, not an urban one. The necessary development should be within and nearest towns, or within the larger villages, where the services are, or can be better developed/extended and supported, and the need to use cars and resultant congestion and pollution is minimal. The world needs less carbon footprint, not more! Ranby village cannot sustain the proposed new developments (or 5% uplift of its actual houses) and its character would be destroyed. The required services and infrastructure are not there. The vast majority of the residents (who attended your consultation meeting last time), like me, do not want such development. In such a rural community, where there are only c.250 homes in the whole parish, it is totally unfeasible to build another 3500 on one greenfield site, and then another 5 in our very rural small village (within the same parish), which has only c.89 houses to start with. Do not think your "broad brush" approach works. If you propose to build the garden village, Ranby should not have further housing built within the village as well. Any "allocation" should be included within the garden village. It would be wholly wrong and unfair not to do so.	The spatial strategy promotes growth, including economic growth, in the Main Towns as a priority, because they are the most sustainable locations for growth. But to be sustainable in the long term it is considered that the Garden village provides a unique opportunity to attract employment and infrastructure improvements to the District, dependent on its location. Ranby village will not be taking 5% growth – the parish growth will be subsumed by the Garden Village.
REF132	JVH Planning on behalf of Kilner Estate	Object to Policy ST1 on the basis that it includes new settlements at Cottam and at the A57/A1, which consider are unsustainable and undeliverable. Object to the Cottam Power Station and the Garden Village being included in the strategy and suggest that the whole settlement hierarchy needs to be revisited with proper consideration of the level of homes that are needed over the Plan Period. The proposed development in the Garden Village and Cottam can be redistributed within the existing settlement hierarchy to settlements that can deliver new homes and can provide existing social and physical infrastructure. It is proposed that the Plan be redrafted to do: • Omit the two new settlements Cottam and Garden Village • Redistribute the numbers anticipated in the Plan period to the existing settlement hierarchy especially to the smaller rural villages to allow them to grow organically and make the best use of the existing infrastructure and make allocations in the villages to achieve this strategy	The spatial strategy promotes growth, including economic growth, in the Main Towns as a priority, because they are the most sustainable locations for growth. But to be sustainable in the long term it is considered that the Garden village provides a unique opportunity to attract employment and infrastructure improvements to the District, dependent on its location. It will provide a sustainable growth option in the long term. Cottam is not identified as a new settlement. It will be a broad location for regeneration in the long term should the provisions of the relevant policy be met. The number of dwellings attributed to the smaller villages is considered to be sustainable and appropriate to local character, and in line with the level of accessibility that tier of the hierarchy has to local shops, services and public transport.
REF168	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	The Council previously commented on this proposal and welcomes the response provided in the consultation statement and recognition that further transport assessment work will be required.	Comments noted.
REF172	Elkesley Parish Council	The garden village could have a significant impact on Elkesley and would appreciate it if there could be some direct consultation with the villagers to help decide how the communities could support each other and not leave Elkesley as a remote satellite village. 5.3.33 Develop access to the new rail and bus links for other communities. Elkesley is another community that could benefit from this, will there be extra parking available at the station to accommodate travellers from outside of the garden village?	The directly affected Parish Councils are consulted on proposals for the Garden Village and this has involved Elkesley. The delivery of a Garden Village should bring benefits to the wider community particularly by improving accessibility for the rural community to a range of services.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF182	Anglian Water	<p>SUPPORT Anglian Water is keen to promote the development of 'Water smart communities' including as part of the proposed garden village. They use a more holistic and integrated approach to water management with the aim to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance liveability by contributing to green streetspaces and high quality open space • Promote the sustainable use of water resources and infrastructure to enable growth • Build resilience against the impacts of climate change and extreme weather events • Contribute to natural capital and biodiversity through multifunctional water features • Deliver water efficient homes to reduce household bills and support affordability <p>Fully support the requirement to provide a robust water management scheme which includes water recycling /rainwater harvesting together with water efficiency measures. Supportive of the requirement to incorporate strategically designed and appropriately phased utility infrastructure including that provided by Anglian Water.</p>	Support noted and welcome. Integrated water management has been added to the policy to ensure a sustainable approach to water management is secured.
REF186	Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England	Welcome 4.a.iii (co-location of railway station and bus interchange); 5. (green and blue infrastructure and connectivity); 13. b. and c. (financial contributions to the railway station and bus service).	Support noted and welcome.
REF035	Resident	The Council's earlier decision, following public consultation on the Draft Strategic Plan in 2019, to relocate the garden village development is strongly supported and avoids the closure of Gamston Airport, for now! The new site for the garden village affords much better travel connectivity by road and rail and provide a large number of dwellings over and beyond the plan period. Believe that the Gamston site requires 'safeguarding' for the current authorised use as one of the best licensed General Aviation airfields in the UK. Indeed, the airfield is a strategic aviation asset in Bassetlaw with a historic past and potential for further aviation related employment once its future is assured in the emerging Plan.	Support noted and welcome. General aviation airfields are afforded protection by national planning policy.
REF149	Stone Planning Services Limited on behalf of Charterpoint (NG22) Limited	Generally, this policy is supported. It is an ambitious area for strategic growth for 4,000 dwellings and 15ha of employment, which will require significant front-loaded development infrastructure. Note that the development will not only need the broad range of community infrastructure but also significant off-site highway contributions. The Viability Assessment concludes that this green field site cannot contribute towards CIL, but it can deliver the necessary infrastructure requirements. The Viability Assessment shows a net Viability Margin of -£10.929m when assessed against CIL. The cost of the new junction onto the B6420 is £3m in itself. Policy ST3 at Part 4 sets out the transport requirements; in addition to the £3m there are contributions to the A1 slip road south, the B6420/A620 junction and the A614/A57/A1 junction. There are also contributions to a Public Transport network including a new railway station on the Worksop to Retford rail line. Cannot see where these requirements are fully quantified and whether delivery is dependent on the public purse at a time when public funding is likely to be squeezed. These are huge infrastructure commitments. Strategic sites of this scale are very challenging and whilst we recognise that some housing will be delivered during the plan period, consider it unlikely that the less profitable employment site will come forward. There is nothing in the policy which sets out a triggered link between residential and employment delivery. The site is very close to Site ST10 - Apleyhead Junction. In view of their scale and proximity they will compete, and this could suppress delivery. The employment element on this site will not be delivered in the Plan Period.	At a strategic level the Whole Plan Viability Assessment 2021 states that the Garden Village can be delivered through a financially viable scheme. Many of the infrastructure requirements identified involve proportionate contributions and are not expected to be funded solely by the Garden Village. The employment offer at Apleyhead is expected to be very different and aimed at different markets. There is no evidence to suggest that the employment provision is undeliverable; it is adjacent to the A1, equidistant between Worksop/Retford and could be delivered alongside and/or in advance of the housing element of the scheme. The Council is therefore confident that both sites are capable of coming forward in the plan period for employment growth.
REF197	Resident	Why only 500 houses and why start so late? In order to provide sufficient demand for rail services, this will need to be more, unless it is being looked on as a park and rail for the area – which it may become, in which case sufficient car parking with EV chargers will be required. Why a hotel with only 500 houses? What is the target audience?	Garden Villages have a long lead in time to enable necessary infrastructure to be brought into the site. The Council considers 500 homes is realistic in this plan period. Network Rail have given in principle support for the station and the evidence states that the station can be sustained by the Garden Village and use from the wider area. Electric vehicles charging will be a requirement. The Village will be a new settlement so a hotel, adjoining the A1 would be an appropriate use.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF201	Severn Trent	<p>Paragraph 5.3.14 & 5.3.16 Note that the Garden Village is proposed to incorporate interconnected multifunctional Green Blue infrastructure and the effective management of surface water through the development. Supportive of this approach as it will enable the conveyance of surface water through the development, increasing flood resilience and resilience to climate change. Paragraph 5.3.29 supportive of the approach to implement water efficient design and technology and meet the water efficiency target or design commercial areas to me BREEM Standards, so that new develop is design to be sustainable and manage key resources such as water appropriately.</p> <p>Supportive of the principles within Policy ST13, in particular points 10 and 11 which focus on managing water sustainably from reduced consumptions to sustainable discharge of surface water such that it can be utilised by the natural environment, creating space for water that can be enjoyed by people and nature together. Supportive of the Green/Blue Infrastructure section of Policy ST3 such that it proposed to retain the connectivity of water and the natural environment.</p>	Support noted and welcome.
REF211	National Trust	<p>No in principal objection to the concept of a Garden Village to meet the future housing needs of the district both within and beyond the plan period and support the use of a Consultative Group to guide the preparation of this document. Concerned to ensure that the scale of the proposed development and potential impacts on the Sherwood Forest ppSPA identified in the Habitats Regulations Assessment are carefully considered both within the plan and on an ongoing basis. Note that a landscape-led masterplan will be required to 'creatively address the key site constraints and sensitively respond to the unique qualities and opportunities afforded by its landscape, heritage and environmental setting...'. However, remain concerned that the scale and spatial configuration of the proposed site allocation, particularly in combination with Policy ST10 (Apleyhead Junction), will close the gap between Worksop and Retford creating urban sprawl from Worksop to the A1 and onwards to within 2.5km of Retford. The implications of this in terms of loss of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural land also need to be better understood. ST3 B1 remain concerned about the proposed scale of the development - at least 4000 new homes – and what mechanisms will be put in place to ensure that development will not come forward earlier than envisaged and inhibit regeneration elsewhere. Suggest that the scale of development ought to be influenced by the genuine housing and economic needs of the district and sub-region, and by the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development while maintaining green gaps between settlements and the distinct identities of Worksop and Retford. Concerned to ensure that the basic parameters of the site – such as housing and employment allocations – are only set once the recommendations of the Habitat Regulations Assessment have been taken into account. For example, in order to mitigate impacts on Clumber Park SSSI and Sherwood Forest ppSPA a 400m green buffer is proposed along the A1. Does this, along with the other stated requirements of Policy ST3, not considerably reduce the amount of housing and employment that the site can reasonably accommodate? ST3 B4a support the proposal that the Garden Village should be supported by an Integrated Transport and Business Hub – promoting sustainable travel by incorporating a railway station, bus interchange, electric vehicle charging hub and cycling hub. ST3 B5 support the proposal for a multi-functional green and blue infrastructure network covering a minimum of 40% of the site. ST3 B6 support the proposal for 30% tree coverage across the site and retention of existing woodland, to contribute to reforestation of Sherwood Forest. ST3 B7 cautiously supportive of the proposed (i) Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace, and (ii) 400m green infrastructure buffer along the A1, to mitigate recreational and predation impacts on Sherwood Forest ppSPA and Clumber Park SSSI and international sites. Further information is needed on how these features will be designed to achieve the stated aims. The 400m buffer is not yet included on the Concept Plan within the Garden Village Vision Statement (which shows a buffer of perhaps 50m along the A1) and could have a significant impact on the Garden Village concept overall. Welcome the requirement for a project level Habitats Regulations Assessment, concerned that the impacts and mitigation requirements of Local Plan proposals (particularly in relation to traffic and air quality) are not yet fully understood and have not been taken into account in setting the basic parameters – such as housing and employment targets – for the Garden Village. While the HRA Appropriate Assessment of the Local Plan highlights the potential issue of cat predation between the Garden Village and Clumber Park, it does not address whether the proposed pedestrian bridge – a green bridge to support wildlife movement according to the Vision Statement – could have any implications in this regard. Welcome clarification. ST3 B8 Welcome the commitment to at least 20% biodiversity net gain. It is not clear how this ties in with the commitment to provide 40% green infrastructure 30% tree coverage across the site. Welcome further information on the proposed habitats within the site and how these will be designed to be unsuitable/unattractive to ground nesting bird populations associated with the Sherwood Forest ppSPA and Clumber Park SSSI. ST3 13d open minded about the concept of a pedestrian and cycle bridge over the A1. Require further information on the following to support the proposal (i) an appropriate design that manages landscape and visual impacts, (ii) a strategy to manage recreational impacts on the sensitive habitats within Clumber Park, and (iii) clarification of the potential positive and negative effects for wildlife if this was designed as a 'green bridge'.</p>	<p>The scale and potential impacts on the Sherwood Forest ppSPA are considered by the Plan and will continue to be progressed, and in future monitored on an ongoing basis. The Plan identifies a number of brownfield sites for development but there are not enough to support growth. Some greenfield land needs to be used. The impacts on agricultural land have been appropriately considered. Evidence indicates that the lead in time for the Garden Village means that it is unrealistic to expect housing delivery before 2032. This provides sufficient time to enable the regeneration proposed elsewhere in the District to establish, confirmed by the draft Worksop Central DPD. The Vision Statement for the site provides a flexible design framework to accommodate the policy requirements including the housing and employment capacity and necessary 400m buffer along the A1. The Vision Statement was developed and approved by the Consultative Group of which the National trust is a member. The green bridge could be designed to ensure that cat predation is not an issue. The type and mix of habitats on site will be considered in further detail as the scheme progresses. However the vision statement gives an indication is to the type of habitats the Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust have recommended. The policy requires a landscape strategy to ensure the impacts upon landscape are carefully managed. This can be expanded to include a landscape and visual impact assessment. The Clumber Park SSSI Recreational Impact Assessment is underway, work undertaken to date has informed the Local Plan and will continue to do so. The process has been agreed with Natural England. The National Trust are a partner in the Recreational impact</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
			Assessment and have been actively involved in the work undertaken in the project to date. The green bridge is not expected to be sought until the next plan period. Further detail will be discussed through masterplanning; the National Trust will continue to be positively engaged in that process.
1669241	Resident	Note the Council may have taken on board previous representations from us and others offering cautious support for the 4000 dwelling new garden settlement at the A1/A57 Apleyhead Junction, provided that any delays in this site coming forward did not lead to an overall shortfall of provision across the District in this incoming plan period. BDC have therefore reduced the planned first phase delivery of homes within the plan period to from 750 to 500 dwellings by 2037 which is supported, yet there should not be a complacency that even these 500 dwellings will be delivered in such uncertain times. Do not propose further reduction to the first phase delivery of homes in this policy/ allocation, do not think it is appropriate for the Council to reduce the growth targets for the small rural settlements as set out in our representations to ST2 as this restricts this deliverable form of supply and sterilises legitimate, moderate and sustainable growth opportunity.	Comments noted.
REF214	Historic England	The Garden Village principles set out at Para.5.3.5 are noted, and it is acknowledged that the historic environment would be addressed in cultural elements referred to in Bullet Point (BP) 8. The heritage references in paragraph 5.3.13 and 5.3.20 are welcomed. The archaeological assessment referred to in paragraph 5.3.21 is noted but it is not clear how this sits with other aspirations for the site including effective water management and surface water run-off suggested in 5.3.16 which are expected to include wetlands and balancing ponds - these could result in a loss of heritage assets that would not be able to be compensated for. When the significance of any archaeology at the site is currently an unknown, it is not possible to consider the potential harm to heritage assets as part of the Plan process so there is an issue of soundness at present. Section B-12 - It is not clear at present how the proposed allocation has been considered in respect of the nearby designated heritage assets at Clumber Park as well as any, as yet unknown, archaeological elements. Would recommend that the policy wording, and/or justification text, as well as the SA and Heritage Statement address these elements clearly in order to establish expectations as to how the proposed site allocation would respond to the historic environment and any harm resulting from the proposal. Depending on archaeological outcomes from the assessment currently being considered it may be appropriate to have more of a heritage led masterplan than is currently proposed. In order to address some of the concerns in relation to the historic environment it may be necessary to undertake some of the work set out in Section A of Policy ST4: Bassetlaw Garden Village Spatial (typo 'Spacial' in Draft Plan) Design Framework as part of the Plan process to demonstrate that the Plan will be able to achieve its aspirations for the site. Welcome opportunity to discuss this further and ahead of the next round of consultation and to continue engagement with the Council as the SPD progresses.	The concept plan for the garden village is indicative and is expected to be refined as the masterplanning process continues. A desk top archaeological assessment has been completed and a geophysical survey is underway. This will inform the evolution of the design of the site. Historic England have been involved with discussions with Lincs Archaeology and the Council about the approach to archaeology on site and the agreement has been reached in relation to the policy approach. This is evidenced through the draft Statement of Common Ground for both parties. The Heritage Paper sets out how heritage has been considered in the site selection process, the Site Selection Methodology paper confirms this. The Heritage Paper has been agreed with Historic England. The policy has been amended to make reference to a heritage /landscape led masterplan.
1670988	Resident	Ensure that these houses will have safe access to main roads, and potentially for safety, the A1 may require a new speed limit along that stretch.	Appropriate access to main roads will be provided. Highways England confirm that no improvements are needed to the A1 in this plan period.
1670549	Resident	If a new Garden Village is needed, it should be situated on a brownfield site such as at Bevercotes Colliery. It goes against green credentials to destroy countryside when there is an alternative available.	Bevercotes has been considered and discounted as Garden Village because of the extent of biodiversity designations that exist on site. Development would be contrary to national policy and national legislations.
1671492	Resident	Consider the new railway station and associated hub a waste of money so 1 of the main basis of this position is removed and it would be better to go back to using the ex Bevercoates pit site.	Bevercotes has been considered and discounted as Garden Village because of the extent of biodiversity designations that exist on site.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
			Development would be contrary to national policy and national legislations.
1671492	Resident	The cost of setting up the garden village would be better spent developing Retford, Worksop and surrounding villages so that the main facilities for sport and recreation are developed instead of trying to create an extra area of housing with limited facilities.	An appropriate amount of housing has been identified for the Main Towns and also the surrounding villages over the plan period, appropriate to each settlement's place in the hierarchy. This is considered appropriate to support sport and recreation facilities.
1670589	Resident	Active Travel, Public Transport and Connectivity 5.3.31 Transport – Small Rural Settlements within a 3 mile radius of towns should be considered for more growth and in particular to benefit from the provision of cycle routes. An example of this would be a cycle track from Sutton-cum-lound to Retford, a distance of 3 miles.	The Local Plan can only secure infrastructure related to growth identified by the Plan. Other infrastructure may be pursued by the Council and partners, such as for cycling.
1670869	Resident	Does the Authority see any relationship between the proposed Garden Village and the Cottam Power Station site? if so, can this be explained in the plan. is there any underlying expectation/assumption that over time these two sites will effectively merge into a single 'new town'..?which would no doubt be at the detriment to the countryside, habitats and carbon foot [rig of the District?	Cottam is in close proximity to the Trent on the eastern side of the District. The garden Village adjoins the A1 a reasonable distance apart. There is no functional link between the two or no expectation that these will merge in to one single town.
1671143	Resident	The concept of a Bassetlaw Garden Village is a good one and will in particular find support amongst those Rural communities that see it as taking the pressure off of their own communities. It will find "little support" in the Parish in which it is located. Say little support and find myself unable to quantify just how much or little support the concept might have garnered. The problem with this consultation is that however laudable the Council's intentions were to undertake an effective consultation, the consultation itself, hampered by the Covid 19 restrictions barely scratched the surface of a community involvement. The Council tried hard, presenting some very well designed and fulsome information virtually but this was a poor substitute for the face to face events of last year. Understand that there was a need to make progress with the Plan but feel that our communities and Officers alike missed out and wonder how effectively the consultation will reflect the views of the community at large. Concerns about the siting of the Garden Village. Primarily that I find it does not make effective use of land as required in the NPPF clause 118. "give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and other identified needs, and support appropriate opportunities to remediate despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated or unstable land;" Believe that there are brownfield sites in Bassetlaw that might better be used. The decision to give up on earlier intentions to develop part villages at Bevercotes & Gamston was premature. The former dismissed on ecological grounds and the latter as there is a wish not to see airports closed (how long term is Gamston airport anyway?). Instead we are presented with a development of a greenfield site and the displacement of an established farming family to make way for the Garden Village. There are also other sites that might be considered, perhaps a power station site? It seems that the development on the proposed site in Babworth Parish is being driven by landowners who will likely do very well out of it and the very idea that the site is close to, and might at some time in the future feature a rail connection. It is very unlikely that money will be found to develop a station, a connection to a rail line that runs diesel trains, how green is that? The likelihood of electrification of that rail line is an expenditure too far and battery driven trains an even more remote prospect. Not a lot going for a rail connection! But, quite a lot to be liked about the Bassetlaw Local Plan. In fact it is mostly all good. Just let us give some more consideration to the siting of the village itself. In a post Brexit world we need all the agricultural land we have and then we need to comply with NPPF do we not?	In line with Covid legislation and planning legislation the Council undertook an effective virtual consultation that generated the largest response to any strategic planning consultation. The Plan identifies brownfield land for development but there are not enough available, suitable sites in the District so greenfield land needs to be used. Bevercotes has been considered and discounted as Garden Village because of the extent of biodiversity designations that exist on site. Development would be contrary to national policy and national legislations. General Aviation Airfields are afforded protection under national policy. The former Marnham power station is identified for employment use. Cottam is earmarked for growth in the future subject to provisions of the policy being met. Network Rail have provided their in principle support for a railway station.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF052	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>The Bassetlaw Garden Village provides a 'blank sheet' on which to develop many of the ideas described elsewhere in the document, eg quality housing, environmental benefits, healthy lifestyles, etc. Every effort must be made that these principles are not diminished over time. Living in a rural area, am all too aware of the difficulties presented by inadequate, inflexible public transport, aged infrastructure (waste-water systems) that is not up to 21st century use, and lack of local services and facilities. Don't let this happen to the Garden Village! The Bassetlaw Garden Village could follow the example of Chelmsford Garden Village, which is future-proofing itself for when driverless cars are the norm. While there will be parking spaces for cars in the first phase of development, these will gradually be converted into new uses, such as communal gardens, and residents will instead be able to summon driverless vehicles from a car park on the outskirts of the town of Chelmsford. An access point should be created in the north-east corner of the site (or where most convenient) to give pedestrian access to Babworth Parish Church.</p> <p>This needs to refer to the adjacency of Doncaster Sheffield Airport.</p>	<p>Support for Garden Village noted. Reference will be added to Doncaster Sheffield Airport. Improvements to walking and cycle routes will be made where reasonable and appropriate to support the new development.</p>
REF058	Sport England	Para 5.3.15 – Supported Para 5.3.23/24/28 – Supported Para 5.3.31/33/34 – Supported Policy ST3 supported with particular reference to A1 – Active Design and section 4 with the use of evidence to lead the development. Should section 9 make reference to either on site facilities or a contribution to off-site as evidenced.	Support noted. In line with the evidence the preference is for sports facilities to be provided on site to create a community hub and sense of place. Amendments made accordingly.
REF072	Resident	Support this proposal as did when it was made in the previous Draft Plan in early 2020: - The site is close to the main A1 arterial road network and so will not require any major structural road works. - It combines a large residential development with a current expanding economic business development. Therefore new major services can be developed without considerable disruption and can very easily form a sub-regional Enterprise Hub. - It could offer massive employment opportunities to local and incoming Bassetlaw residents. The downside would be that valuable agricultural and woodland would disappear under concrete constructions but would not have enormous infrastructure challenges as in other local areas. This development must not start until there is a mechanism in place to ensure that retail and other community facilities including public transport and logistical services are in place at an early stage to serve Bassetlaw residents.	The Plan identifies brownfield land for development but there is not enough suitable and deliverable brownfield land available so some greenfield land needs to be used. The woodland on site will be protected by policy. Infrastructure is expected to be phased alongside development to ensure that infrastructure meets the needs of new residents. Based on evidence it is considered that delivery of 500 homes is reasonable for a garden village site.
REF100	Resident	How are the residents of the 4000 homes going to be employed?	10 ha of employment land is being provided on site as well as commercial space and local shops and services.
REF104	GESUKLTD	Express our objection and concerns regarding the proposed garden villages both at Ranby, and Cottam. There are a myriad of objections, and reasons these should not be permitted: any new garden village or villages with their vast number of new homes will mean that new homes in the existing villages will not get built, simply because of the numbers allocated to the new garden villages. Not allowing, and or drastically reducing, and limiting the ability to correctly and for the benefit of the areas and local communities in those and surrounding those villages Lots of these existing villages require new development, and housing for many reasons including, and not limited to keeping the villages alive for the ongoing use, and maintenance of the village halls, shops, post offices, pubs, schools etc These garden villages by virtue of their scale will give a very unfair advantage to those developers of the garden villages over the smaller developments, companies, developers and family run house builders that ply their trade building out smaller sites, up to 15 No. in our existing villages, so competition in both numbers and finances will have a very detrimental effect on existing rural development as we know it	The Local Plan's spatial strategy proposes growth in a number of locations which are considered the most sustainable to accommodate additional development. This growth will be delivered through a combination of large urban extensions, smaller sites, regeneration of brownfield sites, via a new settlement and through proportionate growth in the rural area. The proposed mix in the nature of development will help make sure that growth is balanced across the District, meets local needs and doesn't overburden particular areas in terms of existing services and infrastructure. New service and infrastructure provision is also planned in those areas that need it. It is expected that some infrastructure improvements will benefit the wider area rather than just within the new developments. The combination of the size and location of planned development across the District will help make it attractive to a range of developers and investors.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
			In addition, rural growth is being promoted through a number of Neighbourhood Plans across the District. These give local communities a greater say in where new development is located and also provide opportunities to plan for more growth where it is needed.
REF109	Resident	<p>5.3.33 Residents will already be car dependent prior to moving into the new developments. The developers have allocated 2 parking places for each house on the Trinity Farm, Retford site, and are expecting people to drive rather than use public transport or bike to their destinations. The revised plans also raise concerns about safety as the new road layout could allow inconsiderate car users to use it as a race track and runs adjacent to green spaces where families, children and dog walkers may be. There appears to be a few traffic calming measures in place but not sufficient to prevent excess speed and road noise. The plan does not outline the infrastructure of charging points for the new electric cars following the Government announcement that new petrol and diesel cars will no longer be sold from 2030.</p>	<p>The re-alignment of Mansfield Road will help manage traffic flow and speeds through the site. Public transport and cycle access will be a requirement of the policy and should be in place from an early stage to ensure the residents do not become car dependent. Requirements for electric vehicle charging are set out in the Plan's climate change policy.</p>
REF110	Resident	<p>There seems quite a lot of support for a new village. With the plan only allowing for 500 out of the 4000 home to be built in the length of this plan how can you guarantee that the infrastructure be in place including the station, retail and other community facilities, including public transport services, from the early stages to serve those who have invested in their homes as stated on page 21 "The Beginnings of the New BGV will be growing around a new transport hub and employment offer" and in 5.3.33" In the early stages of development it is important that residents do not become car dependant" To meet the above statement it is clear that the plan need to upscale the amount of properties required from the outset and the life of this plan and cut back on other lager developments giving those area time to integrate and develop strategies to cope with increasing numbers? The plan shows that the route down Mansfield road will be altered to slow traffic down by sending it through the new Garden Village. What plans have been made to cope when the A1 has to be shut as happens at least twice a year?</p> <p>5.3.37 What plans and consideration has be taken to cope with the increase of traffic using both Elkesley and Ranby junctions rather than using Mansfield Rd? Policy ST3 point 6 Will this include the trees lining the Bridleway / footpath that run through the centre of the proposed site and maintain this right of way?</p>	<p>The policy will ensure that the infrastructure requirements are clearly identified. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will identify the timeframe for delivery. Through the masterplan for the site a developer will put together and implementation strategy which will ensure that development is aligned with appropriate infrastructure. Highways England have confirmed that no improvements are needed to the A1 as a result of the Garden Village in this plan. The tree canopy cover includes existing trees on site and new planting. Public rights of way will be protected and incorporated into the design.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF129	Resident	<p>Read these proposed developments with genuine disappointment that projects such as these, requiring large areas of countryside space, are deemed acceptable in modern times given the environmental pressures to maintain what is left of our open space. The area is largely surrounded by open country and forestry and indeed, one of the few spaces that retains its rural feel. Any development in this area will have a heavy visual impact. Have excellent historical assets close by including Sherwood, Clumber and the Dukeries which are internationally respected and require special preservation and enhancement rather than projects that could impact negatively and move to a more urban feel in the area. It is a great pity we rely on international hotel and leisure companies to promote these great assets and should be doing more in my view to develop this in environmentally sustainable ways which would go hand in hand with natural development. Compare Sherwood forest with the New forest in the South which retains much of its historical and natural character. Given that Sherwood is arguably the most famous forest in the world, it is rather pitiful what remains and how little has been done to restore and enhance this amazing legacy. The Bassetlaw area is changing and developing, increasingly losing its rural character. Housing and commercial development should only be permitted within (or be part of) existing settlements. Remaining open country should be preserved and ecologically enhanced at all costs, without presuming that undeveloped land is a useable commodity. There should be no removal of mature trees and extra space made available for forestry and biodiversity to offset any negative impact. This is more important than ever, given the dire state of our natural world and rapid loss of natural species, not least through loss of habitat. This is important for this area which could be of greatly increased benefit and a valuable asset as we move to an increasingly developed and urban environment. Can and must do better than this to preserve our precious and unique resources.</p>	A landscape and visual impact assessment will be required to ensure impacts are appropriately mitigated. Where possible brownfield sites in the settlements are used but there are not enough available sites to meet needs so some greenfield sites are required on the edge of settlements and elsewhere. Mature trees are protected by the policy and 20% additional biodiversity value will be secured on site.
REF139	Resident	<p>Most of the points were discussed at a meeting with the planning team on the 11th January 2021 but feeding these into the consultation process to ensure these are captured and Council factor and take action into the next stage. As plans indicate, there will need to be a long period of infrastructure development required as there is limited infrastructure on site (water, sewerage, Phone lines / broadband etc.) Existing Local residents who are undoubtedly going to be affected by this development should not be forgotten about, therefore as part of the next stage planning process / masterplan for delivery (if this proposal goes ahead), this should include requirements to ensure existing residents are included in the developments and are also provided with the same level of infrastructure that the Garden Village is going to get such as improved sewerage, water supply, broadband and telephone lines. This will include upgrades required for telecommunications as the phone line service is poor and fixed broadband capability is non-existent locally at present. The provision of water for us, comes via the water supply to Morton Hill Farm and not directly with the water company. The water supply pipe comes down one of the farmer's fields, and looking at the initial plans this is an area which has been designated for housing. This needs to be included in the delivery plan to ensure water provision continues to local families and infrastructure upgraded as part of the development (water meter needs to be re-sited at our property and not as part of the farms supply). From discussion at the meeting, plans for the byway are not 100% clear / finalised as there are ongoing discussions about it. Have right of way on the top half of the byway and will require continuing access for our vehicle and for delivery of essentials such as access for Oil tankers and Waste Removal tankers (as we currently have a septic tank). Access to big vehicles providing basic services to our property due to the lack of mainstream facilities – no mains sewerage or gas supply for heating, will need to be allowed for. Beyond our property, the byway could be pedestrianised in order to reduce traffic exposure for us, as we currently enjoy little traffic on the byway and building 4000 houses will have an impact on us if traffic were to flow down the byway. The peaceful environment that we live in at present is essential to be maintained for us. Feeding in our concerns about existing privacy and security as currently the area is open fields and hedgerows with little human / vehicular throughput. With the development of the initial 500 houses rising to 4000 houses in the longer term, will no longer be in an isolated location but surrounded by this new development. This will affect our current view and amenities. Expect fencing all around our property and planting of hedgerow and trees to protect and maintain our on-going privacy that currently experience. Feeding this in to ensure that these are captured now and addressed in the masterplan. Also the B6420 which is currently pretty quiet will become busy with 4000 properties being located here. Consideration needs to be given to change the speed limit from 60mph to that appropriate for residential area as the increased traffic sound will have an impact, not to mention the increased pollution this will bring. The plan is detailed in terms of what the proposed development is going to include. Would like to see in the plans a commitment that these will actually be delivered upon, as normally what happens is that plans mention these, but developers find ways of getting out of actually delivering these. So some form of accountability would be beneficial to ensure delivery is actually made of the amenities. As a local resident to the proposed Garden Village would welcome the chance to be more involved in</p>	The local community will continue to be consulted on the Local plan as it progresses and the Garden Village proposals. Further discussions are required with the infrastructure providers in relation to connectivity to utilities infrastructure for neighbouring properties. All existing infrastructure that crosses the site will be protected and access for maintenance maintained. Neighbouring properties legal right of access will be maintained. The masterplan will provide more detail on the layout and approach taken to design across the site. The policy ensures residents will experience an appropriate level of amenity. Boundary treatments will be a matter for the masterplan and subsequent planning application process. The re-alignment of Mansfield Road will help reduce traffic speeds but as the road would in the long term be taken through a residential area, the speed limit should be set appropriate to place.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
		the development of these plans in order that these are not imposed upon us, and have an opportunity to ensure our concerns and worries are factored in.	
REF176	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	It is recognised that the council has an obligation to provide housing stock. If this development is to go ahead, work should not begin until arrangements are in place to ensure that community facilities and public transport services are delivered early on in the development, to mitigate the risk of it becoming a simple housing development in the countryside. Public transport services are particularly important as in the early stages, residents will need to travel for work, education and shopping. A good public transport service will help to keep increased numbers of cars off the roads. What is the impact and loss to local wildlife?	The policy ensures that the infrastructure will be phased alongside new development to ensure the right infrastructure is available for future residents/businesses. This will include public transport. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will provide broad parameters for delivery. This is a living document and will be updated on a regular basis to ensure infrastructure is appropriately phased. A 20% increase in biodiversity value will be required on site to strengthen the ecological value of the site.
REF189	NHS Bassetlaw CCG	This will have an impact on Retford and Villages Primary Care Network (PCN) due to location, Whilst service and infrastructure includes health facilities it is not specific what is meant by this and the plan references 'health care facilities of an appropriate size to meet the needs of the settlement's population'. Community pharmacy provision is determined under the Pharmaceutical Regulations and would need an application to be successful and approved by NHS England Pharmaceutical Regulations Committee. There will be a need for this, so this requirement will need to link into the Nottinghamshire County Council's PNA. Dental facilities are commissioned by NHS England but it remains a dental business decision where to locate their premises. Similarly for optometry. Require ongoing consultation as this plan progresses so that we can support infrastructure development in line with expected need across the wide range of potential primary and community health and care services.	The policy is flexibly worded to provide the CCG and its partners with a degree of flexibility to ensure that health care facilities can be delivered to meet the changing needs of the settlement. The Council will continue to work with the CCG to ensure that infrastructure is delivered at the appropriate time to ensure no adverse impacts on existing services.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	<p>The considerable amount of work so far undertaken by the Council Officers is to be applauded and the general principle of garden villages is quite acceptable although relatively new, in particular to this district. Bassetlaw is predominantly a rural area and we do have an eclectic mix of villages that can easily accommodate more housing if carried out in a very methodical and planned way. In a much earlier edition of this draft local plan it was suggested that villages would “cluster” around larger villages and these larger villages would provide all the necessary services and infrastructure to serve the cluster of smaller villages. That worked very well and with the ever increasing use and provision of electric cars and home charging points the allowance for people to drive to these larger service centres cannot be classed as unsustainable. More and more electricity is being produced in a sustainable and renewable way and cars are being manufactured utilising a vast majority of recycled products and even new cars have to have a very large end of life content of 100% recyclable materials. The circle therefore has been joined and the reliance upon private cars to get people from A to B is no longer an unsustainable problem. It will in the very near future become a sustainable method of transport which will allow people to live in our rural areas. If there is one thing we have learnt with the Covid pandemic it is that isolation is the way forward, forming new large conurbations would be against this principle. Have 2 concerns regarding this particular allocation. Firstly, the location in terms of the employment sector is admirable being so close to the A1 and having the great benefit of such a good link onto the A1 and also the railway but as a housing location it is as bad as it gets. Seeking to locate in total 4000 homes and therefore families adjacent to the A1 with the hope that a green buffer will somehow reduce the negative impacts of both noise and air pollution with no mention of light pollution. Constantly reminded of the dangers of traffic fumes and pollution which affect people's breathing and general health. This is evidenced by many schools trying to reduce the instance of vehicular movement around the roads to and from. Even the M1 is restricted to a speed limit of 50mph adjacent to junction 34 (Meadowhall) simply in an attempt to reduce pollution. This new village will place children in an area very close to the A1 with all its associated fumes and pollution together with its proximity to the interchange where studies have shown fumes are generally greater. The proposal in Policy ST4 part B4 that a deep green infrastructure buffer adjacent to the A1 will somehow resolve the issue of both noise and air pollution is somewhat difficult to comprehend unless the Council have had an in depth fully compliant pollution study carried out on this specific site. It is too late to ensure that potential developers carry this out. If the site is allocated it should be only on the basis that it is safe. Live over 1.5 miles from the A1 and with the prevailing westerly windows noise is clearly audible particularly through the night. Trees and all forms of green infrastructure will, without doubt, help by removing carbon dioxide but green infrastructure struggles more with other gases such as nitrous oxide. Any new planting will take many years, up to 20, to become established, greater than the timeframe of this particular local plan yet, if permitted, development could commence straightaway which will have the negative effect of homes being built and occupied and families put at risk whilst they await the green buffer zone to be established. If we get this location wrong then we may have a massive health problem for the long term future of families and their children. The site lies on the east side of the A1, the prevailing winds are from the west which clearly means any noise or fume pollution produced by vehicular movements on the A1, A57, A614 and the junction itself will wash over the site. For employment, which is a less sensitive receptor, this is less of a problem. New offices and factories have air conditioning and there is often little need for employees to be outside other than at break times or coming and going whereas with residential it is 24/7. As an allocation for employment this is first class, as an allocation for housing it is not and is unsafe and not in the correct location, particularly when there is an excellent opportunity to redevelop an existing brownfield site located in an unbelievably beautiful woodland setting. This alternative site is located approximately 6 miles south along the A1 on the old Beercotes Colliery site. This site is surrounded by established woodland mostly planted to screen the original Beercotes Colliery, is on the east side of the A1 and not affected by prevailing winds and is located approximately 1500 metres from the A1. The site has planning permission for commercial but the costs of improving the A1 junction are excessive and could prove unacceptable rendering the proposal for industry unviable as the majority of users will access or leave the A1. This does not occur with residential, the majority of which will probably go to either Ollerton or Mansfield to the west, Retford to the east and the rest will utilise the A1 to Worksop and the north and Lincoln, Newark and the south. With this split vehicular movements utilising the A1 will be reduced considerably and the improvements to the A1 junction may well be more palatable to developers. The development could include some retail but other main services are located locally and contributions from the development would see these flourish. There is a very good new primary school at Gamston less than 4 miles away, there is an excellent secondary school academy at Tuxford, investment in both would secure their future. Tuxford also boasts a doctors surgery, 2 pharmacies and various shops. Employment would be located just up the road at the new node point at Apleyhead junction or at the expanded offer that should be provided at Markham Moor where land is available and is not adjacent to major residential areas. Tuxford as a major service centre is around 4 miles from the Beercotes site. It is a win-win situation. A brownfield site gets redeveloped. A new vibrant employment site is established at a major crossroads junction</p>	<p>The council's Environmental health Team have identified no concerns in relation to air quality/noise and through discussions it is considered that the site can accommodate appropriate mitigation to address potential impacts from the A1. All relevant assessments will be carried out to support the masterplan process and again to inform a planning application for the site. Beercotes was considered as a new settlement but has been discounted because of the extent of environmental designations on site, meaning that designation is contrary to legislation and national policy.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
		<p>and housing is provided in a brilliant woodland setting with all the requirements to make it attractive with extensive walks, cycling, pony trekking, fishing etc all on the doorstep. If this location was in Europe it would have been redeveloped for the benefit of people some time ago. It is an absolute waste of an opportunity to provide homes for families in a safe, beautiful location with all the social facilities available for a healthy lifestyle. The housing numbers do not have to be great but a clear mix is required, it is not in a flood risk area and therefore provision for senior citizens would be acceptable although there is already a 66 dwelling proposal for over 55s at Springvale Park approximately 1100 metres to the south. These types of sites do not become available every day and such an opportunity to redevelop should not be missed.</p> <p>To sum up:- Bevercotes Colliery site already has its own identity. It has a very good junction onto the B6387 which in turn has a junction on to the A1 for north and south moving traffic. It has good existing roadway links to Ollerton, Mansfield, Nottingham, Retford and Gainsborough. The site is located within established woodland such that screening and landscaping is not a problem, it mostly exists. These woods offer great opportunities for wildlife and habitat enhancement. There are vast areas given over to walking around the restored areas provided by Notts County Council with full access available without having to utilise a car. It is located adjacent to the National Cycle Network. It has a bridleway running through it. It is a brownfield site. Other recreational offers such as angling are located adjacent to the site. There is another major environmental benefit to this site that could truly make this residential proposal zero carbon. Located at Springvale Farm some 1600 metres due south of the old colliery site is an AD Plant which generates electricity from waste fruit and vegetables and energy crops and feeds back the electricity into the national grid. This plant has the capacity to provide electricity to over 3500 homes.</p> <p>With nominal infrastructure put in place consisting of an underground cable and floor mounted transformer, some of this electricity could be routed directly to serve this new residential allocation. Coupled with this is the new technology that allows the gas produced by the AD Plant to be cleaned and put back into the national grid pipeline. With this facility the new homes would be served with both gas and electricity generated from waste. That is truly an eco-friendly village and unlike Cottam, the energy provider is already in place and it does not have to wait before coming online. Putting all the above together this must surely be the best opportunity to provide an eco-village set in wonderful wooded countryside adjacent to all the requirements to promote a healthy community which should be a showpiece for the district and of course the Council.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	<p>Undue competition for rural housing with the provision of so many on Apleyhead site. 2. Most existing villages rely upon the "little and often" principle of development but this means land and construction costs are generally greater than larger scale developments. The garden village is to provide 500 new homes in this plan period, the equivalent of a village the size of Ranskill or East Markham and with this size comes the "economy of scale". Dwellings would be cheaper and people will gravitate to these cheaper homes. This will mean that the only dwellings built in all villages will be large expensive homes, not what the mix requirements suggest. Villages will not be able to retain services nor attract any new ones, they will become "dormitories" and not provide family homes for rural workers or workers at the new employment node points. This form of large scale residential development will have effects on the rural area for generations to come and it is having its effect already with the housing cap on smaller villages now being proposed at 5% rather than 20% which has been used by several Parish Councils in the preparation and adoption of Neighbourhood Plans. The establishment of a new large housing allocation will affect the following:- a. Equal provision of housing around the district given that economies of scale will provide much cheaper homes. b. Reduce further the amount of smaller family homes or senior citizen accommodation in villages. c. The amount of larger more expensive dwellings in villages will increase as these will be the only market that can afford these costs. d. Reduce the ability of villages to retain and attract services. Numbers will less need for the shop, public house, village hall and, most importantly the nursery/primary school.</p> <p>e. There will be no investment or increase in the frequency of the rural bus services. People who buy large rural properties do not utilise the bus service. f. Once this process is put in place and homes start to roll off the construction line then it becomes irreversible, therefore all the negative effects on the existing rural area will last for generations. g. Much in the same way "out of town retail" was resisted, this form of "out of town residential" should also be resisted. Evidence for out of town development does have a major negative effect is clear when one looks at both Retford and Worksop town centres, both are shadows of their former selves. There is a glut of charity shops and what has been recently classified as non-essential shops but the vast majority of footfall traffic heads to the supermarkets given that many of these now stock clothes, household goods, furniture, tools, equipment etc. The need to enter the town has diminished. The same will happen with housing although this time it will be villages and communities that suffer. If the number of families in our villages stays static and does not increase then the schools, shops and public houses will close meaning that children, shoppers and the general community will need to travel, it defeats the object. Other than the general shortfall of housing in the district and in particular affordable housing do not see evidence that suggests a garden village is the way to resolve this. It is correct that it will provide houses, employment and services. The employment requirement is clear but the only reason we need services is because we are putting houses there. If we did not put houses, we would not need the services therefore if the houses can be located in existing areas the whole ethos of a garden village is unproven. Obviously a garden village can be seen as a panacea for all. All the obvious facilities would have to be provided by developers but see little evidence of studies to investigate the impacts, either negative or positive, on surrounding villages and our rural area in general. These large scale allocations for residential development should be omitted and resisted strongly.</p>	The housing requirement for the rural area is considered appropriate in relation to local context and the level of accessibility each village has in terms of services, local shops and public transport. The housing mix policy and those identified by made Neighbourhood Plans will help ensure that a more appropriate housing mix can be achieved in the rural area. New build housing does not necessarily equate to cheaper homes. The requirement for the villages is considered appropriate to enable the sustainable operation of the rural area's shops and services. The level of services that could be secured at the Garden Village such as a railway station cannot be secured elsewhere in the District. By delivering a range of services and delivering public transport it make a greater range of services more accessible to the rural community.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF228	Sutton-cum-Lound Parish Council	<p>Support the concept of the phased development of the new "Garden Village" given the clear sustainable development opportunities the project will bring including the new transport hubs and cycle links. Such a proposal will enable the best available technologies to be applied to the housing scheme and introduce green infrastructure to the new settlement. It will ease development pressure on local villages where unwelcome and inappropriate housing developments have been promoted which diminish the rural and historic character of such small settlements. Given the site's location strategically situation close to the Five Lane Ends A1 intersection, this will essentially be a new "gateway" to Retford and surrounding villages and this "gateway" should not be interrupted by extraneous commercial development when other more suitable sites are available to develop commercial uses including that of a service station. There is a site being promoted to the north of the A1 which could more readily accommodate commercial development. The concept of a "green" service station similar to that at Gloucester Services sounds "nice" but as a local planning authority there are no controls in place to ensure this will come to fruition and stop one of the national commercial groups taking over the site. It is not considered that a service station is an appropriate part of the "gateway" into the new settlement and then on into Retford itself. Question the need for additional service station facilities when there is Blyth only a few miles to the north and Markham Moor a similar distance to the south. A meaningful buffer should be provided between the new settlement and the A1 within which a wider green corridor (say at least 250m wide) could be located including strategically located tree covered screening mounds which would separate the future housing from the A1 providing both a visual and importantly acoustic barrier to the new settlement. There are several examples along the M1 and other strategic highways where housing developments are being constructed adjacent to these busy carriageways and the only way these can acoustically be screened is by incongruous high fencing. At the "Garden Village", the opportunity exists from the outset to incorporate a more naturalistic and sustainable solution which would enable the residents of the new settlement not to be constantly disturbed by the drone from A1 traffic 24/7. Off-site highway works, consider that given the increase in traffic related to the development (new residents and construction traffic) then either prior to or at an early stage of the village development there should be a clear commitment to undertake highway improvements to the cross-roads in Babworth (A620/B6420) and the rail crossing point close to the development. In summary • Sutton-cum-Lound SUPPORT the concept of the "Garden Village" • commercial development is appropriate on the site which is also the "gateway" to Retford; alternative sites are available in the immediate area • It is not considered that a service station is appropriate; (same reason as for objecting to the commercial development) • A significant landscaped and acoustic barrier (minimum 250m wide) should be provided between the new settlement and A1 • Early off-site highway improvements implemented</p>	<p>It is considered that an appropriately designed commercial area could be an attractive gateway to the new settlement. The green buffer along the A1 would need to be approx. 400m wide to address biodiversity impacts. The Garden Village will make appropriate financial contributions to off site highways infrastructure. This will be phased so that delivery is made at the right time to mitigate impacts from the new community.</p>
REF224	Sheffield City Region	<p>Proposals for a new Garden Village in the Draft Plan as well as the Renewable Energy Hub are also supported. These are exactly the type of innovation needed to help close the divide between north and south and level up our areas.</p> <p>Transport policies in the Draft Plan, for both rail and active travel, support key planks of our own work in South Yorkshire, helping to improve connectivity and sustainable travel modes whilst tackling issues like poor health and air quality. Importantly, the Garden Village proposal includes provision for a new public transport facility including a rail station on the Sheffield to Lincoln line. This will complement other initiatives in SCR as well as strengthen rail connections to Sheffield from the east. The SCR Integrated Rail Plan (July 2019) provides more detail on how we see these services developing in the future.</p>	Support noted and welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF198 Bevercotes	Gladman Developments Ltd	<p>Policy ST3 details the Council will support the delivery of a new Garden Village on 216ha of land adjacent to the A1/A57 Apleyhead Junction. The Framework is clear that local plans should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of the area and be sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change. It is essential that the expected supply from the Garden Village over the plan period is based on realistic assumptions on lead-in times and delivery rates. It is important that clear evidence is provided to demonstrate that any assumptions that are made within the housing trajectory are demonstrably realistic at this stage, accurately reflecting the challenges associated with the delivery of such sites and their current planning status. This evidence should include Statements of Common Ground between interested parties and appropriate sense checking should also be undertaken against local, regional and national evidence (for example, the information on lead in times and delivery rates from sites contained within Reports such as Lichfields 'Start to Finish' Report; and Savills Planning and Housing Delivery Report, Second Edition, February 2020). The potential for further slippage from such a scheme will necessitate a flexible approach within the Local Plan's policies to ensure that they are responsive to rapid change and that development needs can be met in full over the plan period. Given the strategic scale and specific nature of the proposal it will be vitally important for the Local Plan to provide a clear contingency against its overall requirement to take into account the fact that such proposals will invariably deliver at a slower rate than originally envisaged when a Local Plan is examined. This can be achieved by including policies that take a responsive and flexible approach to sustainable development at the edge of suitable settlements to ensure that a positive response can be taken where monitoring indicates that the expected delivery from the proposed Garden Village has slipped.</p>	The lead in times for delivery will be carefully evidenced in line with the reports identified to ensure the most up to date position is referenced. Statements of Common Ground will be in place to demonstrate areas of agreement with interested parties. The housing supply indicates a strong buffer and a windfall allowance providing sufficient flexibility in the supply moving forward, ensuring the Council is not overly reliant on the Garden Village to maintain a 5 year supply towards the end of the plan period.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF117 (Ordsall South Rep)	Barton Wilmore on behalf of land owners	<p>Recognise the Council's aspiration to create a new settlement but have previously questioned the need for this strategy given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council has a Vision and Strategic Objectives focusing growth on the main towns, including supporting their growth and regeneration; • There are no policy or environmental constraints in Bassetlaw which means that growth cannot be accommodated at existing settlements; and • The Garden Village is unlikely to make any significant contribution to delivering homes during the plan period to 2037. <p>Disagree that there is a pressing need for a new Garden Village and advocate that the defined Main Towns of Bassetlaw are capable of accommodating additional growth through urban extensions, which is considered to be a more sustainable option for development.</p> <p>Supportive of the Local Plan's ambition to establish sustainable development for the long-term needs of the District, object to the proposed Garden Village on the basis that it will not provide for sustainable development and will undermine the sustainability of existing Main Towns which serve the needs of the rural areas of the District. Policies ST3 and ST4 provides for a loose policy framework rather than a mechanism that the Council can use to control delivery of the Garden Village. The Policy needs to be reworked. Part A of ST3 should set out very clearly what the land uses are to be provided and the essential infrastructure. Part B should not set "parameters". It should set out very clearly what specific criteria are to be achieved if the Council is to grant permission. At present, part B reads as a list of ideals rather than specific requirements.</p> <p>Policy ST4 is a list of statements rather than a specific Policy and it is unclear for developers as to what the Council expects. Policy ST4 does not actually require applicants to do anything. Is it the intention of the Council to have a specific masterplan framework to be prepared as Supplementary Planning Guidance that can be subject to public consultation and adopted by the Council? Paragraph 5.3.33 states that it is important that residents are not car dependent. In the event this project advances, we would agree with this. Policy ST3 is written as a general statement rather than specific criteria which must be achieved. Equally, Policy ST4 makes no mention of a new railway station. Overwhelming lack of evidence to support the feasibility and viability of the proposed sustainability features required to deliver the Garden Village which, consider will not be delivered. Without those features, the Local Plan runs the serious risk of allocating a large proportion of isolated homes into the open countryside. The delivery of new homes through a Garden Village (with or without new transport links) is likely to generate additional car trips into the Main Towns such as Retford as residents will rely on its existing services and facilities. The assessment of the feasibility and viability of the Garden Village appears to be limited to information contained within the 'Bassetlaw Interim Whole Plan & CIL Viability Assessment'. Significant concerns as to the level of detail contained within the assessment. The assessment takes a generic approach to all allocations in terms of costs, including abnormalities (assumes a standard approach with no utility diversions or similar), plus a non-specific approach to obligations that would have no relevance to a new settlement in a relatively isolated position such as this and gives insufficient consideration to foul drainage, water, electricity, gas, off-site highway and other transport costs to ensure sustainability early on. Notwithstanding the weight being afforded to the delivery of a new railway station at the Garden Village, there appears to be no real certainty on how that station would be delivered or the costs of doing so. The strategy underpinning the Garden Village is not based upon achieving sustainable growth. The intention that it should not be car dependent is undermined by the lack of an 'infrastructure first' approach before any homes are built and the Plan is largely silent on how key infrastructure, like a new Railway Station, is to be delivered. For all other allocations in this Plan (Sites HS1-HS13), the Council has set out a specific list of criteria which proposals 'should' meet. This is a more rigid approach to the Policy framework for the Garden Village site, where a list of broad statements has been provided. The Plan is inconsistent in this regard.</p>	<p>The Vison and Objectives will be revisited to better reflect the long term approach to be taken to the spatial strategy. The evidence base indicates that the main towns will have more limited capacity in the longer term. The Garden Village provides an opportunity to future proof growth in the District in a sustainable manner. The policy confirms the Garden Village will only provide for 500 homes in this plan period as well as 10ha of employment land. Two urban extensions have been identified in Worksop and Retford to cater for the needs of those settlements in this plan period and contribute to the next. The Garden Village will be a self sustaining settlement with services to support the needs of its residents. The growth of Worksop, Retford & Harworth will support the vitality and viability of the Main Towns. Policies ST3 and ST4 have been revisited to provide an appropriate policy framework to take the Garden Village forward. A masterplan framework is a requirement for the site, to have Council approval and be subject to community consultation. At a strategic level the Whole Plan Viability Assessment 2021 states that the Garden Village can be delivered through a financially viable scheme. The Rail Station Feasibility Study confirms the railway station is technically feasible and Network Rail have given in principle agreement for the scheme. A new bus service will be a requirement along with new cycle access to ensure that residents do not become car dependent in the early phase.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF202 GV Site	Savills on behalf of land owner	<p>Generally approve of the Garden City Principles being set out as part of the pretext to the policy itself. This reflects our client's commitment to ensuring that development is undertaken in a sympathetic and sustainable way, clearly setting the scene for the following policies. Green Infrastructure and Landscape Paragraphs 5.3.13 to 5.3.19 go to the heart of the landowner's aspirations for the site, with a commitment to a landscape led design which has been influenced by the local character and distinctiveness of its rural location, reflects key characteristics of openness, landscape and heritage, whilst significantly contributing to environmental quality. Para 5.3.14 clearly emphasises the Garden Villages commitment to incorporating "an extensive green/blue infrastructure network. Covering 40% of the site, green infrastructure is at the forefront of the Garden Village's design". It is essential that the 40% figure is correctly noted as aspirational, as the artificial heightening of this figure may have unintended consequences on density – for example, leading to issues with viability and good place-making. Without understanding the next stage in terms of detail it is critical that this figure is specifically noted as indicative. Healthy Place-making highlight support of the healthy place making ethos underpinning the garden village. A key element are the '10 minute neighbourhoods'. This integral design concept ensures residents are encouraged to adopt active lifestyles, by being able to walk/cycle, skate and scoot to reach local services and well-connected green infrastructure easily, or reach public transport to take them there. This is fully supported as an overarching aim for the majority of homes, yet whilst appreciating it may not be achievable with every plot. Paragraph 5.3.31, transport, and the movement of vehicles and people, are vital to the successful development of the Garden Village. Support the promotion of travel choices via walking, cycling, bus and rail over the use of the private car. There are a range of different sustainable transport projects to help deliver the Garden Village, including opening up old railway station, pedestrian/cycle bridge over the A1, re-routing Mansfield Road and new bus provision. These are all supported in principle. The next stage, as you are aware will be to test the financial implications at this stage that has not been carried out. The costs associated with implementing any garden village especially in relation to the transport infrastructure are often significant so the policy should record these as aspirations. Note that policy ST5 references open book viability assessments, this would come at the rear of the process rather than frontloading to ensure deliverability at the outset. This will be one of the first areas of work on appointment of a developer with the final transport projects would likely be brought forward and agreed during completion of the Masterplan framework.</p>	Support noted and welcome. The Vision Statement will recognise that the concept plan is indicative, however the principles of the policy in terms of development capacity can be achieved with 40% green infrastructure. At a strategic level the Whole Plan Viability Assessment 2021 states that the Garden Village can be delivered through a financially viable scheme. The infrastructure requirements have been identified by evidence as being required to support the delivery of 500 homes in this plan and the 3500 thereafter.
REF202 GV Site	Savills on behalf of land owner	<p>The landowners support the overarching policy objectives in principle at this stage as set out in A-B and 5-12. Commitment to 3 hubs but do however raise specific concerns over the commitment to a number of components detailed as part of the initial masterplan for the reasons set out above. Having reviewed Policy ST3 in more detailed query the explicit reference to the three hubs at part 4. Recognise this is the preferred approach and indeed may be the design which comes forward it seems rather restrictive at this stage to be setting out the policy in terms of the three hubs. Suggest refining section 4 to be more flexible in this respect. Unclear as to the amount of employment being phased early, it cites various figures, including 15ha at paragraph 5.3.7 but then within policy ST3 part B2 it states "at least 10ha of employment". Need to clarify the amount and phasing of development including on my client's land (i.e. 5ha) for the early stages. Note at point 13 a list of new and enhanced transport infrastructure to be included to support sustainable and active modes of travel. Support these in principle note the extensive list of provisions and believe they should be cited as aspirational options subject to viability testing to ensure the scheme can be delivered.</p>	One of the principles of the Garden Village is a healthy place. It is important that residents/occupiers are able to use active travel to access everyday services, transport and work. Having three activity nodes supports the principles of the 10 minute neighbourhood and reinforces healthy place-making principles. The concept plan will be identified as indicative so the location of the hubs is not fixed although some of the infrastructure at each is. 10ha of employment land will be identified in the policy, with commercial land as additional.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF193 GV Site	Savills on behalf of land owner	<p>Our client welcomes the overall approach and level of detail within the policy and the commitment to a 'landscape-led' masterplan. The details within ST3 are supported and could be further refined as follows:</p> <p>A.2 In addition to Garden City and Active Design Principles, the policy should make reference to the WHO Guidance on Physical Activity and Sedentary Behaviour published in 2020. This provides evidence-based public health recommendations for all groups in society about the amount of physical activity (frequency, intensity and duration) required to offer significant health benefits and mitigate health risks.</p> <p>B.2 The inclusion of employment land as part of the Garden Village is welcomed and important to creating a sustainable community, as is ensuring a mix of different types of employment premises and sectors. In the development of the Plan, our client has highlighted the importance of ensuring that the types of employment uses are complementary to the residential and other uses proposed on the site. Reiterated the need to locate large/national scale warehousing uses to dedicated employment sites elsewhere in the district and to ensure that there is a positive relationship between employment areas and housing and open space. Uses which would cause excessive noise or pollution should be directed to other parts of Bassetlaw.</p> <p>B.4 The creation of three distinct hubs is supported. In relation to b) iii which concerns the creation of a built community facility including changing accommodation and outdoor space for sports facilities, it is important that these are truly useable facilities. For the green spaces to be truly utilised as active spaces the design should ensure that there are accessible toilets, good lighting, shelter, and wifi.</p> <p>B.5. The figure of 40% of the total land area (minimum) for a 'connected, multi-functional green and blue infrastructure network' is supported and should be seen as a vital element of the Vision for the Garden Village.</p> <p>B.6. The aim of ensuring that tree canopy cover of the development site is a minimum of 30% is supported as well as the retention of existing woodland. It is important that in considering tree cover and new planting, further detailed assessment is undertaken. Trees and woodland present the opportunity to contribute to the scheme as an exemplar in sustainable design. Planting should be planned by looking to the future and considering how it can help with climate adaptation, rather than assuming that recreation of the historic landscape is the only option. Bigger areas of woodland could be included along with linear strips to create a mix of habitats and strong landscape character.</p> <p>B.8. In relation to net biodiversity gain, the inclusion of a target of 20% is welcomed. This must be sought on site as part of the Garden Village as it goes to the heart of the vision for the site.</p> <p>B.13.b. welcomes the comments in relation to the new railway station, which reflects their position that all railway infrastructure, car parking, bus interchange and cycle facilities should be on the southern side of the railway line. Only a platform of the minimum necessary specification should be located on the northern side to minimise intrusion into this area of land.</p> <p>C. The suggestion that permitted development rights (PDR) are removed to restrict the type of alterations and extensions that can take place to properties once built is supported. The design principles are an essential part of creating an attractive and cohesive Garden Village. By removing PDR, it enables the decision maker to assess proposals for changes as they come forward to ensure that they would be in keeping with the character of the development, and would not erode the sustainable design principles which underpin the scheme.</p>	<p>Reference to the WHO guidance will be added to the supporting text. The employment land is being promoted for growth sector use rather than large scale warehousing. The sports/community facilities will be designed to be a community hub with a range of facilities designed for all ages and abilities. Reference will be added to the supporting text to ancillary facilities at outdoor spaces. An arboriculture plan will be required by policy to ensure tree canopy cover is appropriate. This will ensure that the canopy cover is appropriate to place and the species mix reflects the local context. The allocation confirms that only the platform is identified on the northern side of the railway line.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF209 Apleyhead	NJL Consulting on behalf of Caddick	<p>The principle and ambition of a new settlement is supported, particularly where it can (alongside other strategic objectives) deliver a step change in the regeneration and growth prospects for Bassetlaw, and result in the co-location of major employment and housing growth to create sustainable places. Object to detailed wording within ST3 to ST5, particularly where the policies relate to potential offsite infrastructure and accessibility requirements that could burden other landowners who fall outside the new settlement boundary but are required to provide new settlement related infrastructure. As detailed in our previous representations, new settlement policies must not directly link its delivery to the Apleyhead Junction allocation (Policy ST10) which then creates unnecessary and unjustified interdependencies for the sites. Policy ST3 currently, and perhaps inadvertently, places new settlement infrastructure and delivery requirements on the Apleyhead Junction site potentially creating disproportionate interdependencies between the sites. Such requirements could adversely impact the ability to deliver the significant employment development at Apleyhead Junction in the short to medium term. For example, Policy ST3 refers to the 'Provision of cycling links across the A1, including alongside the railway line to Apleyhead Junction...' as an intervention for the Garden Village. Such an intervention may require agreement with or delivery by other parties or may place unreasonable burdens on those who control land out with the new settlement. Further evidence is needed to justify the new settlement proposition, particularly in terms of infrastructure requirements and provision. This additional evidence may then mean an alternative infrastructure solution is needed, which is not overly prescriptive in terms of new settlement details, to ensure the local plan remains sound.</p> <p>An appropriate way of addressing such issues would be for the local plan to identify the broad location for a new settlement rather than set specific site details (such as infrastructure requirements) which is the current approach. That way all reasonable options for the extent of the new settlement, its infrastructure requirements, and layout, for example, can be properly considered. The Draft Garden Village Vision Statement could still set a framework for new settlement aspirations and objectives. The final detail would be omitted from the local plan and Vision Statement and subject to further assessments and appraisals informed by further evidence base work. The detail of the new settlement could then be defined in a later development plan document or supplementary planning document, as informed by further evidence, without delaying delivery of the new settlement. Such a strategy would be consistent with the approach taken by other non-Green Belt local planning authorities where the principle of a new settlement is enshrined in the local plan with the detail fixed through subsequent separate plan documents. Such an approach would not necessarily delay new settlement delivery as the current local plan housing trajectory envisages only limited delivery late in the plan period. The subsequent development plan document can then assess in detail the most appropriate layout, mix of uses, infrastructure requirements and delivery, to deliver a new settlement in the most sustainable way. Where feasible, reasonable, and appropriate, Caddick could also assist in supporting new settlement aspirations. For example, the Apleyhead Junction site could incorporate opportunities to link with new settlement infrastructure. However, the detail of these interventions would be considered at the planning application stage provided the requirements are reasonable and proportionate. It is fundamentally critical the infrastructure expectations are proportionate to the relative development proposition(s) on the constituent sites. The new settlement policy should enable identification of a broad location for a new settlement but not go as far as define a specific site proposition nor set fixed infrastructure requirements which may change over time.</p>	<p>The infrastructure requirements associated with the Garden Village will be revised to reflect the most up to date evidence position. Where evidence shows that more than one scheme will have an impact on infrastructure such as a road junction then it is reasonable to expect a proportionate contribution to mitigate that impact. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will clarify the proportionality. The requirement for cycling links to the Garden Village will be revised as a request to consider options for... in the long term. An allocation is considered an appropriate tool to take forward the Garden Village particularly as development is not identified until late in the plan period.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF228	Sutton-cum-Lound Parish Council	<p>Sutton-cum-Lound Parish Council wish to support the concept of the phased development of the new "Garden Village" given the clear sustainable development opportunities the project will bring including the new transport hubs and cycle links. Such a proposal will enable the best available technologies to be applied to the housing scheme and introduce green infrastructure to the new settlement. It will additionally ease development pressure on local villages where unwelcome and inappropriate housing developments have been promoted which diminish the rural and historic character of such small settlements. However, given the site's location strategically situation close to the Five Lane Ends A1 intersection, this will essentially be a new "gateway" to Retford and surrounding villages and we feel this "gateway" should not be interrupted by extraneous commercial development when other more suitable sites are available to develop commercial uses including that of a service station. There is a site being promoted to the north of the A1 which could more readily accommodate commercial development. The concept of a "green" service station similar to that at Gloucester Services sounds "nice" but as a local planning authority there are no controls in place to ensure this will come to fruition and stop one of the national commercial groups taking over the site. In any event, it is not considered that a service station is an appropriate part of the "gateway" into the new settlement and then on into Retford itself. Moreover, we would question the need for additional service station facilities when there is Blyth only a few miles to the north and Markham Moor a similar distance to the south. It is considered that a meaningful buffer should be provided between the new settlement and the A1 within which a wider green corridor (say at least 250m wide) could be located including strategically located tree covered screening mounds which would separate the future housing from the A1 providing both a visual and importantly acoustic barrier to the new settlement. There are several examples along the M1 and other strategic highways where housing developments are being constructed adjacent to these busy carriageways and the only way these can acoustically be screened is by incongruous high fencing. At the "Garden Village" site, the opportunity exists from the outset to incorporate a more naturalistic and sustainable solution which would enable the residents of the new settlement not to be constantly disturbed by the drone from A1 traffic 24/7. In respect of off-site highway works, we consider that given the increase in traffic related to the development (new residents and construction traffic) then either prior to or at an early stage of the village development there should be a clear commitment to undertake highway improvements to the cross-roads in Babworth (A620/B6420) and the rail crossing point close to the development. In summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sutton-cum-Lound SUPPORT the concept of the "Garden Village" • It is not considered commercial development is appropriate on the site which is also the "gateway" to Retford; alternative sites are available in the immediate area • It is not considered that a service station is appropriate; (same reason as for objecting to the commercial development) • A significant landscaped and acoustic barrier (minimum 250m wide) should be provided between the new settlement and A1 • Early off-site highway improvements implemented 	<p>It is considered that an appropriately designed commercial area could be an attractive gateway to the new settlement. The green buffer along the A1 would need to be approx. 400m wide to address biodiversity impacts. The Garden Village will make appropriate financial contributions to off site highways infrastructure. This will be phased so that delivery is made at the right time to mitigate impacts from the new community.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST4 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SPATIAL DESIGN FRAMEWORK			
REF003	Canal & River Trust	Welcome the proposed rewording of the supporting text and inclusion of Policy ST4 when compared to the February 2020 draft, which make more explicit the need for development to promote off-site improvements to the existing walking and cycling infrastructure in vicinity of the proposed Garden Village. Part D refers to the need for development to promote public rights of way improvements within the site and through connections to the network outside the site boundary. This would help to ensure that it becomes clear to decision makers that demands upon the existing walking and cycling infrastructure, including the towpath of the Chesterfield canal, will be assessed as part of the future masterplanning for the site.	Support noted and welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST4 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SPATIAL DESIGN FRAMEWORK			
REF060	Notts County Council	The provision of a 3ha site within the proposed Health & Well-Being Hub to accommodate a future primary school and early years facility is agreed. A mitigation strategy to accommodate the pupils generated by the first 500 dwelling phase is required. This would be in the form of financial contributions to transport pupils to surrounding schools prior to the opening of a new school onsite.	Comments noted. The requirement for school transport contributions will be reflected in future policy.
REF087	Highways England	The Bassetlaw Garden Village has been proposed to accommodate a total of 4,000 dwellings, note that a minimum of 501 have been allocated for this Local Plan period. In relation to Bassetlaw Garden Village, any development coming forward on this site should note that as the eastern boundary abuts the A1 trunk road, boundary treatment works and drainage will need to be considered to ensure the structural integrity of the network is not compromised.	Comments noted. This will be a matter covered by the masterplan and future planning application for the site.
REF122	North Notts & Lincs Community Rail Partnership	Encourages walking and cycling by virtue of "10 minute neighbourhoods". Consider a footpath and cycleway from the Garden Village into Retford be added to give additional encouragement for walking and cycling. Note that 5.3.34 states "Access to Retford will be achieved on road or in the long term off road via public rights of way to Ordsall South." Discourage walking and cycling on the existing road network and encourage the development of a footpath and cycleway to Retford at the start of the garden village development to encourage the use of active travel as opposed to car travel by the earliest residents rather than add the facility "in the long term". Thus in Policy ST56 3a and 3c should be combined.	The provision of a walking and cycling route to Retford would be generated by the number of residents/occupiers in the development. The provision of infrastructure will be phased to reflect the demand generated by the new development.
REF146	Elkesley Neighbourhood Plan Group	ST4 identifies a footbridge giving access to Worksop and potentially Clumber Park. Cycle tracks, footpaths etc should link up to Elkesley and through to Bevercotes to encourage exercise, not just for the residents but also the tourists who have such a big financial input to Bassetlaw and the businesses located here. The rail-line that ran past Bevercotes could become another recreational trail to link communities from further afield (5.3.34).	The green bridge would potentially be available to all users of the development.
REF153	Natural England	Pleased this policy is following a landscape led approach to ensure that the proposed village fits in with the surrounding countryside and respects the historic setting of Clumber Park. Welcome Green & Blue Infrastructure and Biodiversity which recognises the importance of providing connected natural areas for the benefit of both nature and people. The requirement for SANGS will ensure that new residents will be able to access local green space for everyday recreational needs and dog walking without putting additional pressure on the nearby Clumber Park SSSI. Acknowledge that the additional tree cover will assist in providing nature-based solutions for climate resilience.	Support noted and welcome.
REF172	Elkesley Parish Council	ST4 identifies a footbridge giving access to Worksop and potentially Clumber Park. Cycle tracks, footpaths etc should link up to Elkesley and through to Bevercotes to encourage exercise, not just for the residents but also the tourists who have such a big financial input to Bassetlaw and the businesses located here. The rail-line that ran past Bevercotes could become another recreational trail to link communities from further afield (5.3.34).	The Local Plan can only identify proposals that are necessary to deliver the site allocations. The Council will continue to work with partners to secure improvements to the cycle network in the District.
REF186	Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England	Welcome D. (transport and accessibility).	Support noted and welcome.
REF211	National Trust	ST4 3ii welcome the provision that sensitive design, height and form of development along the western boundary should respect the character and setting of historic Clumber Park. ST4 4i states that the design will incorporate important views such as those from Clumber Park. Not aware of any views of the Garden Village site from Clumber Park and this is unlikely to be a key design consideration provided that boundary planting and building heights are carefully managed.	Comments noted. Reference will be removed.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST4 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SPATIAL DESIGN FRAMEWORK			
REF214	Historic England	<p>The Garden Village principles set out at Para 5.3.5 are noted, and it is acknowledged that the historic environment would be addressed in cultural elements referred to in Bullet Point (BP) 8. The heritage references in paragraph 5.3.13 and 5.3.20 are welcomed. The archaeological assessment referred to in paragraph 5.3.21 is noted but it is not clear how this sits with other aspirations for the site including effective water management and surface water run-off suggested in 5.3.16 which are expected to include wetlands and balancing ponds - these could result in a loss of heritage assets that would not be able to be compensated for. When the significance of any archaeology at the site is currently an unknown, it is not possible to consider the potential harm to heritage assets as part of the Plan process so there is an issue of soundness at present. To address some of the concerns in relation to the historic environment it may be necessary to undertake some of the work set out in Section A of Policy ST4: Bassetlaw Garden Village Spatial (typo 'Spacial' in Draft Plan) Design Framework as part of the Plan process to demonstrate that the Plan will be able to achieve its aspirations for the site. Welcome opportunity to discuss this further and ahead of the next round of consultation and to continue engagement with the Council as the SPD progresses.</p>	<p>The concept plan for the garden village is indicative and is expected to be refined as the masterplanning process continues. A desk top archaeological assessment has been completed and a geophysical survey is underway. This will inform the evolution of the design of the site. Historic England have been involved with discussions with Lincs Archaeology and the Council about the approach to archaeology on site and the agreement has been reached in relation to the policy approach. This is evidenced through the draft Statement of Common Ground for both parties. The Heritage Paper sets out how heritage has been considered in the site selection process, the Site Selection Methodology paper confirms this. The Heritage Paper has been agreed with Historic England. The policy has been amended to make reference to a heritage /landscape led masterplan.</p>
1671033	Resident	<p>Commend and draw attention to Transport and Accessibility section in the Bassetlaw Garden Village Spatial Design Statement. Agree with all the points in this section and want to emphasise point 4 and the importance of 'creating safe, direct, new and improved pedestrian and cycling links from the site to Worksop, Retford, Clumber and Apleyhead junction.' This is a really important opportunity to create safe cycling links between our main communities, work, leisure and school sites. This is essential to create healthy sustainable communities in the future. Hope BDC will continue to work with NCC and stakeholders, such as Sustrans, to develop these routes.</p>	Support noted and welcome.
REF058	Sport England	Supported – particularly section B and Healthy, Active Buildings and spaces Section C? and section D	Support noted and welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST4 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SPATIAL DESIGN FRAMEWORK			
REF202 GV site	Savills on behalf of land owner	<p>This policy could be condensed within ST3 limiting the opportunity for policy conflicts and overlapping. It also seems to overlap with the purpose of the Garden Village Vision Statement. This policy should be deleted with the design considerations deferred to Garden Village Vision Statement. Landscape Led, High Quality Design and Distinctive Character welcome the reference to density at point 5 of Policy ST4 as it is important have some understanding of what densities are being assumed on the net developable areas. There is no specific dwellings per hectare/ acre mentioned within the policy and so it is hard to understand the densities providing as part of the Garden Village and if indeed the initial masterplan is deliverable (in terms of being both market facing and delivering the quantum envisaged). Note instead the inclusion of a density plan at Appendix 3 of the Garden Village Vision Statement which assumed would provide further clarity in this respect. However the plan does not include specific dwellings per hectare/ acre. Recognise the council's detail may not be established at this stage it would be useful to include some approximate figures to help provide clarity and understand if the 40% Green/Blue for example does not comprise on other Garden Village principles and overall deliverability. Green/Blue Infrastructure and Biodiversity support the design of green/ blue infrastructure as an integral part of the layout. Need to raise another fundamental issue for our client, which is the boundary planting on the south-eastern side, to ensure a clear separation with our client's farm. Recognise the text touches upon a 'deep' tree buffer, needs the reassurance this would be c. 100m deep and would request that this specific figure is written into the text and within the Vision Framework Document. Need to have a commitment to provide hard boundary treatment in this location to ensure the operational aspects of the farm are unhindered, designing out any opportunity for trespassing. Note that there is reference to fencing within the pretext of Policy ST3. This is supported but again the overlapping nature of the policies appears some elements are being missed.</p> <p>Transport and Accessibility As detailed at paragraph 5.3.36 the Garden Village will require the partial re-alignment of Mansfield Road. While our client accepts this in principle it is appropriate that due care and diligence has been given to the phasing and timing of the changes to Mansfield Road, especially as this impacts on our client's existing business. This re-alignment should not take place within this plan period and where possible should be pushed back as late as possible into the development. Recognise such details as road access maybe premature at this stage but need to ensure such considerations have been made to demonstrate unhindered (dedicated) farm access from both north and southbound along Mansfield Road. Welcome further discussions with BDC in this respect. Like part D, which is dedicated to transport and accessibility, to include reference to the need for access to be maintained through the development to the farm holding which is important to our client and operation of their business and should be emphasised within the text. Recognise this is touched upon within paragraph 5.3.18 given it is of significant importance to our client request that the maintaining of our client's access is detailed with part D.</p>	The policy will be amended to better reflect the design principles and priorities at the Garden Village and to avoid duplication. As a long term proposal it is not necessary to include a detailed density plan at this stage, as that is a matter for the detailed design and development process. It is possible to include 40% green infrastructure and infrastructure on site with the quantum of development proposed. The buffer on the south western boundary would be 100m deep. Detailed boundary treatments are a matter for the detailed design and planning process. The re-alignment of Mansfield Road will be delivered off-line so should not cause any unnecessary impacts on local business. The timing will need to be agreed with the Local Highways Authority to reflect the phasing of development. The Vision Statement maintains dedicated access to the farm adjoining the south-west of the site. Reference will be added to the policy accordingly.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST4 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SPATIAL DESIGN FRAMEWORK			
REF193 GV site	Savills on behalf of land owner	<p>A clear policy which sets the parameters for future masterplans/designs for the Garden Village is welcomed. Landscape Led, High Quality Design and Distinctive Character A.6. In addition to the principles set out for new development, it is suggested that opportunities for providing a green energy supply to development on the site should be incorporated. Green/Blue Infrastructure and Biodiversity B. The principles are supported. The criteria should be widened to include the need for any proposals to enhance the existing green infrastructure on the site, such as the brickyard, the woodland at Morton Hill Clump and the old byway running west to east along the site. Along with the aspirations of part C, keen to emphasise the importance of ensuring that any masterplan is based upon creating useable and valuable natural resources. Whilst achieving a broad range of green infrastructure is, and should be, at the very heart of the vision for the Garden Village, it may not be possible to achieve everything (tree planting, wood pasture, species rich grassland, orchards etc). It would be a significant achievement if all types of greenspace space could be achieved within the Garden Village, however, ST4 should encourage a masterplan which has properly researched and explored these concepts, and includes an exemplar approach to green infrastructure. It would be better to meet the objective to a high standard, even if this means focusing on fewer types of habitat and but delivering them with excellence.</p> <p>B.7 It is important that cycle and footpaths throughout the site are well lit to encourage their use throughout the year and at all times of day and night. The Garden Village should provide local cycle routes connecting it to Worksop, Retford and the countryside, ensuring that wherever possible, these are truly segregated to encourage people to change their transport behaviour and cycle. D C. 4 The principles in this section are supported although should be reviewed within the context of the new WHO guidance. With specific reference to the integration of space to grow local food through allotments orchards and community gardens within 10 mins of each hub, it is important that any masterplan is based on creating useable and valuable resources. It would be a significant achievement if all three types of space could be achieved within 10 mins of each hub, however, ST4 should encourage a masterplan which has properly explored these concepts and includes an exemplar approach to community food production. It would be better to meet the objective to a high standard for all hub areas, even if this means focusing on only one or two approaches.</p>	The policy makes reference to use of renewable and positive energy schemes. Policy will ensure protection and enhancement of on site green infrastructure. The proposed habitats mix has been guided by the Notts Wildlife Trust, but the detailed provision will be a matter for the masterplan and subsequent decision-making process. Safe cyclepaths are covered by the sustainable travel policy. Reference to WHO guidance will be added to the supporting text. Access to local food growing will be maintained but the requirements will be flexible to ensure the provision can be design responsive.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST6 - WORKSOP CENTRAL			
REF003	Canal & River Trust	<p>The Chesterfield Canal flows through the centre of Worksop, and provides good access for residents and visitors to the wider Green Infrastructure network through the use of our towpaths. The canal environment also offers opportunities to encourage tourism, through the focus on heritage assets associated with the canal corridor and from the use of leisure resources connected with the use of the canal. For example, the canal is used by leisure craft. Such use contributes to the local leisure and visitor economy of the area. It can also assist in animating waterside spaces, and providing a more attractive setting for existing and proposed development. In order to ensure that the Plan is effective in maximising the benefits of the canal, it is essential that policy is provided to provide guidance and certainty to developers and decision makers over how waterfront spaces should be incorporated into new development. Welcome the wording of part A.6. of this policy, when compared to the February 2020 document, which provides more detail as to what is expected within the future Development Plan Document (DPD) and of developers with regards to the relationship between the town and the canal. The DPD could provide greater certainty for developers and decision makers in supporting the regeneration of the Town Centre. This provides a unique opportunity to help guide the redevelopment of key sites in proximity to the canal, which could help to ensure that the potential benefits of the canal to the town are maximised. Welcome the opportunity to comment upon the DPD as and when it is developed.</p>	The Chesterfield Canal is designated as a Major Green Corridor and is considered a significant environmental asset for the town. It forms a central role in the Regeneration of Worksop Central and will provide a multifunctional purpose for recreation, habitat protection, walking and cycling infrastructure alongside and future development working with the canal rather than against it.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST6 - WORKSOP CENTRAL			
		Paragraph 5.4.8 To avoid confusion, advise that "Canal and Rivers Trust" should be amended to "Canal and River Trust" (with River being singular).	
1661750	St Anne's Church	Good to see improvement of the town centre taking place but how will you attract shops to take up places as there are so many empty shop spaces now. A vibrant town needs investment from large companies. When we are already putting off companies like Lidl for not building in the right place we are giving the wrong message. Welcome new housing but what infrastructure will be put in place particularly with the strain already on local GP and dental services. What is the incentive for young people in these plans to stay in the town? Families and the elderly but 18-30 group. Will need housing be targeted at them and affordable?	The Worksop Central DPD provides a comprehensive regeneration strategy for the area. This includes improving the public realm, allocating sites for development and transport infrastructure improvements. The creation of new people friendly spaces will help to provide an attractive town centre that will help to give confidence to existing and new businesses that Worksop as a place to stay and invest in.
REF059	WSP-Priory Shopping Centre	<p>The policies that are referring to from our previous representations and these new representations have changed. Therefore, to clarify, "Policy ST4, Worksop Central Area" (WCA) (of the January 2020 draft Local Plan) is now referred to as "Policy ST6, Worksop Central" (WC) within the November 2020 draft Local Plan, whilst "Policy ST13, Town Centres and Local Centres" (of the January 2020 draft Local Plan) is now referred to as "Policy ST14, Town Centres, Local Centres, Local Shops and Service" within the November 2020 draft Local Plan. The PSC is the main shopping centre in Worksop town centre and comprises approximately 40 retail units. The PSC has been working closely with the Council to invest in the shopping centre, and they secured planning permission in September 2019 for its redevelopment for a new foodstore which will not only improve the shopping centre, but also improve the vitality and viability of the town centre. As a key stakeholder in the town centre, the PSC has a strong interest in future planning policy in Worksop town centre and across the District. Previously made representations to the draft Local Plan (January 2020) supporting the inclusion of the PSC in the Primary Shopping Area (PSA) of the town centre. Supported draft Policy ST13 which stated that "retail development on a site outside a Primary Shopping Area or development of main town centre uses on a site outside a town centre will be expected to follow the sequential assessment approach" and that an impact assessment will be required for all applications for retail and/or leisure development that are outside Worksop town centre if they are over 929sqm. Raised concerns in respect of Policy ST4, the draft Local Plan (January 2020) given this appeared to support retail and main town centre uses within the WCA even if they are located outside the town centre. Requested that Policy ST4 was amended to state that applications for main town centres uses proposed outside of the town centre in the WCA should satisfy the sequential and impact test as set out in Policy ST13. In the current draft Local Plan (November 2020), the Council continue to seek to protect and enhance the town centre as highlighted in Policy ST14 which is welcomed. Our representations to Policy ST4 have not been taken into account and this policy remains largely unchanged. For this reason, the Draft Local Plan (November 2020) is unsound and does not comply with Paragraph 35 of the NPPF. The Plan has not been positively prepared as it fails to protect the town centre. Paragraph 6.7.3 of the draft Local Plan states that Policy ST14 should promote the continued vitality and viability of the District's town and local centres in a flexible way whilst supporting the role they play "at the heart of the local communities". Furthermore, the "Spatial Strategy: Worksop" document, prepared by the Council states that their vision is to revitalise Worksop town centre through creating distinct retail and leisure zones. However, draft Policy ST6 allows for main town centre uses that are located outside of the town centre which could have a detrimental impact on it. The Local Plan, as currently worded, cannot be considered to be positively prepared in respect of the town centre. JUSTIFIED The draft Local Plan is not sound because there is no justification for allowing main town uses in parts of the WC designation falling outside of the town centre without having to comply with the sequential and impact tests. The Council's own vision seeks to revitalise Worksop town centre, however, allowing main town centre uses (particularly retail uses) to locate outside of the town centre without assessing whether there are any sequentially preferable sites within the town centre or whether they will result in a significant adverse impact, goes against national policy and is contrary to draft Policy ST14. The omission of referring to the retail tests within draft Policy ST6 is not justified and is not sound. EFFECTIVE Paragraph 6.7.1 of the draft Local Plan states that "town and local centres...provide a focus for growth in retail, commercial and leisure sectors" and centres "act as a focal point for local communities and ensure that valued services are available in accessible locations". However, without amending draft Policy ST6 to refer to the sequential and impact tests, the Local Plan will not deliver its vision and objective of revitalising Worksop town centre and thus it is not effective as currently written. CONSISTENT WITH NATIONAL POLICY Paragraph 86 of the NPPF specifically states that local planning authorities should "apply a sequential test to planning applications for main town centre uses which are neither in an existing centre nor in accordance with an up-to-date plan". Paragraph 89 adds that local planning authorities should require impact assessments for retail and leisure development if it is over a proportionate, locally set floorspace threshold. In this case the Council sets a threshold of 929sqm. However, draft Policy ST6 is not consistent with either paragraph 86 or 89 of</p>	<p>It is important that Policy ST6 and the Local Plan itself is consistent with national planning policy. On that basis, Policy ST6 will be amended to ensure that any retail and/or town centre uses outside the primary shopping area or town centre boundary has no adverse impact upon the effective functioning of the primary shopping area or town centre. Policy ST6 will be amended accordingly.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST6 - WORKSOP CENTRAL		<p>the NPPF given it fails to require a sequential or impact assessment to be submitted for new development in the WC designation if they are located outside of the town centre. This would have a detrimental impact on Worksop town centre. Policy ST6 fails to protect and support Worksop town centre from “out of centre” development including main town centre uses. The draft Local Plan is unsound: It has not been positively prepared; There is no justification as to why main town centres uses can be provided in out of centre locations within the WC designation without having to comply with the sequential and impact tests; It is not effective to deliver the Council’s own vision; and It is contrary to National Policy. Furthermore, draft Policy ST6 conflicts with draft Policy ST14 which requires sequential assessments to be undertaken for main town centre uses and impact assessments for retail and leisure proposals in Worksop if they are over 929sqm. The draft Local Plan is unsound and should be amended accordingly. Strongly urge the Council to amend draft Policy ST6 to accord with Paragraph 86 and 89 of the NPPF and draft Policy ST14. Suggested amendments to the wording of Point 2 of draft Policy ST6: “The provision of commercial, education, health, retail, community and other services and facilities and temporary uses, of a suitable scale to meet identified needs subject to the sequential and impact assessment as set out in Policy ST14 if proposing a main town centre use outside of the designated town centre.” Without this additional wording, the Local Plan is contrary to the NPPF and unsound and should not be adopted. The PSC helps to anchor Worksop town centre and its success is vital to reviving the fortunes of the town centre. Welcome the Council’s vision for the revitalisation of the town centre and that it should be protected, remain concerned that draft Policy ST6 will result in proposals for new retail and main town uses being permitted outside of the town centre without having to satisfy the sequential or impact tests. Urge the Council to reconsider the wording of Policy ST6 as requested and recognise the importance of supporting the town centre first approach and to encourage future investment to the town centre.</p>	
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Area Plan	No specific comments as these are areas we are not close to. Supporting the “comprehensive redevelopment of brownfield sites...” will always be supported by Scrooby SNAP.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF201	Severn Trent	Supportive of the approach outlined within Policy ST6, in particular bullet point 8 to develop an integrated strategic flood Management Scheme that supports regeneration without increasing flood risk. Note there are opportunities through the use of multifunctional space to further enhance the regeneration and further reduce existing flood risk.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF211	National Trust	Support the aims of Policy ST6 to regenerate the central area of Worksop, in particular its commitment to ‘the positive re-use of underused or vacant land’. Concerned that the Spatial Strategy along with Policies ST10 (Apleyhead strategic employment site) and also ST3 (Garden Village) if not properly designed and phased will undermine this aim. This is because the availability of surplus greenfield land for employment and housing is likely to make it even more difficult to attract investment to redevelop more complex and challenging brownfield sites in the town centre.	The reuse of brownfield land focuses heavily within the Local Plan and Worksop DPD. Both documents allocate a substantial level of brownfield land for development and provide a good balance between the use of Brownfield Land and Greenfield Land across the District.
REF221	Resident	<p>Writing as an interested member of the public, not as someone with expertise. I was born in Worksop seventy years ago, after a short break to train as a teacher, I returned to work here in primary education for forty years. As a teacher knowledge of the history of the town was important and interesting and would encourage interest, pride and care of the environment. My history curriculum in class began with the development of the town from Norman times. The pupils went on a historical walk through the town and they went on to produce their own guide book. Unfortunately I don't think any school does this now:- 1. Castle Hill- site of wooden motte and bailey castle. 2. The Old Ship Inn- Tudor building, could this be redeveloped as a tourist information centre, residential would be preferable to losing the building. 3. Original settlement was centred around a market cross where the market was at the top of Potter Street, in Norman times it was called Werchsope. 4. Going along Potter Street east is the Boundary Inn, marks the boundary between the Norman settlements of Werchesope and Redforde. Locally produced goods would be exchanged along this route. 5. The Gatehouse- very rare building where the monks from the Priory offered shelter for travellers. 6. Market Cross was south of its present site and marked the site of the market for Redforde so called because there was a wood and stone bridge across the river Ryton here and the sand under the water turned the eater red as the supports were sunk.</p> <p>7. The Priory was a big and important church, it was an Augustinian Priory twice its current length. The 13 monks used the piece at the back and the ‘commoners’ the front until Henry VIII had it knocked down. Dates back to early 12 Century. 8. Water wheel, opposite Priory Church, this was used to provide power at a farm/mill here. 9. Chesterfield Canal- designed by James Brindley in 1777 (I think). It was unusually narrow and special boats were built to use it called Cuckoos. Passing places were built and the wharfage at Town Lock was called Cuckoo Wharf. 10. Smiths Flour Mill dates back to 1706? My grandfather drove steam lorries at the beginning of 20th Century making cross-Pennine journeys with flour</p>	<p>The regeneration strategy for Worksop Central plays on its strengths such as its heritage, the CANCH, River Ryton and Chesterfield Canal and seeks to maximise opportunities through the redevelopment of underused or vacant land. It is also important that these sites and assets are linked through better connections and transport infrastructure.</p> <p>Reducing the threat of flooding is a key priority to give the community and businesses confidence that their investment in the town is secure.</p> <p>The redevelopment of vacant or underused sites will focus on providing the right housing need such as affordable homes and homes for older people. These will compliment other</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST6 - WORKSOP CENTRAL			
		<p>11. The railway station. Town Centre Worksop has become a commuter town. In the 1950's it was a thriving market town with some up-market shops. Don't think it is an achievable goal to aspire to that now. Online shopping and out of town centres have put a stop to that. Would be a shame for a pretty town centre to become lost and die.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop the Old Ship Inn 2. Turn more of the town centre into residential/office space 3. Eateries/coffee shops to be considered 4. Toilet facilities are desperately needed, supervised would suggest 5. The canal- think this a very important under-used resource at the moment both as a waterway and a walkway, both west towards Shireoaks and east towards Retford. a. Develop wharfage for residential narrow boats while putting in supporting infrastructure e.g. water supplies, fuel etc. b. Parking spaces for short stay boats c. Improve the walkway (towpath), develop cycle path and install lighting d. Develop café culture e. Provide hard standing for stalls e.g. hot potatoes, hot dogs, pizza. This would be seasonal but good for spring to autumn f. Summer, Christmas, Easter markets selling crafts or artisan products e.g. cheese, breads, brewed beers etc. (Welbeck may be interested here) g. Develop Gateford Road access to town, the approach from St Johns Church to the traffic lights is poor. h. Land north of the Railway Station, then Lidl is wasted. Consider development for the elderly e.g. McCarthy Store, types of accommodation/ or charging station for electric cars. The only charging points in Worksop are at Bannatyne's or near the Savoy Cinema. 	market-led development sites within the town centre and wider area.
1670988	Resident	The Bassetlaw Plan needs to detail HOW they can ensure that the flood risk will not be increased, when already the surface water runs away onto businesses and properties. This will need permeable paving and drainage systems and lots of work to improve flood risks in the future. Detail the plans for flooding.	The preparation of the Worksop Central DPD is being supported by the development of a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the area. This will detail the flooding risk and the recommendations needed to improve the situation in the future. In addition, the Council is in discussions with the Environment Agency about other flood prevention measures for the area.
1670988	Resident	Consider using existing properties no longer used for their purpose to turn into housing.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF058	Sport England	Section A6 supported	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF198 Bevercotes	Gladman Developments Ltd	The regeneration of previously developed vacant or underused sites within urban and rural Bassetlaw forms a key part of the vision and objectives of the Local Plan. Two 'Priority Regeneration Areas' are identified in the Plan: 'Policy ST6: Worksop Central' and 'Policy ST7: Cottam Priority Regeneration Area'.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF117 (Ordsall South Rep)	Barton Wilmore on behalf of landowners	Policy ST1 requires about 700 homes to be provided in 'Inner' Worksop. Policy ST6 requires at least 660 homes in Worksop Central Area. Are these the same thing? Having regard to our review of the Council's Land Availability Assessment, there does not appear to be enough land in the defined Worksop Central Area to meet the identified needs. Equally, no other strategies are set out as to how this level of housing can be delivered.	Yes. The Local Plan requires 660 of the Worksop requirement to be delivered within Worksop Central. The Council has undertaken a call for land and a sustainability appraisal for the sites. The sites identified within the Worksop DPD are capable of accommodating enough homes to meet the Local Plan target.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST7 - COTTAM PRIORITY REGENERATION AREA			
REF003	Canal & River Trust	<p>We welcome the consideration given to this site within the Local Plan, which should help to provide certainty to future developers and decision makers with regards to how this large brownfield site will be brought back into use following its use as a power station. Due to the former use of the site and its proximity to the River Trent and Local Wildlife Sites, it is important that any redevelopment of the site seeks to fully remediate the site and prevent any contamination towards the nearby watercourse. We therefore welcome the reference given in the draft policy towards the need for remediation and protection of the watercourse. This will ensure compliance with the aims of paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>The Trent is identified by the Trust as a Freight waterway, capable of handling waterborne freight. We therefore welcome the latest policy wording, where part B.12 highlights that consideration should be given to opportunities to utilise the River Trent for the transportation of construction and waste materials. We believe this would help to accord with the principles of paragraphs 102 and 148 of the National Planning Policy Framework and, in the case of larger loads, in the governments water preferred policy for the movement of abnormal loads.</p>	Thank you for your comments. The Rover Trent is identified as a major Green Corridor within the Local Plan and its waterway freight status will not be impacted.
1651001	Resident	I am puzzled why Cottam has been chosen for a new village. It is at the end of what in effect is a dead end road . It is completley isolated. It is hemmed in by the River Trent. There are no obvious work opportunities in the vicinity There is no public transport opportunities. It will encourage numerous car journeys to go anywhere. The location could not be more inappropriate	The Site has now been identified as a priority Regeneration Area due to the level of uncertainty in terms of the type of development and the delivery of such infrastructure that is needed to support the redevelopment of the site. The site is also considered a longer term site due to its scale and its likely to be redeveloped later in the plan period and beyond.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST7 - COTTAM PRIORITY REGENERATION AREA			
REF026	Rampton and Woodbeck Parish Council	<p>The proposed housing development at Cottam Cottam is one of our neighbouring parishes and we, and others from our parish have attended meetings on the development; however, a large proportion of the EDF land, including that of the former power station itself falls within the Rampton & Woodbeck Parish boundary. The decision to give permission for a substantial number of houses on this site is both reckless and wrongheaded. Section 6.2.1 is concerned with the High Marnham Energy Hub and the opening sentence implies the environmental reason why that site is not being developed for housing: "The Former High Marnham Power Station is predominately brownfield with a legacy of contamination due to its historical association with a coal fired power station and associated infrastructure." This description is also an accurate description of the Cottam Power Station site as conceded in 5.4.11: "The site is predominately brownfield with a legacy of contamination due to its former uses associated with a coal fired power station and associated buildings and infrastructure." We are aware that there are no accurate site maps for Cottam of where contaminates have been buried. We are also aware that former and retired Cottam Power Station have been reemployed to try and identify where contaminants may be buried. It is obvious that if those decontaminating the site must rely on fallible human memory alone there can be no guarantee that some contaminates might be left and pose a health threat to residents of the new development. Were the Council aware of this? If so, why propose using the Cottam site for housing? If potential residents are made aware of the possible risks will anyone want to live there? The High Marnham Energy Hub is an excellent and innovative use of an otherwise problematic brownfield site. The Council deserves praise for supporting this. Councillor White, in her Forward to the Plan, describes it as unique, which can only mean it is the only one of its type. With the rapid growth of renewable but unpredictable energy sources such as wind and solar power we need more energy hubs, and the Cottam site is the obvious candidate and will show that the Council is serious about its green agenda and that the Marnham Energy Hub is not just a single token gesture. In addition to the above arguments, the same arguments against the Garden Village can levelled against the Cottam development that is there should be no new builds until the conversion of vacant builds has been exhausted and residential developments should not be encouraged in isolated rural areas, away from places of work, recreation and shopping causing more vehicle use. We are also surprised that no mention is given to the Cottam site's principal infrastructure asset, the working railway line to the Power Station site. Once again, the thinking seems to be predominantly 20th century when planning was structured around car use. An important further consideration regarding transport is the lack of a public transport system. Nearby Rampton lost its regular travel to work bus, and this will also be a factor for those moving into the proposed Cottam development who need public transport. The roads in and through Cottam are narrow country lanes, and an increased number of cars will not only have an effect on road use but will also lead to further pollution. There is already a safety aspect with increased traffic for the delivery hub in the village, this will be worsened by the needs of extra vehicles, and families living in rural areas often find they need to have more than one car. If the development were to be a mix of social housing, residents on benefits or low incomes would be severely impacted by the lack of effective public transport access to large shops, schools, and doctors' surgeries etc. A community shop proposed in the plan would likely to be expensive and unaffordable for lower income residents.</p>	<p>The site is being promoted for residential redevelopment but when considering the constraints and other information, the Council has now identified it as a longer term priority regeneration area. This is due to the significant level of constraints and the uncertainty about how some of these could be overcome through development. The level of constraints means there is considerable uncertainty about the delivery of the site and what types of developments are appropriate moving forward. However, the site is largely a brownfield former industrial area that has the potential to be redeveloped in the longer term.</p> <p>The redevelopment of the site could include some renewable energy and technology and it will also have to improve local infrastructure.</p> <p>Any redevelopment of the site will need to be carefully planned through the development of a comprehensive masterplan that will have community engagement. The detail within the masterplan will be subject to the agreement of the Council.</p>
REF040	Misterton Parish Council	<p>The draft Bassetlaw Local Plan has made reference to the need to develop rural businesses. An ideal opportunity would be to preserve one of the cooling towers and other infrastructure to set up a national 'heritage' tourist attraction. It won't be many years before power generation by coal will be history - Cottam provides an ideal opportunity, and the space, to set up such a tourism/leisure offer, with one route of access via the River Trent. This will help to regenerate north-east Bassetlaw, providing opportunities for local businesses, accommodation, etc</p>	Thank you for your comments.
REF041	Retford Civic Society	<p>The Society is pleased to see that proposals to develop a new village on the site of the former Cottam Power Station have been dropped from the Draft Plan.</p>	Thank you for your comments.
REF057	Clarborough and Welham Parish Council	<p>More generally, we welcome the proposals for the proposed development of the sites of the former power station in the Trent Valley. We are, however, concerned that other villages in our area are not adversely affected by the development in their vicinity.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The impact on nearby communities will form part of the careful planning for the site through a comprehensive masterplan. This will be subject to public engagement.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST7 - COTTAM PRIORITY REGENERATION AREA			
REF060	Notts County Council	The transport and movements requirements (4a) are likely to extend much further than the site in order to mitigate the traffic impact on rural villages. Such impacts are likely to fall within the scope of a Transport Assessment and to provide a means of sustainable travel. The redevelopment of this site would require provision of its own primary school given its remote location. Based on the proposed number of dwellings, the school size would need to be 1.5FE (315 places) with the ability to expand to 2FE (420 places).	Thank you for your comments. The Council has produced some initial transport flow and capacity work for the site which NCC have contributed towards.
1666840	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	I am very pleased that the plan recognises that Cottam is not at this time suitable for large scale development (I would question if without significant investment in roads and infrastructure if it ever will). I do appreciate that BDC has listened to the communities concerns in regards to this site and some of the issues stated by residents are listed in this report.	Thank you for your comments.
REF071	Minerals and Waste, NCC	The County Council notes that these paragraphs have been included which cover the points raised by the County Council in response to the January 2020 Draft Plan in relation to the disposal of PFA material within the Northern and Southern Lagoons at Cottam Power Station. We welcome this being noted within the plan. Part 11 of the policy references that the lagoons where PFA have been deposited will be protected from inappropriate development and ensure their restoration and aftercare is in line with the relevant permissions. The County Council will continue to work with EDF on the restoration and aftercare of these sites within a wider scheme to redevelop the site.	Thank you for your comments.
REF074 map of assets is included with submission	Avison Young on behalf of National Grid	<p>Proposed development sites crossed or in close proximity to National Grid assets:</p> <p>Following a review of the above Development Plan Document, we have identified that one or more proposed development sites are crossed or in close proximity to National Grid assets.</p> <p>Details of the sites affecting National Grid assets are provided below. Cottam Priority Regeneration Area (ST5 and ST6)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4VK ROUTE (TWR 001 - 001B): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line. Route: COTTAM - EATON SOCON - WYMONDLEY 2 4VE ROUTE TWR (021A - 047): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line. Route: COTTAM – GRENDON 4VE ROUTE TWR (001A - 020A): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line route: COTTAM - KEADBURY 1 ZDA ROUTE TWR (228B - 247): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line. Route: COTTAM - STAYTHORPE 1 ZDA ROUTE TWR (210D - 227A): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line route: COTTAM - WEST BURTON 400Kv Underground Cable route: COTTAM 400KV NORTH CSE COMPOUND <p>Electrical Substation: COTTAM 400KV A plan showing details of the site locations and details of National Grid's assets is attached to this letter. Please note that this plan is illustrative only.</p> <p>Please also see attached information outlining further guidance on development close to National Grid assets.</p> <p>Further Advice</p> <p>National Grid is happy to provide advice and guidance to the Council concerning their networks. If we can be of any assistance to you in providing informal comments in confidence during your policy development, please do not hesitate to contact us.</p> <p>To help ensure the continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect their assets. Please remember to consult National Grid on any Development Plan Document (DPD) or site-specific proposals that could affect National Grid's assets. Guidance on development near National Grid assets</p> <p>National Grid is able to provide advice and guidance to the Council concerning their networks and encourages high quality and well-planned development in the vicinity of its assets.</p> <p>Electricity assets</p> <p>Developers of sites crossed or in close proximity to National Grid assets should be aware that it is National Grid policy to retain existing overhead lines in-situ, though it recognises that there may be exceptional circumstances that would justify the request where, for example, the proposal is of regional or national importance.</p> <p>National Grid's 'Guidelines for Development near pylons and high voltage overhead power lines' promote the successful development of</p>	The existing electric infrastructure will be protected on site. Indeed, access for servicing and maintenance will also form part of the masterplan for the redevelopment of the site. The Council and others will continue to work with National Grid through the planning for the site.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST7 - COTTAM PRIORITY REGENERATION AREA		<p>sites crossed by existing overhead lines and the creation of well-designed places. The guidelines demonstrate that a creative design approach can minimise the impact of overhead lines whilst promoting a quality environment. The guidelines can be downloaded here: https://www.nationalgrid.com/document/130626/download</p> <p>The statutory safety clearances between overhead lines, the ground, and built structures must not be infringed. Where changes are proposed to ground levels beneath an existing line then it is important that changes in ground levels do not result in safety clearances being infringed. National Grid can, on request, provide to developers detailed line profile drawings that detail the height of conductors, above ordnance datum, at a specific site.</p> <p>National Grid's statutory safety clearances are detailed in their 'Guidelines when working near National Grid Electricity Transmission assets', which can be downloaded here: www.nationalgrid.com/network-and-assets/working-near-our-assets</p> <p>Gas assets</p> <p>High-Pressure Gas Pipelines form an essential part of the national gas transmission system and National Grid's approach is always to seek to leave their existing transmission pipelines in situ. Contact should be made with the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) in respect of sites affected by High-Pressure Gas Pipelines.</p> <p>National Grid have land rights for each asset which prevents the erection of permanent/ temporary buildings, or structures, changes to existing ground levels, storage of materials etc. Additionally, written permission will be required before any works commence within the National Grid's 12.2m building proximity distance, and a deed of consent is required for any crossing of the easement.</p> <p>National Grid's 'Guidelines when working near National Grid Gas assets' can be downloaded here: www.nationalgridgas.com/land-and-assets/working-near-our-assets</p>	
REF101	East Markham Parish Council	This site given the problems associated with contamination its remote location it is difficult to see either people or businesses willing live or set up here. It will require a disproportionate use of resources. East Markham Parish Council believes that the Cottam regeneration scheme represents a disproportionate spend on the site for little in the way of benefit. It is difficult to see this representing an attractive site for either developers or residents. Also difficult to see either Cottam or High Marnham being attractive to business. Each site is remote and has poor transport links. East Markham Parish Council believes that the funds proposed for each of these two sites would be better-used improving infrastructure elsewhere within the district.	The redevelopment of Cottam is considered to be a long term regeneration site. There are a number of significant constraints that need to be addressed before the principle of some development types are acceptable. The Council will continue to work with the site promoters and local communities on the potential regeneration options over the plan period.
REF106	Water Management Consortium	The Boards are primarily concerned with the rate of flow and volume of water to our network of maintained watercourses, therefore the Boards support the preference for sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) and recommends that SUDS are incorporated into all developments where feasible. SUDS should be designed to mimic the pre development 'greenfield' surface water regime and must be agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority. The Boards recommend including in this section that drainage design needs to take into account climate change by allowing for an expected increase in the volume of rainfall, when assessing the storage and conveyance requirements for potential development sites. The site lies within the Board's district, there are numerous Board maintained drains located through and adjacent to the site. The Board's consent will be required prior to any works in, under, over or within 9 metres of the bank top of the watercourse. The Board requires an easement strip along the Board maintained watercourse in order to allow for continued maintenance and future works. The Board's consent will be required prior to any increases in surface water discharge from the site being made to any watercourse, other than a designated main river.	Thank you for your comments. This information is very helpful and will form part of the masterplanning for the site.
REF122	NNLCRP (North Notts & Lincs Community Rail Partnership)	The existing railway line serving the former Cottam power station could be utilised for light rail into Retford based on a cost effective operation similar to that used between Stourbridge Junction and Stourbridge Town by flywheel energy operated trains. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/British_Rail_Class_139	The potential for light rail has been dismissed by Network Rail, but the Council will continue to work with the site promoters on sustainable transport options for the site moving forward.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST7 - COTTAM PRIORITY REGENERATION AREA			
REF153	Natural England	<p>We note that in point 4 of the policy wording that linkages to the wider green infrastructure network is promoted, which is welcome. We suggest that opportunities to link the lowland fen priority habitat, which is present on the site, to surrounding habitats should be taken and contribute to the Nature Recovery Network. We suggest that integrated water management (as mentioned above) could be a useful approach given the history of contamination on this site. If the water on the site can be recycled it may be a way to improve the water quality in the Trent as mentioned in B point 5.</p> <p>This site may also present an opportunity for meeting Net Zero Carbon targets.</p>	Thank you for your comments.
REF132 - same segment is in GV ST3 table as well	JVH Planning on behalf of Kilner Estate	<p>Accordingly we object to Policy ST1 on the basis that it includes new settlements at Cottam and at the A57/A1, which we consider are unsustainable and undeliverable. We object to the Cottam Power Station and the Garden Village being included in the strategy and suggest that the whole settlement hierarchy needs to be re visited with proper consideration of the level of homes that are needed over the Plan Period. The proposed development in the Garden Village and Cottam can be redistributed within the existing settlement hierarchy to settlements that can deliver new homes and can provide existing social and physical infrastructure.</p> <p>We object to Policy ST2, it is not clear if the figures on page 35 are a new requirement or include existing permissions Pages 36 and 37 lists the smaller rural settlements which collectively accommodate 1,502 of the housing requirement, again it is not clear if these figures include existing commitments</p> <p>We object to ST3 and the Garden Village concept for the reasons set out above</p> <p>It is proposed that the Plan be redrafted to do the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Omit the two new settlements Cottam and Garden Village • Redistribute the numbers anticipated in the Plan period to the existing settlement hierarchy especially to the smaller rural villages to allow them to grow organically and make the best use of the existing infrastructure and make allocations in the villages to achieve this strategy • Consider an alternative use of the Cottam Power Station Site. 	<p>Cottam has now been identified as a priority for regeneration. There isn't a particular land use attached to the proposed policy within the Local Plan due to the uncertainty with existing planning constraints.</p> <p>Therefore the site is identified as a broad location for growth on the Policies Map rather than a specific site allocation within this Plan.</p>
REF182	Anglian Water	Anglian Water is the water undertaker for Cottam and has no objection to the principle of residential development on this site.	Thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST7 - COTTAM PRIORITY REGENERATION AREA			
REF149	Stone Planning Services Limited on behalf of Charterpoint (NG22) Limited	<p>This is a relatively isolated site served off a series of minor roads which is allocated to serve 1,600 dwellings and 14.4 ha of B1, B2 and B8 employment. We do not consider this to be a commercially attractive site to employment investors or a sustainable location. The site as originally developed as a power station because of the proximity of the River Trent and rail infrastructure and its relative isolation from residential areas; these are bespoke locational criteria and not sustainable criteria for a mixed use residential and employment allocation. Notwithstanding the existing river defences, the site is partially in Flood Zones 2 and 3. However, a Flood Risk Assessment has not been undertaken to determine if the site is suitable for housing, a particularly vulnerable use, and employment. We consider that resolving flood issues is a prerequisite to allocating the site. We are also aware that there is a significant amount of demolition to be undertaken and inevitably contamination to remediate. We consider that delivery of any employment at this site to be hugely optimistic. The Viability Appraisal shows a net Viability Margin of -£16.35m when assessed against CIL. The Council should not rely on employment delivery from Cottam Power Station.</p>	<p>The site is being promoted for residential redevelopment but when considering the constraints and other information, the Council has now identified it as a longer term priority regeneration area. This is due to the significant level of constraints and the uncertainty about how some of these could be overcome through development. The level of constraints means there is considerable uncertainty about the delivery of the site and what types of developments are appropriate moving forward. However, the site is largely a brownfield former industrial area that has the potential to be redeveloped in the longer term.</p>
REF152	Gerald Eve on behalf of EDF	<p>This submission follows previous representations submitted in February 2020 during the last round of public consultation, and also following our subsequent communications with BDC during 2020 regarding the Site's future. Since the previous round of consultation, BDC has amended draft Policy ST7 (previously known as Policy ST5). The amendment has changed the thrust of the policy's objective from that of an allocated development site to be delivered during the plan period, to a broad location that should be safeguarded for residential-led regeneration in the longer term including beyond the plan period. Through discussions with BDC during late 2020, it is understood that this approach has been taken due to the Council's concerns regarding deliverability of the Site for both technical reasons and possibly due to concerns relating to rights of access and continued use and protection of third party infrastructure on the Site. As BDC is aware through various communications during 2020, EDF is confidentially in discussions with a third-party developer which is looking at the comprehensive redevelopment of the Site. The developer has completed a comprehensive technical due diligence exercise, which EDF has receipt of, both in terms of the Site's development and legal constraints. Whilst EDF understands BDC's concerns regarding deliverability in the short term, EDF maintains that the redevelopment of the Site is achievable and commercially viable and could come forward earlier than anticipated by the current draft Policy. Notwithstanding the above, the identification of the Site as a Priority Regeneration Area is welcomed and supported, and EDF is committed to continuing to work with BDC to resolve any concerns raised. With this approach in mind, EDF considers that the Site's delivery programme could be reviewed again as part of the Council's next local plan review or new local plan, which may also be informed or supported by a developer's progress towards submitting an outline planning application for the Site's redevelopment.</p> <p>In the meantime, the sub-sections below summarise the technical due diligence work completed since the previous representations were submitted in February 2020 to provide an overview of the current stage of work as well as providing assurance that BDC's concerns can be addressed.</p> <p>Technical Due Diligence Through its communications during 2020, BDC made EDF aware that comments had been raised by several stakeholders and statutory consultees regarding deliverability, specifically matters relating to highways, utilities and the potential for incorporation of the ash lagoons within the development boundary. For information, the comprehensive programme of technical work already undertaken includes the following items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acoustics / Noise • Liaison with third parties on site regarding possible enclosure and undertaking full acoustic sampling and reviews • Noise level monitoring around site from Cottam Development Centre (Power station and PRS), substation and road traffic • Noise Modelling and Mitigation Optioneering <p>Air Quality (AQ)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmation of Construction and Operational AQ Assessment - (Cessation of Power Station). • Validation of AQ Assessment and assessment of NOx impact • Review of Dust data and validation • Assessment of need for Dust standoff (400m) <p>Roads and Highways</p>	<p>The site is being promoted for residential redevelopment but when considering the constraints and other information, the Council has now identified it as a longer term priority regeneration area. This is due to the significant level of constraints and the uncertainty about how some of these could be overcome through development. The level of constraints means there is considerable uncertainty about the delivery of the site and what types of developments are appropriate moving forward. However, the site is largely a brownfield former industrial area that has the potential to be redeveloped in the longer term.</p> <p>The proposed Policy within the Local Plan states that any proposals for the site must demonstrate how it intends to overcome the significant planning issues identified. This includes how a proposal would be considered sustainable in such a rural location.</p> <p>The development should be supported by a comprehensive masterplan that details the proposed land uses, its required infrastructure and the delivery.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST7 - COTTAM PRIORITY REGENERATION AREA		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic Counts at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Gainsborough Road ◦ Cottam Road/Brampton Road ◦ A57/Laneham Road • Calculation of Traffic Generation • Preparation of Preliminary Access Junction Designs • Impact Assessment of Development on wider traffic network • Budget figures for networks improvement • Updated Cost Plan and Programme <p>Ecology & Trees • Review of additional data from EDF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion of walkover survey to confirm habitat status • Review of Landscape and restoration plans • Check of Tree Preservation Orders • Check of National Biological Records Centre (NBRC) • Surveys undertaken: Winter Bird, Badger, Riparian Mammal, Bats and Breeding Birds <p>Ground and contamination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ground Level Survey (Drone with spot levels) • Mineral's Resource Assessment • Ground Investigation focussed on confirming ground Model columns and quality, in particular the Pulverised Fly Ash (PFA) for potential re-use. • 9 cone penetration test holes, 13 cable percussive holes, ~10-15 window sample holes, 3 to 7 trial pits. • 2 rounds gas and groundwater monitoring • Factual Report, and Interpretive Report • Cut and Fill balance and volumes • Options Report (Foundations, Pulverised Fly Ash, Sands & Gravels) <p>Drainage and Flood Risk</p> <p>Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmation of drainage and flood solution • Model compensatory area, risk to 3rd parties & agree with Environment Agency, including a breach scenario • Cross-Sections of flood protected areas before & after development. • Drainage Assessment review • Global & phased Drainage Strategy • Liaison with Lead Local Flood Authority, Environment Agency and Severn Trent Water Utilities • Review of Existing Service plans and application for missing data. • Review of existing distribution network infrastructure • Feasibility assessment of routes for gas and electricity • 3rd Party liaison (Western Power Distribution, Northern Power Grid and National Grid) • Evaluation of High-Pressure Gas Main and required standoff and end use. • Abnormal legal requirements (Easements, Wayleaves) • Production of Utilities Strategy 	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST7 - COTTAM PRIORITY REGENERATION AREA			
REF152	Gerald Eve on behalf of EDF	<p>The findings from these detailed studies have provided confidence in pursuing a full regeneration strategy, albeit EDF is cognisant that there remains a significant amount of work to progress in consultation with all stakeholders and the public before an initial planning application is ready for submission. In response to comments raised regarding development on the ash lagoons, a review has been completed of the masterplan submitted on behalf of EDF during the last consultation that identifies 'Future Development Land' on part of the southern ash lagoon. The area of the power station site containing the lagoons does not form any of the land required to deliver the 1,600 homes allowed for within the draft policy and EDF remains confident that the masterplan is realistic and deliverable at the scale of development indicated within draft Policy ST7 (i.e. for 1,600 homes plus other appropriate land uses); moreover, potential may even exist to deliver more homes through, for example, using a variety of development densities. For the avoidance of doubt, the ash lagoons do not form part of the proposed core development area. Rights of Access and Site Infrastructure EDF has previously confirmed to BDC that third party rights of access and use of services, for which BDC has raised concerns, will remain and be protected as part of any future redevelopment of the Site. EDF has agreements in place with both Uniper (operator of the Cottam Development Centre) and National Grid, which any future developer of the Site would have to adhere to as part of any transfer in title. All the existing rights will be protected to ensure the ongoing existing operations of Uniper and National Grid.</p> <p>The summary below sets out the relevant rights and infrastructure that had been specifically noted by BDC as requiring assurances during discussions held in mid-2020:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gas pipeline - The pipeline runs to the north of the site and will remain an operational asset. The detailed design of the development will ensure all required development distances are adhered to. Consultations have taken place with the HSE who have confirmed pre application advice regarding proximity of development to the pipeline. This does not impact on the master plan scheme. • Water abstraction and discharge permit to the River Trent - Uniper will retain a water abstraction licence and make up and purge pipelines will be re-routed by EDF along the southern and western boundaries of the site to avoid the development site. • Access to the dock and subsequent access rights - The rights of Uniper and National Grid to use the Dock area will be retained as part of the detailed design. • Discharge of surface water through the EDF site – The right to discharge surface water across the EDF site will be retained and this has been factored into the masterplan. Any future surface water drainage strategy for the site would need to take the existing infrastructure into consideration to ensure no risk to the continued operation of the CDC. • Connections to the National Grid sub-station – The sub-station will remain operational and the connections have been factored into the masterplan. A suitable no-build zone has been incorporated into the masterplan around the sub-station and its associated connections and will be refined in detailed design. • Access rights for operation and maintenance purposes – Such required rights will be retained. • Rights to lay conducting media and high voltage cabling across the EDF site – Such required rights will be retained away from the development Site. Existing agreements specifically protect existing and proposed uses of the EDF land. <p>It is important to note that all of the above items were considered during the masterplanning exercise that informed the vision document submitted during the last consultation period in February 2020. No changes to that masterplan are therefore considered necessary at this stage and, EDF is confident that the Site is capable of delivering the intended scale of development (i.e. 1,600 homes and other land uses) without hindering access to, or operation of, the various third party owned infrastructure.</p> <p>Summary</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST7 - COTTAM PRIORITY REGENERATION AREA		<p>EDF welcomes the inclusion of the former Cottam Power Station within BDC's Draft Local Plan as a Priority Regeneration Area for residential-led development. Whilst EDF considers the redevelopment of the Site could commence during the plan period, earlier than anticipated by draft Policy ST7, it is recognised that there is further work and consultation to be completed with a number of key stakeholders to ensure the sustainable redevelopment of the former power station site. EDF strongly believes that the masterplan that has been presented to BDC within EDF's vision document (February 2020), is deliverable and, importantly, commercially viable whilst protecting the network of third party owned infrastructure across the Site.</p>	
REF163	Pegasus Group on behalf of the Harworth Group	<p>Land at the former Cottam Power Station is identified as a broad location for priority regeneration at Policy ST7: Cottam Priority Regeneration Area. The site is safeguarded from development that would jeopardise the comprehensive remediation, reclamation and redevelopment of the whole site in accordance with a masterplan to be agreed with the Council. Subsection B sets out a series of criteria for the development proposals at Cottam Power Station (1 – 12), and Subsection C sets out acceptable main uses for the site, subject to the requirements at Subsection B. The uses considered acceptable within Policy ST7 are; housing development of up to 1,600 dwellings, employment development for up to 14ha (use classes B2, B8 and E(g)), public transport hub and renewable energy uses. Policy ST7 is supported, initial masterplanning work indicates the site has capacity to deliver approximately 1,750 dwellings, and therefore Policy ST7 should be flexible to accommodate additional housing development over the 1,600 dwellings currently included. It is suggested that the overall quantum of development at Cottam Power Station is expressed as 'approximately' rather than as a target/maximum. The future development of the site would be supported by appropriate infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>A Sustainability Appraisal Report prepared by LUC (November 2020) accompanies the Draft Local Plan consultation. Paragraph 5.123 confirms that whilst new settlements require greater land take, they can also provide greater benefits in terms of provision of employment and new infrastructure, services and facilities. Of the five new settlement options considered by the Council, Cottam Power Station and Bassetlaw Garden Village perform particularly well in sustainability terms as both new settlement and employment site options. Paragraph 5.124 confirms that 'the potential negative effects identified as a result of redeveloping Cottam Power Station are likely to be minimised by the fact the site currently houses a power station'.</p> <p>In accordance with Subsection B of Policy ST7, any future planning application would be accompanied by an illustrative masterplan and phasing plan, that will demonstrate that the proposed quantum of development can be accommodated on site, and delivered alongside appropriate infrastructure. The future planning application will be accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES), which will present the findings of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), the scope of which will be agreed with the local planning authority.</p> <p>The EIA will evaluate the likely environmental impacts of the proposed development on a variety of technical disciplines, which would likely include; heritage and archaeology, ecology and biodiversity, landscape and visual impact, flood risk and drainage, transport and access and ground conditions and land contamination. The future planning application will set out how the proposed development can meet the requirements of Subsection B. The planning application will recognise and assess the presence of natural assets within proximity of the site, including the Flatlands Plantation Scheduled Monument, the Cottam Wetlands Local Wildlife Site and the River Trent. In relation to development the Minerals Safeguarding Areas, an approach of incidental mineral extraction would be adopted as part of the redevelopment proposals.</p> <p>Policy ST7 C. – Suggested Amendment:</p> <p>C. The following are considered acceptable main uses for the site, subject to meeting the requirements above:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Housing development approximately 1,750 dwellings 2) Employment development (comprising offices, research and development and industry in (comprising B2, B8 E(g)) for up to 14 ha 3) Public transport hub 4) Renewable energy uses 	Support for the policy is welcome. As a broad location there is no need at this stage to identify numbers for this site. To provide flexibility it is considered that the broad mix of uses is sufficient for a broad location. The use of an Environmental Impact Assessment in support of the application is welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST7 - COTTAM PRIORITY REGENERATION AREA			
REF163	Pegasus Group on behalf of the Harworth Group	To conclude, the identification of the former Cottam Power Station site under Policy ST7: Cottam Priority Regeneration Area is supported. Policy ST7 sets out a number of requirements for the redevelopment of the site, and any future planning application would be accompanied by an Environmental Impact Assessment and full suite of technical documents that would address the requirements at Subsection B. Initial masterplanning work has indicated that approximately 1,750 dwellings can be delivered on site, and it is suggested that the wording of Policy ST7 at Subsection C is amended to reflect this quantum of development. The planning application would be accompanied by an Illustrative Masterplan and Phasing Plan to demonstrate how the proposed development can deliver the housing and employment development proposed, alongside appropriate supporting infrastructure.	
REF201	Severn Trent	Severn Trent would note that the proposed redevelopment of Cottam Power Station, presents a number of issues in relation to existing infrastructure, therefore it is vital that master planning is undertaken for this development is undertaken for this site providing clear proposals for the site and an indicative Layout that can be utilised to understand the proposals in advance of the development coming forward so that a business case and associated infrastructure scheme can be developed and delivered in line with development. This will take both time to secure investment approval, and to design as the likely solution would be both expensive and time consuming to deliver.	The Council will continue to work with Severn Trent and the site promoters on the future regeneration of the site. This will include further engagement with consultees on potential land uses and schemes.
REF203	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	<p>The site comprises the 348 ha former Cottam Power Station site. The Cottam Wetlands Local Wildlife Site (LWS 1/101) is within the eastern part of the site. There are records of great crested newts at this site. Their breeding ponds and associated terrestrial habitat is fully protected in the UK under the Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981 and are listed as a European Protected Species under Annex IV of the European Habitats Directive. An Ecological Impact Assessment (EIA) will be required to assess the impacts of this development. We note that the wording within this current draft Point 4 has been amended and we are largely satisfied with that. Protect and enhance the biodiversity value of the Cottam Wetlands Local Wildlife Site, its buffer zone and promotes linkages to the wider green infrastructure network, evidenced by an Ecological Impact Assessment;</p> <p>An EIA will need to assess the whole of the site because great crested newts and other protected species may be present in the North and South Lagoons and within the open mosaic habitat on previously developed land (OMH). An appropriately sized buffer zone should be evidenced through the EIA. Buffer zones vary depending on their focus on the landscape, habitat and/or species conservation, each of which demands a different approach for their creation. EIA is a process of identifying, quantifying and evaluating potential effects of development-related or other proposed actions on habitats, species and ecosystems. The findings of an assessment can help competent authorities understand ecological issues when determining applications for consent. EIA can be used for the appraisal of projects of any scale including the ecological component of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). When undertaken as part of an EIA, EIA is subject to the relevant EIA Regulations.</p> <p>We note that Point 11 states the following:</p> <p>11. Protect the Pulverised Fuel Ash North and South Lagoons, and slurry lagoon from inappropriate development, and ensure their appropriate restoration and after care in line with relevant permissions;</p> <p>The lagoons could form part of the blue infrastructure for the site that could have benefits for wildlife and people if restored appropriately. The restoration however, would need to be informed and evidenced by the Ecological Impact Assessment (EIA).</p> <p>Any development of the site would need to consider and evaluate the open mosaic habitat on previously developed land (OMH) within the former power station site. This is a Habitat of Principal Importance under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006. Section 41 of The Act requires the Secretary of State to publish and maintain lists of species and types of habitats which are regarded by Natural England to be of "principal importance" for the purposes of conserving biodiversity in England.</p>	Thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST7 - COTTAM PRIORITY REGENERATION AREA			
REF213	Treswell with Cottam Parish Council	welcome and support the Council's wish not to be reliant on the delivery of the Cottam site to meet its housing and employment land requirements for all the necessary reasons stated 5.5.1- 5.5.8 recognises that if, and when, all the conditions have been complied with, this plan identifies the site as a priority Regeneration Area and broad location for future growth and that regeneration of this area may/will be permitted only in compliance with Policy ST7: Cottam Priority Regeneration Area A/B1-B12 however, at Policy ST7 C, the members present continue to believe that the Cottam Power Station Site remains unsuitable for housing development up to 1600 dwellings, Employment development for up to 14ha, public transport hub and renewable energy uses for the reasons previously noted and alternative uses for this valuable site should be explored.	Thank you for your comments. The Council will continue to engage with the local community when further information about the regeneration of the site becomes available.
1669241	Resident	We have also supported the regeneration-led new settlement at Cottam provided that any delays in this secondary location in the plan period did not lead to an overall shortfall of provision across the District. We note that due to restoration and reclamation issues, BDC do not now seek to rely on any housing delivery in this plan period and this approach is supported.	Thank you for your comments.
REF214	Historic England	Policy ST7: Cottam Priority Regeneration Area - Section B-3 refers to the 'Flatlands' Plantation SM and this should be revised to 'Fleet' Plantation SM. Neither the policy or its supporting text refers to other nearby heritage assets, including highly graded ones, which could have their significance harmed as a result of the potential regeneration proposals. This should be revised to address the omissions. The SA and Heritage Statement make some reference to those other assets but there is little assessment of the potential for harm to those assets as a result of the various proposals. The SA concludes there is a likely significant negative effect on both heritage and archaeology. There is no apparent additional information to address these effects in the evidence base and it is recommended that further work be undertaken in this respect. At present there are concerns about the soundness of this site being taken forward in the Plan.	
1670549	Resident	Building 3,500 dwellings in this area will lead to serious road congestion unless significant investment is spent on roads in the surrounding area. The main route into Retford would not be able to take this traffic, nor the lanes around it. In order to help alleviate this the railway line to the power station should be upgraded to take passengers connecting them with local towns. Work would need to be done to strengthen the flood defences in order to give prospective owners reassurance otherwise obtaining buildings insurance may prove difficult so close to the river Trent.	The site is being promoted for residential redevelopment but when considering the constraints and other information, the Council has now identified it as a longer term priority regeneration area. This is due to the significant level of constraints and the uncertainty about how some of these could be overcome through development. The level of constraints means there is considerable uncertainty about the delivery of the site and what types of developments are appropriate moving forward. However, the site is largely a brownfield former industrial area that has the potential to be redeveloped in the longer term.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST7 - COTTAM PRIORITY REGENERATION AREA			
		<p>The narrative and policy in this version of the plan is much improved for previous versions, and recognises the challenges of this site. For this the officials and others who have redrafted this should be commended and thank you. However..... There is not reference to the impact on the village of Cottam (indeed this village gets no mention at all) which would provide any reader who is not familiar with the area with an incomplete picture of potential impacts. (also see previous comments re small rural settlements). At best this is not appropriate and needs to be rectified in the next iteration of the plan. At worst this is either a lack of understanding by those representing us, or a disingenuous attempt to suggest this is a stand alone site which has no impact.... Flood risk is now identified, and although the site benefits from some defences, larlgly becvuae of its current purpose; these would need ot be mainitned, and probably improved at signifancat cost (to who??) to avoid any future increase to the flood risk to the the site and the surrounding area. As noted in the plan a full and thorough flood risk assessment, including on the surrounding area must be completed, alongside EIAs and contaminated land assessments etc before any consideration of any regeneration of this site. The plan recognises this now, but the policy is still proposing option of a significant housing and/or employment hub at this site. this policy should be revisited, and focus on the identifying the challenges and alternative uses for this site, before even suggesting the creation of a new settlement on this scale. It is not clear anywhere in the plan why High Marnham, rather than Cottam site is considered more appriate for green energy. the Cottam site already has a well established nature reserve, which could be exnpaded, and is expected to continue as a gas fired power station, so why not extend this to green (solar) energy and maximise the infrsucture already in place ie links to the national grid. The site has significant transport issues. There has been an independent assessment the transport challenges commissioned by the Authority which identifies a significant impact on all the local villages and settlements de to increased car use and concludes "Any development on the site is therefore likely to be heavily reliant on car based trips and would be contrary to national and local transport policies with regards to focussing significant development in locations that are, or can be made to be sustainable, by reducing the need to travel by car by providing a genuine choice of sustainable transport modes". I have been unable to find a similar report for the Hlgh Marnham site - there should be one and a full comparative ansysis undertaken between the two sites. There is no reason both sites could not be identified for green energy (solar) generation, resulting in Bassetlaw being at the forefront of tacking climate change and leading the way for others. surely this is a legacy we would all welcome.. But if there is a need for one or other site to provide housing or employment hubs, then further details as to the options, risks and benefits for both sites must be identified and shared with the communities affected. in the meantime policy ST07 needs to be further strengthened to reflect, and ensure any future decisions consider, the impact on the current communities of Cottam and Coates, but also Rampton, Treswell, Leverton etc and include how these will be protected and/or compensated as appropriate.</p>	<p>The site is being promoted for residential redevelopment but when considering the constraints and other information, the Council has now identified it as a longer term priority regeneration area. This is due to the significant level of constraints and the uncertainty about how some of these could be overcome through development. The level of constraints means there is considerable uncertainty about the delivery of the site and what types of developments are appropriate moving forward. However, the site is largely a brownfield former industrial area that has the potential to be redeveloped in the longer term.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the community and the site promotor on the future proposed uses for the site. The level of infrastructure to support a large redevelopment will be extensive and this will need to be detailed through a masterplan and its associated documents moving forward. The cost of redeveloping the site will largely be through the private sector, but some Government Grant monies could be used to help subsidise some of the upfront costs as the site is partly a brownfield site.</p>
1670869	Resident		
REF044	Resident	<p>This brown field site, which has a high degree of contamination, and will be very difficult, if nor impossible to completely remove, and its total lack of infrastructure could not support such a large housing project without a huge cost, not just to the developer, to Bassetlaw and council tax payers. Nor could the local community support the doubling of its population in such a small geographical area without it causing huge disruption locally and in the wider community. Dunham in the south to Sturton le Steeple in the north has only approximately 1600 houses. This housing project is proposing 1650 houses! That's approximately 6600 people, 3300 car journeys twice a day. At the moment we are told there is no need for such a large amount housing. It flies in the face of the many protestation wishing for a reduction to climate change ST45 Green infrastructures ST35 our historical environment ST37 as well as our rural heritage assets, villages and rural landscape. ST38</p>	<p>The site is being promoted for residential redevelopment but when considering the constraints and other information, the Council has now identified it as a longer term priority regeneration area. This is due to the significant level of constraints and the uncertainty about how some of these could be overcome through development. The level of constraints means there is considerable uncertainty about the delivery of the site and what types of developments are appropriate moving forward. However, the site is largely a brownfield former industrial area that has the potential to be redeveloped in the longer term.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the community and the site promotor on the future proposed uses for the site</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST7 - COTTAM PRIORITY REGENERATION AREA			
REF052	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>The draft Bassetlaw Local Plan has made reference to the need to develop rural businesses. An ideal opportunity would be to preserve one of the cooling towers and other infrastructure to set up a national 'heritage' tourist attraction. It won't be many years before power generation by coal will be history - Cottam provides an ideal opportunity, and the space, to set up such a tourism/leisure offer, with one route of access via the River Trent. This will help to regenerate north-east Bassetlaw, providing opportunities for local businesses, accommodation, etc.</p>	<p>The site is being promoted for residential redevelopment but when considering the constraints and other information, the Council has now identified it as a longer term priority regeneration area. The type of uses are yet to be decided and the decision to demolish or keep the cooling towers is down to the landowners of the site.</p>
REF104	Local Developer	<p>We wish to express our objection and concerns regarding the proposed garden villages both at Ranby, and Cottam. There are a myriad of objections, and reasons these should not be permitted. One of which is that any new garden village or villages with their vast number of new homes will mean that new homes in the existing villages will not get built, simply because of the numbers allocated to the new garden villages.</p> <p>Therefore not allowing, and or drastically reducing, and limiting the ability to correctly and for the benefit of the areas and local communities in those and surrounding those villages</p> <p>Lots of these existing villages require new development, and housing for many reasons including, and not limited to keeping the villages alive for the ongoing use, and maintenance of the village halls, shops, post offices, pubs, schools etc</p> <p>Also these garden villages by virtue of their scale will give a very unfair advantage to those developers of the garden villages over the smaller developments, companies, developers and family run house builders that ply their trade building out smaller sites, up to 15 No. in our existing villages, so competition in both numbers and finances will have a very detrimental effect on existing rural development as we know it</p>	<p>Policy ST2 is supportive of small scale residential growth in the rural area.</p>
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	<p>It is welcomed that some form of redevelopment of the majority of this site is to be considered once the existing coal fired plant has been fully decommissioned and demolished. However, this site is not without its problems and redevelopment in a fashion that is safe, environmentally friendly, attractive, deliverable and does not detrimentally affect local villages and areas will take considerable work. One of the major problems regarding safety is the fact that the majority of this site is within a flood zone 2 and all of the surrounding land including escape routes are in zone 3. It is difficult to understand how a sequential and an exception test could justify this location, particularly for housing when the district already has a 10.7 year housing land availability assessment. However, as a continuity of a commercial use the site is highly suitable.</p> <p>The gas fired station will continue for many years and therefore commercial/industrial design here would sit well with the current built form. Speculative built housing would not and it would be totally out of character.</p> <p>The location also has several environmental issues. Housing is classified as a very sensitive receptor when considering flooding and in the notes to this policy it suggests senior citizen accommodation could also take place, this sector is very vulnerable. Given the flood zone 2 and 3 allocation it is highly likely that homeowners will struggle to obtain home insurance and even if they do it will come at a cost. The other environmental issue has also major health implications. As we are aware, this is the site of Cottam Power Station, the old coal fired station is almost decommissioned and being prepared for demolition. There still remains the very new gas fired operation and of course all the distribution network including pylons, cables, transformers etc. These latter items in particular create noise and also produce massive electromagnetic fields around overhead cables. Studies have shown that these can have a very detrimental effect on health and wellbeing.</p> <p>To place housing in the shadow of an existing power station and generation connectivity hub would be massively detrimental with houses being overshadowed by the current power station.</p> <p>In 5.5.9 the Council state that they do not wish at this stage to be reliant on this site to meet either their housing or employment land requirements. Therefore, all reference to this site should be excluded until a more holistic and detailed approach has been produced. As it stands Cottam Regeneration Area is simply a suggestion and should not be a strategic policy yet.</p>	<p>The purpose of a broad location is to identify where growth could go in the future subject to the provisions of the policy. All of the matters identified are referred to in policy, where additional evidence is sought to demonstrate that the development can address all necessary constraints in a satisfactory manner.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST7 - COTTAM PRIORITY REGENERATION AREA			
REF205	Heatons on behalf of Tarmac Trading Ltd	<p>Policy ST7 promotes the comprehensive redevelopment of the former Cottam Power Station and aims to safeguard the area from development that would jeopardise its remediation, reclamation, and redevelopment. Tarmac broadly supports the proposed regeneration of the former power station but would like to draw the LPA's attention to the following points.</p> <p>Safeguarding of Mineral Resources</p> <p>Firstly, that the regeneration area is located within mineral safeguarding areas for oil and gas resources, as well as sand and gravel resources as per Policy SP7 of the emerging Nottinghamshire County Council Minerals Local Plan (MLP). As you will be aware, the MLP is at a late stage of examination and therefore its contents should be attributed weight when considering the draft content of the Bassetlaw Local Plan. In the determination of planning applications for non-minerals development within the District, the policies of the MLP must be considered as part of the development plan.</p> <p>The purpose of these mineral safeguarding areas, which are identified in Nottinghamshire by the County Council as minerals planning authority, is to safeguard known deposits of minerals which are desired to be kept safeguarded from unnecessary sterilisation by non-minerals development. The Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan does not show mineral safeguarding areas on the Interactive Policies Map published online. This is contrary to the guidance within national Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) for Minerals, in which it is stated at paragraph 005 (Reference ID: 27-005-20140306) that: "District councils should show Mineral Safeguarding Areas on their policy maps". There are viable sand and gravel resources at Cottam which should not be sterilised by the development promoted through Policy ST7.</p> <p>The wording of Policy ST7 includes:</p> <p>"Proposals for the development of this priority regeneration area will be permitted where they: ... 10. Ensure the requirements for non-minerals development in Minerals Safeguarding Areas in the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan have been met"</p> <p>We submit that the mineral safeguarding areas as identified by Nottinghamshire County Council be included within the Bassetlaw District Council Policies Maps.</p> <p>Safeguarding of Minerals Infrastructure</p> <p>Tarmac supports the inclusion of Policy ST7 Point B.10 above. However, would suggest that its wording within the Draft Local Plan is expanded to include reference to the safeguarding of minerals infrastructure in addition to development affecting mineral safeguarding areas. Modifications proposed post Examination of the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan emphasise the role of district authorities in safeguarding mineral associated infrastructure (MM17 of the November Modifications Document),</p> <p>'The NPPF states that planning policies should also safeguard existing, planned and potential sites for: the bulk transport, handling and processing of minerals; the manufacture of concrete and concrete products; and the handling, processing and distribution of substitute, recycled and secondary aggregate material. In two-tier administrative areas such as Nottinghamshire, responsibility for safeguarding sites for the storage, handling and transport of minerals rests largely with the district or borough planning authority except where these facilities and sites are located at quarries or aggregate wharves or rail terminals'</p> <p>The former Cottam Power Station benefits from significant infrastructure that would be beneficial for certain users of the site. Importantly, the site is rail-linked. The rail-link present would enable the export of materials/products from the site during construction and beyond using a more sustainable alternative to road freight.</p> <p>The use of the railway for the movement of materials is mentioned at Policy ST7 Point B.12, however, it is mentioned in the context of importing construction materials and exporting waste materials to/from the site during its redevelopment. The potential importance of retaining the rail link as a sustainable method of transporting materials to/from the site upon its redevelopment is omitted from Policy ST7, despite the demonstrable and overwhelming economic and environmental benefits of its retention. This would be more consistent with the objectives of the NPPF (in particular Chapter 9), as well as Strategic Objective 13 of the Draft Local Plan itself, which states that the Local Plan should "make efficient use of the existing transport infrastructure".</p> <p>Policy ST7 of the Bassetlaw Local Plan should be re-worded to much better reflect the requirement to safeguard important infrastructure such as the railhead at Cottam.</p>	<p>The Minerals Planning Authority confirm that making reference to the relevant minerals and waste plans in the Local plan and provide the necessary link to the minerals safeguarding areas is compliant with national policy. The County Council have confirmed that they are supportive of the policy wording relating to minerals. Re-use of the railhead would be supported but this is a detailed matter that needs to be worked up at masterplanning stage to ensure it can be delivered and is feasible. At Local plan review when the policy is reviewed this can be updated where necessary.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST7 - COTTAM PRIORITY REGENERATION AREA			
REF198 Bevercotes	Gladman Developments Ltd	<p>The regeneration of previously developed vacant or underused sites within urban and rural Bassetlaw forms a key part of the vision and objectives of the Local Plan. Two 'Priority Regeneration Areas' are identified in the Plan: 'Policy ST6: Worksop Central' and 'Policy ST7: Cottam Priority Regeneration Area'. As previously highlighted, Gladman advise that Bevercotes Colliery merits inclusion within the Plan as an additional Priority Regeneration Area, reflecting its past use and unique locational advantage to support economic investment and job growth. The redevelopment of the former Bevercotes Colliery will remediate and reclaim a significant brownfield site and its identification as a regeneration site would fully align with the strategic objectives of the Plan to spearhead the regeneration of previously developed land and of Bassetlaw. Furthermore, the site's planning history supports a development area which can deliver the redevelopment of Bevercotes Colliery alongside new and enhanced habitats for nature and wildlife including designated Local Wildlife Sites, which through continual improvement will help realise the areas' full biodiversity potential. Through the planting of deciduous and native broadleaf trees, the management of existing varieties, (some of which are covered by tree preservation orders) and the creation of new wet and dry land habitats, the site will support a number of amphibians including great crested newts as well as water voles, ground nesting birds, bats and badgers. The reintroduction of bridleways around the site will also open up the area up to occupiers of the development and the general public and encouraging breeding birds.</p> <p>4.7 Policy ST7: Cottam Priority Regeneration Area</p> <p>4.7.1 Policy ST7 safeguards land at the former Cottam Power Station site as a broad location for priority regeneration within the Local Plan. The policy sets out considered acceptable main uses for sites including housing development, employment development (B2, B8 E(G)), public transport hub and renewable energy uses providing that the listed criteria are met.</p> <p>4.7.2 Gladman welcome the Council's ambition to regenerate large brownfield sites with a legacy of contamination and support Policy ST7, which supports Strategic Objectives 3 and Strategic Objective 4 of the Local Plan.</p> <p>4.7.3 It is noted that Policy ST7 and the Cottam site are not relied on by the Council to meet the housing or economic requirements and in essence form an aspirational policy to safeguard brownfield land as a potential location for future growth.</p> <p>4.7.4 Gladman are of the view that a similar approach should be taken to support the regeneration of the Bevercotes Colliery site. The Council are aware through on-going engagement and previous representations, that land at Bevercotes Colliery predominantly comprises previously developed land thereby offering the sustainability advantages of turning previously developed land back into use – a key objective for the Council. Furthermore, the site has extant planning permission (09/05/00002) for employment which demonstrates the principle of development in this location and that there is the ability to bring forward a sustainable form of development at the site.</p> <p>4.7.5 It is Gladman's view that the Bevercotes Colliery site should also be included in the Plan as a Priority Regeneration Area and an aspirational location to regenerate previously development land while allowing for relevant conditions to be complied with. It is evident that the site also offers the opportunity to provide flexibility to the Council's future needs with its ability to support employment proposals.</p> <p>4.7.6 While the Local Plan evidence base has not thoroughly assessed the site for economic and employment purposes. Bevercotes Colliery site is a long-standing, historic site of employment and now offers the opportunity to provide a range of business uses including B(8) and aligned B(2) uses which meet the requirements of the Framework to drive economic development and regeneration while recognising the differing locational requirements of different sectors⁹.</p> <p>4.7.7 Indeed, Gladman highlight that Bevercotes Colliery should be recognised for its ability to deliver employment uses across the footprint of the existing extant planning permission allowing for the effective use of land in meeting employment purposes on brownfield land while safeguarding and enabling the improvement of the surrounding environment¹⁰.</p> <p>4.7.8 Including Bevercotes Colliery as an aspirational Priority Regeneration Area, which does not contribute to meeting specifically defined development needs of the District, while setting conditions which recognise the site's unique set of circumstances would support the Council's objective of regenerating brownfield sites while safeguarding any potential ecology that may</p>	Bevercotes Colliery has planning permission for employment use. As such, there is no need to support the site's regeneration through the Local Plan.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST7 - COTTAM PRIORITY REGENERATION AREA			
		exist. Indeed, the site's location and challenging brownfield characteristics provide significant opportunities for the region to deliver a pioneering green economy at the heart of the Government's ambition to 'Build Back Greener'11.	
REF117 (Ordsall South Rep)	Barton Wilmore on behalf of land owners	We acknowledge that there is uncertainty regarding the former Cottam Power Station. In addition to the obvious contamination issues and unstable land, this site also suffers from flood risk and environmental constraints. There does not appear to be a strategy for its regeneration and as such, we seek clarification that the suggested 1600 homes are not counted within the sources of existing supply. That would undermine the Council's strategy elsewhere. We agree that it should be identified as a much longer-term opportunity site.	Reference to 1600 homes will be removed from the policy.
REF199	Cushman and Wakefield on behalf of UNIPER UK LTD	I am instructed by Uniper UK Ltd to submit written representations to the consultation of the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan November 2020. Specifically, the representations focus on Uniper's operational power station – Cottam Development Centre (CDC) - and the adjoining strategic draft policy allocation (Policy ST7) on the former Cottam Coal Fired Power Station. Referring to ongoing discussions with your authority and the owners of the adjoining strategic site, my client broadly supports the draft policy ST7 and its supporting text, which correctly identifies the existing site constraints affecting the Cottam Priority Regeneration Area, as a result of the relationship with the CDC. Specifically, paragraphs B8 and B9 of the draft policy. My client is committed to working collaboratively with your authority and the owners of the strategic site in order that a positive policy context can help support the continued operation of CDC and future energy development projects on the site and the regeneration of the former Cottam Power Station site. In sharing this aspiration, my client proposes that the policy and supporting text be amended to reflect the potential opportunities and benefits that CDC could create and capture future energy project developments to compliment the regeneration of the Cottam Strategic site	Support noted and welcome. The Council would be happy to have further discussions with Uniper about the potential opportunities and benefits that could be realised in the area. The policy is a broad location; on that basis it will be reviewed at Local Plan review. It is considered that would be the more appropriate point to amend the policy if necessary.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST8 - PROVISION OF LAND FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT			
ST041	Retford Civic Society	Most of the employment land in Retford is in use or will be soon. So that there is a continuing supply of new jobs, it is essential that the one small site to be allocated for employment in the town is properly serviced and made available for businesses to build on. It took over 20 years for the last employment allocation on Randall Way to be brought forward, due to a lack of investment in infrastructure. This must not happen again. The servicing of this allocation should be facilitated by development of the nearby residential land which is in the same ownership. Although the planning permission which already exists for part of Trinity Farm has a phasing condition, this condition does not expressly require the employment land to be serviced. The Local Plan should include a specific requirement for all the employment allocation on Randall Way to be serviced and made available for individual employers to build on before there is any development on the housing allocation on North Road (Trinity Farm).	The planning permission for the Trinity Farm employment allocation is in place. This includes infrastructure matters. The Local Plan will reflect the principles of the planning permission. This includes access arrangements and that appropriate provisions are in place for utilities etc.
REF061	Resident	The larger picture of development of the Garden Village, the energy hub at the High Marnham power station site and other sites around Bassetlaw is welcome. Have concern for those local communities which may be directly affected by these developments. Hope that any potential deleterious effects will be carefully considered and all possible action taken, or insisted upon where developers are involved, to reduce these as much as possible.	The Local Plan should be read as a whole. Site allocation policies will ensure that appropriate mitigation is sought to address potential adverse impacts. For other sites, other policies in the

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST8 - PROVISION OF LAND FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT			
			plan such as for design, amenity, transport, flood risk will ensure that impacts on local communities are carefully assessed and mitigated appropriately.
REF092	DHA Planning	<p>Explore Industrial Park Strongly support the formal allocation of the site for general employment development under Policy ST8(B). Previously requested such an approach, which is consistent with that taken by Bolsover District Council for the remainder of the site which, as set out above, has been formally allocated for these uses. Welcome the support of Bolsover District Council in allocating their part of the site for general employment uses, and are pleased that Bassetlaw is now taking the same approach in its emerging Local Plan. This is appropriate, especially given that paragraph 9.9 of the Council's latest Economic Development Need Assessment recognises that EIP is one of eight important employment sites within the district. It goes on to note that:</p> <p>"These are good quality employment sites and there should be a presumption of retention for continued employment uses. However, it is recognised that some operational flexibility may be required."</p>	Support noted and welcome.
REF101	East Markham Parish Council	<p>Concerned that there is no provision in the plan for Small and Medium Enterprises to locate in villages like East Markham. The plan is in danger of ensuring villages become nothing but bed and breakfast communities with residents commuting out for work. There needs to be a greater emphasis on providing opportunities for small start-up businesses with high speed internet connections and excellent connectivity to the wider area. Notes there is no mention of development on the Gamston Airport or the Bevercotes Colliery Site. Their proximity to the A1/A57 road network this is a lost employment opportunity. Would prefer to see both sites not developed for warehousing and logistic facilities rather for medium sized manufacturing and high tech companies.</p> <p><i>The following section was written in reference to the January 2020 DLP 6.3.6. Apleyhead does form a logical extension to the logistics of the A57 corridor but concerned about the impact of any development on existing links and also Clumber Park.</i></p>	<p>Policy ST12 supports the growth of business outside the allocations, this includes the for start up business in the rural area. Gamston Airfield Business Park is protected as an Existing Employment Site by policy ST11 to help support its long term operation. All of the site allocations are able to provide space for start-ups should there be market demand to do so. The supporting text for the garden Village makes reference to such use. Bevercotes Colliery has planning permission for employment use. The Plan would therefore be supportive of a proposal to accommodate business development on site in line with the planning permission. The potential impact of new development on Clumber park will be assessed by the Habitats Regulations Assessment and the Recreational Impact Assessment.</p>
REF106	Water management Consortium	<p>The Boards are primarily concerned with the rate of flow and volume of water to our network of maintained watercourses, therefore the Boards support the preference for sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) and recommends that SUDS are incorporated into all developments where feasible. SUDS should be designed to mimic the pre development 'greenfield' surface water regime and must be agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority.</p> <p>Recommend drainage design needs to take into account climate change by allowing for an expected increase in the volume of rainfall, when assessing the storage and conveyance requirements for potential development sites.</p> <p>HARWORTH EM002 The site lies partially within the Board's district, the Board maintained White Water Main Drain is located on the northern boundary of the site. Consent will be required prior to any works in, under, over or within 9 metres of the bank top of the watercourse. Requires an easement strip along the Board maintained watercourse in order to allow for continued maintenance and future works. Consent will be required prior to any increases in surface water discharge from the site being made to any watercourse, other than a designated main river.</p> <p>EM007 The site lies just outside the Board's district but within the catchment. Consent will be required prior to any increases in surface water discharge from the site being made to any watercourse, other than a designated main river.</p>	<p>Reference to SUDS taking into account climate change will be added to the water quality policy. Sites EM002 and EM007 both have planning permission for employment use. Detailed requirements identified by the Board should be addressed through discussions to deliver those permissions.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST8 - PROVISION OF LAND FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT			
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Area Plan	<p>Its a great disappointment that once against any business or economic growth is still about Warehouses, Logistics and IT. Bassetlaw's heritage and expertise should make it a magnet for manufacturing, not "labouring". Whilst employment expansion is a necessity it does appear that at least one of these sites does not follow the Local plan policy of the use of brownfield sites. Symmetry Park and its expansion northwards is at the loss of acres of agricultural and forest land, that is wrong when there are still unused brownfield sites around the old Harworth Colliery.</p>	<p>The supporting text recognises the potential manufacturing can bring to the long term prosperity of the District. Policy ST8 provides for B2 employment use which would include manufacturing. Where possible the Local Plan site allocations are brownfield land. But there is not brownfield land available to meet the future needs of the District. Symmetry Park has planning permission so the principle of development has already been agreed. Harworth Colliery has planning permission, which over time will see the regeneration of this extensive brownfield site.</p>
REF142	Retford Branch Labour Party	<p>There is a mismatch with the ratios of 'dwellings required' to 'jobs created' when the figures for the whole of the District are compared to the Retford implications. Retford town is expected in the Plan to carry at least 10% of the total district's total 'New Build' through to the end of Plan, and the imbalance is particularly distinct when the 'Employment sites' figure for Retford is just around 3%. The only significant Employment growth in Retford is shown at Trinity Farm ST08 EM006. Whilst this is good, it means for instance that workers from the 800+ dwellings proposed for the opposite end of Retford will face a 2+ mile journey to the only new work in town - it may well be made in electric vehicles, but it will be in vehicles across an already congested section of the A620 unless there is fast frequent cheap and properly timed public transport provided by the developers. Background papers for the Plan assess the potential of the area for employment growth. The housing provision in the Draft Plan is based on a scale of employment growth close to the top of this range and see no measures for Retford which are likely to bring the required employment growth. This is a serious mismatch that may render the Plan too weak for immediate approval by the Inspector, and it is essential to either adjust the dwelling numbers down, or the local employment up. The only other 'fix' for this might be a rigid transport Plan that forces Developers of 10 or more dwellings to give cast iron guarantees of subsidised regular bus and train travel to the 5 or 6 key employment locations that Retford residents attend. The Council has committed resources to a study of central Worksop, has identified this area as a 'Priority Regeneration Area' and is to prepare a development plan document to guide its future. Retford does not yet have the same provisions, and the Party wishes to support the Business Community initiatives in Town and expects to see a proportionate allocation of BDC funding. The Plan risks setting Retford on a path to growing, not falling, unemployment. It certainly places Retford at high risk of falling local employment rates. Suggested changes to the plan • If the plan cannot provide sufficient local jobs, then the standard method of assessment for new homes must be followed. • The Draft Plan says little about Retford Town Centre where there are numerous opportunities for employment and housing. A commitment must be made for an assessment of and plan for Retford Town Centre and to ensure that the organisation doing so takes in feedback from across the town and its interest 6 of 18 groups. The Council must keep neighbourhood plan preparation under review and to consider an alternative approach if it fails to make rapid progress. • The future is difficult to predict, but the Party believes that Leisure and Hospitality will form a significant section of future District prosperity especially in historic Towns. Unless this Plan matches its aspirational rhetoric, the Town will end up as an extensive retirement town with a regular outflow of talent and youth - we will be judged in 20 years' time, and 'it's a nice place to end your days' has limited appeal to most under 50s.</p>	<p>Policy ST8 covers the employment land required to meet needs for uses such as offices, general industry and storage and distribution. This is consistent with national policy. Overall Trinity Farm provides for 11.11 ha of land for employment/employment generating uses, 5 ha is for offices, general industry and storage and distribution. The rest will provide a range of additional jobs. A requirement of national policy is that employment land is identified to reflect market demands. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment 2020 identifies that, from discussions with local property agents that the demand for employment land in Retford identified by the Local Plan is broadly appropriate. On that basis, it would be difficult to demonstrate deliverability – a requirement of national policy. However, the Local Plan is supportive of town centre growth which can also support jobs growth and also protects 5 existing employment sites in Retford to help their future operation. The sustainable transport policy requires developers to use a Travel Plan which should set out how the package of measures that will be implemented to reduce the demand for travel by less sustainable modes, and how sustainable travel from their development will be made. Requirements must be proportionate to the type and scale of development to be consistent with national legislation. It is considered that use of the standard method does not support jobs growth generated by the employment land supply, would address local housing needs or help secure strategic infrastructure interventions. If these matters are not addressed the Local Plan would be contrary</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST8 - PROVISION OF LAND FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT			
			to national policy. Policy ST15 focuses on the management of town centres; section D2 focuses on Retford Town Centre. The Retford Town Centre Neighbourhood Plan is progressing well. The purpose of neighbourhood plans is that they are community-led, however the Council provides officer support to facilitate its preparation. This will ensure that the correct procedures including consultation are followed. Leisure and hospitality are town centre uses. The Neighbourhood Plan would be the ideal vehicle to take this aspiration forward. The Local Plan supports town centre uses in the town centres so the approach would be complementary to that taken.
REF160	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Much is made of aspiring to create high paid jobs in the District. That is laudable, but not all jobs are going to be such. This week the Council proudly announced that Burger King are coming to town; on a site next to ASDA, which the Council also lauded, whose 200 staff are mostly paid only slightly above the National Living Wage. The Council made much of the development at Symmetry Park but two years on the current jobs and those coming are again at or slightly above the NLW. The agent marketing the large warehouse development there listed as one of the sites benefits as being in a low wage area with a large supply of people looking for work. There are existing large employers in the area paying low wages already. Presumably these will continue to do so and continue to employ hundreds of local workers.	The wages paid by employers is not a matter for the Local Plan. But to support the aspiration to attract a diverse range of employment to the District is vital that the right sites are available. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment 2020 identifies that, from discussions with local property agents that the demand for employment land, capable of attracting better paid, higher skilled jobs is along the A1/A57 corridors. Additionally the allocation of Marnham is designed to introduce a specific growth sector to the District.
REF158	Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council - in agreement with Rotherham and Doncaster Councils	Paragraph 6.1.25 of the draft Plan is welcomed, which states that: "The Council will continue to work collaboratively with neighbouring authorities to ensure any benefits associated with this policy are not lost at a strategic level to D2N2 or Sheffield City Region, and at a local level do not adversely impact upon the economic growth strategies of the District or any other authority." However, the policies as currently drafted do not provide an appropriate mechanism for the impact on the economic strategies of other authorities to be taken into account. Policy ST8 Strategic Employment Site C. To develop the role of the A57/A1 growth corridor the development of a strategic employment site, SEM01: Apleyhead Junction (118.7ha) will be allocated to accommodate <u>sub-regional and/or</u> regional employment growth in accordance with Policy ST10. Development <u>should</u> <u>will</u> <u>be</u> <u>required</u> <u>to:</u> 1. provide E(g)/B2/B8 employment functions connected with <u>key sectors identified by the D2N2 LEP Local Industrial Strategy</u> the logistics sector; <u>1. 2.</u> demonstrate D2N2 LEP support for delivery; <u>2. 3.</u> be supportive of the role of key urban centres, such as Worksop; <u>3. 4.</u> have the ability to deliver significant economic development benefits in terms of development value and gross value added for the District, D2N2 and Sheffield City Region; <u>5. 5.</u> not adversely impact upon the economic growth strategies of the District or any other authority; <u>4. 6.</u> not compromise the viability or deliverability of other employment allocations identified by this Plan or in Local Plans adopted by other authorities within D2N2 or the Sheffield City Region; <u>7. 7.</u> demonstrate that, in the case of a major inward investment, the needs of the business cannot be reasonably met on allocated employment land within either D2N2 or Sheffield City Region; <u>5. 8.</u> be satisfactorily accommodated by critical infrastructure, in terms of capacity and timescales associated with investment works; <u>6. 9.</u> have good access to key strategic transport routes; <u>7. 10.</u> provide a significant number of new permanent jobs including skilled employment.	Through Duty to Cooperate the Council have worked with Barnsley and the other South Yorkshire authorities to agree an evidence led approach to the progressing Apleyhead. The policy will be re-worded to be identified as a logistics site, that should not adversely impact upon the growth strategies of authorities in logistics property market area. This should address the concerns of the authorities. A draft Statement of Common Ground will be prepared with neighbouring authorities.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST8 - PROVISION OF LAND FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT			
REF168	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	<p>Strategic Employment Land / Apleyhead junction The Council along with other South Yorkshire authorities previously expressed concerns regarding the proposed provision of strategic employment land and the strategic employment site SEM01: Apleyhead Junction. The responses provided in the consultation statement are acknowledged and the recognition that further work with Sheffield City Region and neighbouring authorities is needed in relation to the Apleyhead site is welcomed. Noted that no further engagement has taken place to date. Taking account of the consultation responses and the revised policy, the Council remains concerned with the plan's proposals. This is a view shared by other Councils and comments agreed by Barnsley, Doncaster, and Rotherham Councils are included below at Appendix 1 which outline the concerns and requests a number of amendments to policy.</p>	<p>The Council acknowledges the concerns Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council and the other South Yorkshire authorities have in relation to Apleyhead. Further discussions will continue to take place with the authorities under Duty to Cooperate, this includes involvement in evidence base work being prepared to inform the Council's approach.</p>
REF178	Councillors, East Retford South	<p>The Bassetlaw plan identifies a need of 10,013 new build homes across Bassetlaw by 2037. Of these, 1,802 are required to be built in Retford, 18% of the District's total. The Bassetlaw plan identifies employment sites which will bring 11,000 new jobs across Bassetlaw. Of these, 5 Ha of land (Trinity Farm) are identified in Retford, with a projected uplift of 280 jobs, 2.5% of the District's employment aspirations. There is an obvious disparity between the percentage increase in homes vs the percentage increase in jobs. It appears that the ambition for Retford is limited. Namely, to 'thrive as a well-established market town providing for the changing needs of local residents, rural communities, and visitors to the town.' [BDC Spatial Strategy: Retford] The results of our local survey show that employment opportunities are a top priority for residents, with 45.76% listing it as their highest priority when considering provision of services.</p>	<p>Policy ST8 covers the employment land required to meet needs for uses such as offices, general industry and storage and distribution. This is consistent with national policy. Overall Trinity Farm provides for 11.11 ha of land for employment/employment generating uses, 5 ha is for offices, general industry and storage and distribution. The rest will provide a range of additional jobs. A requirement of national policy is that employment land is identified to reflect market demands. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment 2020 identifies that, from discussions with local property agents that the demand for employment land in Retford identified by the Local Plan is broadly appropriate. On that basis, it would be difficult to demonstrate deliverability – a requirement of national policy. However, the Local Plan is supportive of town centre growth which can also support jobs growth and also protects 5 existing employment sites in Retford to help their future operation.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST8 - PROVISION OF LAND FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT			
REF211	National Trust	<p>Object to the proposed 118.7ha Strategic Employment Site in Part C of this policy. The 2019 Economic Development Needs Assessment showed no demonstrable need for this site. A new 2020 assessment assesses the number of jobs that the land supply could generate and how this in turn would affect population and housing growth. It should be noted that even under a growth model, the 2020 OE forecasts data suggests that only 84ha of land is needed in total (slightly higher than the 2019 figure of 63 ha) – see HEDNA 2020, paragraph 10.4. This has been boosted further by taking account of the completions trend, resulting in an aspirational need figure of 186.9ha. This figure should be viewed as an upper end target which is broadly met by the existing land supply (excluding Apleyhead) of 184.3ha. While the HEDNA states that Apleyhead exhibits the key attributes of a strategic employment site (e.g. strategic highway accessibility etc.), information in the report also reveals that in the absence of a Regional Spatial Strategy there is no other available evidence of need for such a strategic site in the region/sub-region. There is a risk that its allocation will impact on the delivery of allocated employment sites in the district and elsewhere and will inhibit regeneration of brownfield sites. Note that Sheffield City Region Authorities, in their responses to the Draft Local Plan 2019, have requested that the policy is amended to ensure that Apleyhead Junction does not accept proposals that could reasonably be accommodated on existing sites in other parts of South Yorkshire and D2N2 city regions. Bassetlaw has not responded positively to this suggestion. Bassetlaw's proposed approach to employment land has the effect of approximately doubling the housing requirement. With reference to the HEDNA, it is not clear that any of the criteria set out in Planning Practice Guidance for circumstances where higher housing growth figures should be set have been met. At a local level, both the excessive employment development and associated housing growth are likely to have ramifications for the environment including key environmental assets such as Clumber Park, as a result of air pollution, recreational pressure and cat predation – identified in Bassetlaw's Habitats Regulations Assessment. Other issues include loss of agricultural land and the closing of the undeveloped gap between settlements.</p>	<p>The Logistics Study evidences a need for logistics led sub-regional regional development along the A1/A57 corridors. The market requires larger sites; Apleyhead is considered to be an appropriate site to meet the specific demands of the logistics sector. The policy is clear that Apleyhead will be for a specific employment need, additional to that identified for the general employment sites, none of which can accommodate the scale of growth needed at sub-regional/regional level. The Local plan is promoting brownfield sites but these are not considered to be of a scale to address the specific sub-regional/regional requirements of the logistics sector. The Council has engaged positively with neighbouring authorities through Duty to Cooperate to progress this site. It is considered that the requirements of national policy and planning practice guidance have been demonstrated in the Local Plan's approach. The HRA considers that mitigation is achievable to address any potential impacts on air pollution and cat predation. A Recreational Impact Assessment is being undertaken to address potential recreational impacts – the National trust are a partner in that process. National policy does not prevent the development of agricultural land or land in the countryside.</p>
REF214	Historic England	Concerns in respect of the approach to the historic environment in relation to General Employment Site Allocation EM008 High Marnham Green Energy Hub and EM009 Bassetlaw Garden Village in addition to Strategic Employment Site SEM01 Apleyhead Junction.	Thank you for your comments.
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	<p>The location of these is very important. Large scale B8 facilities should be located either adjacent to a main arterial road or at least on a road network that leads straight to the A1 or M1. This will lessen their impact upon surrounding villages, towns and the road network. Ideal locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Harworth (existing and extended). - Blyth (existing and extended) - Ranby including Apleyhead junction but some on the Retford to Worksop road would be possible (Proposed in this draft plan). - Markham Moor. (Proposed in this comments document). <p>Other B2 uses may have a lesser impact upon residential properties and the road network and these could be located closer to existing conurbations thus feeding off the existing workforce location.</p>	Comments noted. The Local Plan allocates land alongside the A1/A57 where the sites have been identified as suitable, available and deliverable and are considered to be attractive to the market.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST8 - PROVISION OF LAND FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT			
REF188	Emery Planning on behalf of J.G.Pears Property Ltd.	<p>High Marnham Green Energy Hub is identified within both Policy ST8: Provision of Land for Employment Development and Policy ST9: EM008: High Marnham Green Energy Hub. Strongly support the identification of the site within the employment land policy, in recognition of the significant opportunities it offers to aid the economic prosperity of the District, and within its own allocation in order to ensure and focus its delivery.</p> <p>Support the reference at paragraph 6.1.17 (p58) to the "positive policy intervention" that Policy ST8 makes to ensure the regeneration of the former coal fired power station site at High Marnham and the acknowledgement that its closure directly affected employment in the rural area, and indirectly affected local supply chains. J G Pears are committed to facilitating the delivery of new specialised employment uses on this site and agree that this will be essential to support those local communities and the wider District, and make optimum use of this significant brownfield site in the longer term. J G Pears have already engaged with the Service Director of Investment and Growth and Nottinghamshire County Council and look forward to working together with the District and Country Councils as well as D2N2 and other stakeholders to see the comprehensive delivery of the site drawing significant inward investment to the area.</p>	Support noted and welcome.
REF224	Sheffield City Region	<p>Whilst supporting the Draft Plan's overall approach and much of the specific policies, it is also important to repeat some of the comments made by the LEP/MCA on strategic employment sites in February 2020. In particular, proposals for the Apleyhead site and the associated policies for this in the Draft Plan require further discussion. Whilst supporting this aspect of the Draft Plan in principle, there are some practical changes which could help to strengthen the way that the Apleyhead site is presented in Policy ST8 so that it more closely aligns with our priorities in South Yorkshire. Apleyhead has a potentially important role to play in helping to attract large scale inward investment to the benefit of South Yorkshire as well as D2N2. Implementation needs to be more carefully considered as the Plan develops. There are some important changes in emphasis to Policy ST8 between the previous and current draft of the Plan. The previous draft identified the strategic employment site at Apleyhead for logistics uses; whereas the current draft widens this to allow employment uses within any key sector identified in the D2N2 Local Industrial Strategy (LIS) – presumably sectors listed in the LIS like creative and digital, transport equipment manufacturing, visitor economy, transport and logistics, professional and scientific services, construction, and food and drink manufacturing. The evidence also suggests that new jobs at Apleyhead would rely on increased levels of commuting from outside of Bassetlaw, ie residents from South Yorkshire travelling to occupy these jobs. Given this, and the broader range of uses proposed for Apleyhead, must work together to ensure this site does not have a detrimental impact on economic development within other authorities as well as create unsustainable patterns of commuting. There is an opportunity to undertake further collaborative work so that can address cross boundary and strategic issues between Bassetlaw and South Yorkshire. This would benefit from all four South Yorkshire local authorities being involved and could add further detail to the Statement of Common Ground agreed by the MCA and other authorities in the wider city region (approved by the MCA in June 2020). This would also be in line with Paragraph 6.1.25 of the Draft Plan which explains how the Council is working collaboratively with neighbouring authorities, which is welcomed. Elected Members and officers from Bassetlaw District Council have played an active role in strategic cross boundary policy and project delivery at the SCR scale. This includes collaborating on issues relating to housing and planning, but also on transport, infrastructure, skills, and business investment and promotion. This is extremely valuable and provides a strong basis for us to continue to work together.</p>	<p>Through Duty to Cooperate the Council have worked with Sheffield City Region and the other South Yorkshire authorities to agree an evidence led approach to the progressing Apleyhead. The policy will be re-worded to be identified as a logistics site, that should not adversely impact upon the growth strategies of authorities in logistics property market area. This should address the concerns of the authorities. A draft Statement of Common Ground will be prepared with neighbouring authorities and SCR.</p>
REF198 Bevercotes	Gladman Developments	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework sets out four tests that must be met for Local Plans to be considered sound. In this regard, we submit that in order to prepare a sound plan it is fundamental that it is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positively Prepared – The Plan should be prepared on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development. • Justified – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on a proportionate evidence base. • Effective – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and • Consistent with National Policy – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework. <p>Duty to Cooperate The Duty to Cooperate is a legal requirement established through Section 33(A) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, as amended by Section 110 of the Localism Act. It requires local authorities to engage constructively,</p>	<p>Through Duty to Cooperate the Council have worked with SCR and the South Yorkshire authorities to agree an evidence led approach to the progressing Apleyhead. The Council has agreed draft Statements of Common Ground with SCR and neighbouring authorities. A Duty to Cooperate Compliance Statement was published alongside the November 2020 Plan. The Sustainability Appraisal is consistent with</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST8 - PROVISION OF LAND FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT			
		<p>actively and on an ongoing basis with neighbouring authorities on cross-boundary strategic issues throughout the process of Plan preparation. As demonstrated through the outcome of the 2012 Coventry Core Strategy Examination and the 2013 Mid Sussex Core Strategy Examination, if a Council fails to satisfactorily discharge its Duty to Cooperate, this cannot be rectified through modifications and an Inspector must recommend non-adoption of the Plan. Whilst Gladman recognises that the Duty to Cooperate is a process of ongoing engagement and collaboration, as set out in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) it is clear that it is intended to produce effective policies on cross-boundary strategic matters. In this regard, Bassetlaw District Council must be able to demonstrate that it has engaged and worked with neighbouring authorities, alongside their existing joint working arrangements, to satisfactorily address cross-boundary strategic issues, and the requirement to meet any unmet housing needs. This is not simply an issue of consultation but a question of effective cooperation. The revised Framework (2019) has introduced a number of significant changes to how local planning authorities are expected to cooperate including the preparation of Statement(s) of Common Ground (SoCG) which are required to demonstrate that a plan is based on effective cooperation and has been based on agreements made by neighbouring authorities where cross boundary strategic issues are likely to exist. The revised Framework (2019) sets out that local planning authorities should produce, maintain, and update one or more Statement(s) of Common Ground (SoCG), throughout the plan making process¹. The SoCG(s) should provide a written record of the progress made by the strategic planning authorities during the process of planning for strategic cross-boundary matters and will need to demonstrate the measures local authorities have taken to ensure cross boundary matters have been considered and what actions are required to ensure issues are proactively dealt with e.g. unmet housing needs. Sustainability Appraisal In accordance with Section 19 of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, policies set out in Local Plans must be subject to Sustainability Appraisal (SA). Incorporating the requirements of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, SA is a systematic process that should be undertaken at each stage of the Plan's preparation, assessing the effects of the Local Plan's proposals on sustainable development when judged against reasonable alternatives. Bassetlaw District Council should ensure that the results of the SA process clearly justify its policy choices. In meeting the development needs of the area, it should be clear from the results of the assessment why some policy options have been progressed, and others have been rejected. Undertaking a comparative and equal assessment of each reasonable alternative, Bassetlaw Local Plan's decision-making and scoring should be robust, justified and transparent. On 24th July 2018, MHCLG published the Revised National Planning Policy Framework which was subsequently updated in February 2019. These publications form the first revisions of the Framework since 2012 and implement changes that have been informed through the Housing White Paper, The Planning for the Right Homes in the Right Places consultation and the draft Revised Framework consultation. The revised Framework (2019) introduces a number of major changes to national policy and provides further clarification to national planning policy as well as new measures on a range of matters. Crucially, the changes to national policy reaffirm the Government's commitment to ensuring up-to-date plans are in place which provide a positive vision for the areas which they are responsible for to address the housing, economic, social and environmental priorities to help shape future local communities for future generations. In particular, paragraph 16 of the Revised Framework (2019) states that Plans should: "a) Be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development; b) Be prepared positively, in a way that is aspirational but deliverable; c) Be shaped by early, proportionate and effective engagement between plan-makers and communities, local organisations, businesses, infrastructure providers and operators and statutory consultees; d) Contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals; e) Be accessible through the use of digital tools to assist public involvement and policy presentation; and f) Serve a clear purpose, avoiding unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area (including policies in this Framework, where relevant)." A central feature of the NPPF is the need for local plans to support the building of a strong, competitive economy. Paragraphs 81 and 82 of the NPPF indicate that planning policies should: "81. a) set out a clear economic vision and strategy which positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth, having regard to Local Industrial Strategies and other local policies for economic development and regeneration; b) set criteria, or identify strategic sites, for local and inward investment to match the strategy and to meet anticipated needs over the plan period; c) seek to address potential barriers to investment, such as inadequate infrastructure, services or housing, or a poor environment; and d) be flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the plan, allow for new and flexible working practices (such as live-work accommodation), and to enable a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances. 82. Planning policies and decisions should recognise and address the specific locational requirements of different sectors. This includes making provision for clusters or networks of knowledge and data-driven, creative or high technology industries; and for storage and distribution operations at a variety of scales and in suitably accessible locations." With regard to housing, to support the Government's continued objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that the Local Plan provides a sufficient amount and variety of land that can be brought forward, without delay, to meet housing needs. In determining the minimum number of homes needed, strategic plans should be based upon a local housing needs assessment defined using the standard method, unless there are exceptional circumstances to justify an alternative approach. Once the</p>	<p>national legislation and includes an assessment of policy options and reasonable alternatives. The Local Plan is consistent with national policy and identifies a significant housing supply, with appropriate buffer to maintain a rolling 5 year supply over the plan period. The Council is fully informed about changes to national planning legislation and planning reforms and potential impacts for the plan-making process.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST8 - PROVISION OF LAND FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT			
		<p>minimum number of homes that are required is identified, the strategic planning authority should have a clear understanding of the land available in their area through the preparation of a strategic housing land availability assessment. In this regard, paragraph 67 sets out specific guidance that local planning authorities should take into account when identifying and meeting their housing needs. It states: "Strategic policy-making authorities should have a clear understanding of the land available in their area through the preparation of a strategic housing land availability assessment. From this, planning policies should identify a sufficient supply and mix of sites, taking into account their availability, suitability and likely economic viability. Planning policies should identify a supply of: a) specific, deliverable sites for years one to five of the plan period; and b) specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth, for years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-15 of the plan." Annex 2 of the Framework (2019) provides updated definitions for the terms "deliverable" and "developable". These are defined as: 'To be considered deliverable, sites for housing should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years. In particular: a) Sites which do not involve major development and have planning permission, and all sites with detailed planning permission, should be considered deliverable until permission expires, unless there is clear evidence that homes will not be delivered within five years (for example because they are no longer viable, there is no longer a demand for the type of units or sites have long term phasing plans). b) Where a site has outline planning permission for major development, has been allocated in a development plan, has a grant of permission in principle, or is identified on a brownfield register, it should only be considered deliverable where there is clear evidence that housing completions will begin on site within five years.' 'To be considered developable, sites should be in a suitable location for housing development with a reasonable prospect that they will be available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged.' Once a local planning authority has identified its housing needs, these needs should be met as a minimum, unless any adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of doing so. This includes considering the application of policies such as giving consideration as to whether or not these provide a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type and distribution of development (paragraph 11b(i)). Where it is found that full delivery of housing needs cannot be achieved (owing to conflict with specific policies of the NPPF), Local Authorities are required to engage with their neighbours to ensure that identified housing needs can be met in full (see Paragraph 35 of the NPPF 2019). The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) was published by the Government to provide clarity on how specific elements of the NPPF should be interpreted. The PPG has been updated to reflect the changes introduced by the revised NPPF to national planning policy. The most significant changes to the PPG relate to defining housing need, housing supply and housing delivery performance. In terms of economic development, The PPG continues to require strategic policy-making authorities to prepare a robust evidence base to understand existing business needs, which will need to be kept under review to reflect local circumstances and market conditions. Thorough consideration must also be given to the specific locational requirements of specialist or new sectors that have the ability to drive the economic prospects of the areas in which they locate. With regard to housing, The Standard Method was introduced by the Government to simplify the process of defining housing need, and avoid significant delay and debate experienced in plan preparation and at planning appeals. Revisions to the PPG, 20th February 2019 confirmed the need for local planning authorities to use the 2014-household projections as the starting point for the assessment of housing need under the standard method. The most significant of these updates was the confirmation of the need for local planning authorities to use the 2014-household projections as the starting point for the assessment of housing need under the standard method. It is vital to consider the economic impact of COVID-19 and the long-term role that housing will play in supporting the recovery of the economy, both locally and nationally. Encourage Bassetlaw to fully consider the merits of planning for a housing figure beyond the minimum requirement of 288 dwellings per annum. An increased housing figure would enable Bassetlaw to capture a larger proportion of the £7 billion yearly housebuilder contributions. With 218,000 homes predicted not to be built due to COVID-19 from now to 2024/255, it is imperative that Bassetlaw Local Plan identifies sufficient land to support the delivery of homes. In order for the housing needs for the whole plan period to be met, it will also be essential to provide sufficient headroom within the housing supply. Supports the Home Builders Federation's recommendation that local plan should seek to identify sufficient deliverable sites to provide a 20% buffer between the housing requirement and supply. Planning for the Future – White Paper, 6th August 2020, set out proposals for how it is seeking to 'radically reform' the planning system. The proposals are seeking to streamline and modernise the planning process. This consultation regarding these proposals closed on the 29th October. It will be important that the Council keeps abreast with the implementation of these changes to determine any potential implications for the Local Plan. The White Paper reiterated the role of planning in supporting economic recovery following the Covid-19 outbreak and the importance of supporting local opportunities for economic growth and job creation. Timescales remain uncertain, subject to the outcomes of this process the Government has signalled its intent to make rapid progress toward this new planning system through the swift introduction of new legislation to implement the changes. Further consultation on immediate changes to the current planning system closed on 1 October 2020 - proposed revised standard method for calculating local housing need, which proposed to incorporate a percentage of existing stock as the baseline of the calculation. In December 2020 the Government published</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST8 - PROVISION OF LAND FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT			
		<p>their response to the 'Changes to the Current Planning System' provides an overview of the consultation responses before highlighting that it has been deemed that the most appropriate approach is to retain the Standard Method in the current form with an additional 35% uplift to the 'post-cap number' for 20 local authorities. The Government's rationale behind this approach is to increase homebuilding in existing urban areas to make the most of previously developed brownfield land over and above that in the existing standard method. The latest correspondence from Government regarding the revisions to the Standard Method for calculating local housing need will not affect the minimum local housing need which Bassetlaw should Plan for. It is vital that the Council keeps in touch with the implementation of changes deriving from the White Paper consultation to determine any potential implications for the Local Plan.</p>	
REF198	Gladman Developments Ltd	<p>Promoting the former Bevercotes Colliery site through the local plan making process. The emerging Plan's consideration of the site to date has been focussed on its potential development as a Garden Village, notwithstanding the judgements reached to date, the plan making process should actively consider alternative options for the future of the site, focussing on its significant economic development and regeneration potential. It will be important for the plan making process to fully consider the specific locational requirements of different sectors and the ability of this specific location to accommodate businesses with specific locational needs. The regeneration potential of the site should be supported through a positive and proactive approach within the Local Plan that fully recognises its ability to support the sustainable economic growth of the area. These provide details outlining the site's development potential for the delivery of a new, green economy enterprise zone comprising of a state of the art sugar beet processing facility, waste to energy facility, educational centre and electric service station, with supporting leisure and recreational features. Further information is set out in the appended Vision Document. Supportive of the Council's vision and objectives which provide a positive and proactive approach to future development in Bassetlaw over the plan period to 2037. Supportive of the positive approach to new growth, which sees the Council make provision for new homes above that required by the Standard Method to help achieve the District's economic objectives. Strategic Objectives 3 and 4 set out the intention of the Plan to encourage and support sustainable economic growth and support sensitive regeneration of previously developed, vacant or underused sites and spaces within urban and rural Bassetlaw. Strategic Objective 14 states that new settlements and development contribute to the provision of necessary infrastructure to deliver growth. The Bevercotes Colliery site has been identified by the Council as having the potential to accommodate a garden village community, together with Gamston Airfield and its potential allocation for this purpose has been tested through the emerging Plan's Sustainability Appraisal. The site remains an existing employment site with extant planning permission for its redevelopment for B2 and B8 uses (reference: 09/05/00002). The current iteration of the Plan is now silent on Bevercotes Colliery. It is important that the full potential of the site to support economic development and regeneration is recognised through the plan making process and as such, the sites suitability, availability and achievability for a range of employment uses should also be given pro-active consideration. The strategic objectives of the Plan, principally SO3 and SO4, highlight the need to prioritise development on previously developed land that is capable of sensitively regenerating Bassetlaw and stimulating sustainable economic growth. The land at Bevercotes Colliery can help the Council achieve its strategic objectives and the site should be identified as an additional Priority Regeneration Area. Land at Bevercotes Colliery can also be bought forward in a manner to meet the intentions of SO14. The Council are aware through on-going engagement and previous representations, that land at Bevercotes Colliery predominantly comprises previously developed land thereby offering the sustainability advantages of turning previously developed land back into use – a key objective for the Council. The site has extant planning permission (09/05/00002) for employment which demonstrates the principle of development in this location and that there is the ability to bring forward a sustainable form of development at the site. Bevercotes Colliery site should be included in the Plan as a Priority Regeneration Area and an aspirational location to regenerate previously development land while allowing for relevant conditions to be complied with. It is evident that the site offers the opportunity to provide flexibility to the Council's future needs with its ability to support employment proposals. The Local Plan evidence base has not thoroughly assessed the site for economic and employment purposes. Bevercotes Colliery site is a long-standing, historic site of employment and now offers the opportunity to provide a range of business uses including B(8) and aligned B(2) uses which meet the requirements of the Framework to drive economic development and regeneration while recognising the differing locational requirements of different sectors. Bevercotes Colliery should be recognised for its ability to deliver employment uses across the footprint of the existing extant planning permission allowing for the effective use of land in meeting employment purposes on brownfield land while safeguarding and enabling the improvement of the surrounding environment.</p> <p>Including Bevercotes Colliery as an aspirational Priority Regeneration Area, which does not contribute to meeting specifically defined development needs of the District, while setting conditions which recognise the site's unique set of circumstances would support the Council's objective of regenerating brownfield sites while safeguarding any potential ecology that may exist. Indeed, the site's location and challenging brownfield characteristics provide significant opportunities for the region to deliver a pioneering green economy at the heart</p>	Bevercotes has planning permission for employment land. The Council supports the development of the site for the consented use. It is considered that the planning permission for the site enables the positive re-use of brownfield land and the site's regeneration. Ongoing discussions have been had with the site promoters in relation to the development of this site.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST8 - PROVISION OF LAND FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT			
		<p>of the Government's ambition to 'Build Back Greener'. Policy ST8: seeks to deliver the Council's strategy for economic growth and investment through ensuring an attractive and flexible supply of employment land is available in the District. Reiterate that the recognition of Bevercotes Colliery in the Plan as an additional Priority Regeneration Area aligns with the overall Strategic Objectives of the Plan and the ambitions of Policy ST8. Bevercotes Colliery is a long-standing employment location and has the ability to form a comprehensive employment area including B(8) and aligned B(2) uses, as demonstrated through the extant planning permission on the 80.94 hectare site and the wider market interest in the vision document. The site has a unique set of circumstances, including boundary tree cover at 25 metres, allowing for the sensitive setting of development within the surrounding landscape and also benefits from its location less than 1km from the strategic A1 corridor. Continues to represent an excellent location for strategic employment development that requires acknowledgement within the policies of the plan.</p>	
REF117	Barton Wilmore on behalf of land owners	<p>Chapter 6 of the Local Plan seeks to promote economic growth across the District and set out policies to encourage economic development over the plan period. Policy ST8 identifies sites capable of accommodating significant economic growth over the plan period. The 2019 EDNA recognises the need for further land to support strategic manufacturing and distribution sectors, and Bassetlaw benefits from its strategic highways within the A1 and A57 corridors and proximity to the M1. Support the Council's approach to strategic employment growth across the district and support the strategic employment allocation for EM007 to the south of Snape Lane in Harworth. Harworth is identified as an employment growth area and the EM007 allocation for 80.9ha of B2 and B8 uses will generate considerable economic and employment growth within the District. Welcome this allocation as a strategic employment site and emphasise the role of our Client's site for driving forward economic growth and employment opportunities in Harworth and the District as a whole. Land at Snape Lane, Harworth (Policy ST8 & Site EM007) has been promoted for development for c81ha of employment land since the inception of the Local Plan. Outline planning permission (15/00971/OUT) was granted on 14th March 2017 for 235,000 sqm of employment development (Use Class B1, B2, B8 and ancillary development) to form a new strategic employment site. The permission has a lifespan of 10 years and helps underpin a step change in the fortunes of Harworth Bircotes in economic growth terms. A S.73 Planning Application (19/00886/VOC) to amend the site layout, to aid the delivery of the Site through establishing development platforms to accommodate large buildings was supported on 6th November 2019. This application is subject to the completion of a S.106. This site is at a very advanced stage and the allocation in the draft Local Plan reflects the status of this land as a committed employment site.</p>	Support noted and welcome.
REF177	Axised on behalf of FCC Environment	<p>Policy ST8 seeks to deliver the Council's strategy for economic prosperity and inward investment. To support job growth and upskilling of residents, sustainable economic growth will be directed to General Employment Sites and a Strategic Employment Site as identified on the Policies Map. Part B of the policy provides details of General Employment Sites which are made up of those sites with planning permission and site allocations. The total amount of available employment land is 168.6 hectares. FCC's comments to the January 2020 draft Local Plan questioned why their site was not included under Policy ST6. The Council has responded to these comments by stating: "Planning permission exists for part of the site and an occupier is in place to develop the remainder in 2022. On that basis, there is no need to allocate the site a tenant is lined up to occupy. Therefore there is no need to allocate this land. The planning permission and development management process is addressing the needs of the site." It is correct that planning permission exists for part of the site, it is not clear from the Council's response why some sites with planning permission are allocated as General Employment Sites under Policy ST8, and others, such as FCC's site are not. FCC's site forms a logical extension to the existing employment site EES10 Carlton Forest and would deliver in the region of 135-300 jobs depending on the final use. FCC's site could contribute to the Council's existing supply of employment sites and should be identified within this policy. It is considered that this inconsistent approach to the allocation of sites with planning permission represents a failing of the plan as it is not justified. The approved development on the site clearly demonstrates that the site is sustainably located to deliver employment development within the Plan period. In accordance with paragraph 35 of the NPPF, the Plan must be positively prepared and should provide a strategy which as a minimum seeks to meet the area's needs. Policy ST1 confirms the provision of at least 168ha of general employment land should be delivered over the Plan period to accommodate local employment growth. This is not a maximum target and assumes that additional employment development could come forward in appropriate locations over and above the determined employment need; whilst FCC contend that the entire 8 hectare site should be allocated for employment uses, as a very minimum the parcel of land with planning permission should be included within Policy ST8.</p>	The site is identified as an Existing Employment Site in the Local Plan where new or additional development would be supported. The general employment sites have been identified based on a range of evidence base documents and informed by evidence of market demand. The majority of the site is identified as a Local Wildlife Site which is afforded protection by the NPPF. Its allocation for employment would be contrary to national policy.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST8 - PROVISION OF LAND FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT			
REF225	Sheffield City Council	<p>The Bassetlaw draft local plan proposes to allocate more employment land than has been previously agreed at city region level, which would potentially have a negative impact on economic development in other Sheffield City Region authorities and the region as a whole. Previously objected to this approach (Bassetlaw consultation Jan/Feb 2020) as a city region and jointly with the other South Yorkshire authorities, but the latest version of the Bassetlaw Plan fails to take account of these objection. SCC commented on an earlier Regulation 18 consultation on the Bassetlaw Plan published in January 2020 as part of a Sheffield City Region (SCR) Combined Mayoral Authority response. That was endorsed by the City Region and all four South Yorkshire authorities. This response was approved at the time by the Interim Head of Planning and the Cabinet Member for Transport and Development. The main concerns we had with the previous draft related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the amount of land for employment uses proposed in the Plan and the fact that this level was too high and not justified, so represented an over-allocation of land. • concerns regarding one specific proposed strategic site allocation that we understood was included in order to meet a potential demand for a large inward investment opportunity. Did not necessarily object in principle to such an allocation, considered that there were insufficient controls on the type of development that could take place on that site to ensure it would deliver this specific type of investment. Concerned the way the allocation was presented and supported in the Plan and how it was proposed to deliver the site. Unfortunately, these concerns have not been addressed in the latest version of the Plan so we, the SCR and other South Yorkshire authorities are again making representations expressing these same objections. A potential over provision of employment land could jeopardise the aims of our and other local plans in the city region to deliver sufficient employment land to meet individual authorities' needs. Sheffield and the other SCR districts are proposing to allocate sufficient employment land to meet our own identified needs and not seek to provide additional land, unlike the Bassetlaw Plan. If one district provides for significantly more employment land than has been calculated to be needed, this will create an element of additional 'competition' between individual local authorities for new investment, with one authority having an unfair competitive advantage by nature of a wider offer, or portfolio, of land and sites than other areas. The Bassetlaw Plan could create a greater level of investment opportunities at the expense of other areas. One of the roles of city regions is to ensure that individual areas operate in a strategic, coordinated way to ensure maximum benefits for the region as a whole. This is delivered through Statements of Common Ground, and Bassetlaw will be failing to adhere to this approach with the draft Plan as proposed. The previous combined response suggested amendments to proposed policies and allocations to address these issues and ensure an approach that met both local and city region needs. Given the failure to address these concerns are again proposing an amendment to the policy wording that has been agreed with the other three South Yorkshire authorities. Have some very general and brief comments relating to housing and transport. These do not raise any strategic issues for us and our comments are therefore supportive of the approach. Given the above Sheffield City Council formally objects to elements of the draft Bassetlaw Plan as it is currently worded and suggest an alternative approach, as set out in detail below. Understand that the city region and the other 3 South Yorkshire authorities will be making responses on the draft Plan in line with our comments below and will suggest changes identical to our suggested rewording of Policy ST8. 	Through Duty to Cooperate the Council have worked with Sheffield and the other South Yorkshire authorities to agree an evidence led approach to the progressing Apleyhead. The policy will be re-worded to be identified as a logistics site, that should not adversely impact upon the growth strategies of authorities in logistics property market area. This should address the concerns of the authorities. A draft Statement of Common Ground will be prepared with neighbouring authorities.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST8 - PROVISION OF LAND FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT			
REF225	Sheffield City Council	<p>Policy ST8 B – General Employment Sites point out again the supply of 168 hectares is 100 hectares more than the identified need of 68 hectares representing an over-supply of 100 hectares or 147%, contrary to the agreed Statement of Common Ground. C. Strategic Employment Site The need should be a regional one, assuming Sheffield City Region is classed as a region including Bassetlaw. “Sub-regional” does not appear to have been defined, so it is not an appropriate term. We suggest that the words “sub-regional and/or” are deleted and question whether “national” should be included to reflect the supporting text in 6.1.20. The wording of the policy should be strengthened to make sure the specific development requirements of the site are met, by changing “should” to “will be required to”. The National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 82 states that planning policies should recognise and address the specific locational requirements of different sectors including logistics. National Planning Practice Guidance on Housing and Economic Needs Assessments (Paragraph: 031 Reference ID: 2a-031-20190722) states that where such a need for strategic facilities exist, strategic policy making authorities should collaborate with other authorities to identify the scale of need across relevant market areas. This process has not been undertaken either regionally or for the Bassetlaw Local Plan. The SCR Strategic Employment Land Appraisal Summary Report (May 2020) (submitted to the SCR Infrastructure Board on 2nd July 2020) states that collaborative work on logistics should be undertaken in the future. This work has yet to take place and it is considered that the allocation of the site and its regional importance is a duty to cooperate issue and should be addressed as one. Regional work on this issue would also address if there is justification/need for a regional site. The recent consultation on Issues and Options for a draft Sheffield Local Plan discussions on this issue took place and there was agreement with the SCR and the adjoining LPAs that a city region-wide assessment of logistics needs should be produced. The South Yorkshire authorities would welcome the opportunity for engagement on these issues at the earliest opportunity. Should the site be retained for allocation, to meet demand for logistics outside of Sheffield that could be wholly or partly accommodated on the site (although this has yet to be determined), this should also be reflected in the wording of policy ST8. The requirement in C1 should be changed from “key sectors identified by the D2N2 LEP Local Industrial Strategy” to “the logistics sector”. So that the policy does not lead to a further over-supply of employment land in the district and draw demand away from nearby areas, further clauses should be added to the policy that any development on the site should not adversely impact upon the economic growth strategies of the District or any other authority and should not compromise viability or deliverability of Local Plans adopted by other authorities within D2N2 or the Sheffield City Region. Our understanding is that the original (and main) reason to allocate this site is to meet a potential major inward investment opportunity that would otherwise be lost to the region due to the lack of a suitable site, there should also be a requirement for any development to be capable of accommodation only on this site and nowhere else in the region. Should the site remain proposed for allocation then the proposed changes in red are required:</p> <p>C. To develop the role of the A57/A1 growth corridor the development of a strategic employment site, SEM01: Apleyhead Junction (118.7ha) will be allocated to accommodate regional employment growth in accordance with Policy ST10. Development will be required to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. provide E(g)/B2/B8 employment functions connected with the logistics sector; 2. demonstrate D2N2 LEP support for delivery; 3. be supportive of the role of key urban centres, such as Worksop; 4. have the ability to deliver significant economic development benefits in terms of development value and gross value added for the District, D2N2 and Sheffield City Region; 5. not adversely impact upon the economic growth strategies of the District or any other authority; 6. not compromise the viability or deliverability of other employment allocations identified by this Plan or in Local Plans adopted by other authorities within D2N2 or the Sheffield City Region; 7. demonstrate that, in the case of a major inward investment, the needs of the business cannot be reasonably met on allocated employment land within either D2N2 or Sheffield City Region; 8. be satisfactorily accommodated by critical infrastructure, in terms of capacity and timescales associated with investment works; 9. have good access to key strategic transport routes; 10. provide a significant number of new permanent jobs including skilled employment. 	<p>The District has a strong employment land supply, the majority of the employment allocations have planning permission. The latest evidence in the Logistics Study shows that the employment need has increased to 84ha, it is appropriate and consistent with national policy to over-allocate to provide flexibility and choice to the market. Through Duty to Cooperate the Council have worked with SCR and the South Yorkshire authorities to agree an evidence led approach to the progressing Apleyhead. The policy will be re-worded to be identified as a logistics led site, that should not adversely impact upon the growth strategies of authorities in the general employment FEMA or the logistics property market area. The Council has agreed draft Statements of Common Ground with SCR and neighbouring authorities.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST8 - PROVISION OF LAND FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT			
REF209 Apleyhead	NJL Consulting on behalf of Caddick	<p>Welcome the revised local plan which combines the previous Policy ST6 and Policy ST8 into a single new Policy ST8, as this clearly explains the proposed economic growth and employment development strategy. Concerned the wording of ST8, which is fundamentally an overarching employment land policy, is overly prescriptive and includes unnecessary detail which should be amended and moved to policy ST10. Without the amendments below would object to ST8. Inconsistencies remain between Policy ST1 and Policy ST8. For example, ST1 refers to strategic employment sites as ones which can support 'future significant indigenous employment growth and/or strategic employment needs'. Yet Policy ST8 refers to Apleyhead Junction being 'allocated to accommodate sub-regional and/or regional employment growth in accordance with Policy ST10'. Consider that ST8 should be revised to mirror the terminology of ST1 in order to reflect the types of uses and investment which can be realised on the site. The different terminology creates potentially avoidable policy tensions. As we detailed previously, to deliver the Local Plan vision in full and particularly the 11,200 additional jobs target (i.e., a step change in growth and investment in the district) all allocations within the plan must be delivered – both strategic and non-strategic. ST8 should not inadvertently create barriers to the delivery of Apleyhead Junction as a key site. Following on from the amendments to ST1 in respect of the overall employment land target, ST8 should be amended to include Apleyhead Junction in the group of employment sites needed to deliver the stated growth ambitions. If the local authority required further detail on the relevance of Apleyhead Junction as a major employment site this detail could be included in Part C of the policy as amended below. ST8 can be further simplified to only deal with key overarching employment land matters and not include criteria based assessments (as are included in ST8 part C) which are better placed in the site specific policy (ST10). Logical to include Apleyhead Junction into the general sites list (as Site EM010: Apleyhead Junction), with the detailed policy requirements in ST10 then updated accordingly to address both key principles and detailed policies. This creates a policy (ST8) which deals with the list of employment sites and defers the criteria for each site to the site specific policies. Suggest the following wording to Policy ST8:</p> <p>B. Employment Sites The following Employment Sites will support the delivery of economic growth: Apleyhead Junction added to the sites list, as Site EM010. Apleyhead Junction major employment site C. To develop the role of the A57/A1 growth corridor as a strategically important location, the Apleyhead Junction site (Site EM010) will be allocated as a major employment site enable future major local employment growth and/or significant indigenous employment growth and/or strategic employment needs within and beyond Bassetlaw's boundary in accordance with Policy ST1. (note: the criteria from ST8 are moved to ST10)</p>	The policy will be re-worded to ensure consistency across the Plan and to better reflect the approach being taken to the site through the Local Plan. Apleyhead is considered as a strategic employment site, so is therefore additional to the general employment needs of the District.
REF204	Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning consultant on behalf of land owner	<p>Lodged objections to this policy on behalf of our Client at the previous consultation stage. The policy remains unchanged and our objection is repeated. Continue to object to the non-allocation of our Client's land as identified and for the reasons set out in our letter of 26th February 2020 and appendices. Seek a more generous policy for the development of land for business purposes outside areas defined in the Plan where there are no overriding technical or environmental objections – also as set out in our letter. This would be consistent with the NPPF which confirms that all forms of business are acceptable in rural areas (subject to the specially protected areas identified in the Framework).</p> <p>The draft Plan aspires to encourage economic growth: "To make a real step change in economicconditions in the District" (paragraph 1.5.1). This approach is supported. The Plan also notes, (paragraph 3.5) the continuing growth of the logistics sector, with market interest "evidenced" along the A1 corridor in particular. The Council-approved commercial development known as Symmetry Park, is an acknowledged response to this interest. It is understood that the developers intended to develop the site speculatively – that is, the developers were aware of and responded to market forces but that the initial commitment to the site was made with no end users in place, thus emphasising the strength of these pressures. Reviewed the draft Plan proposals for employment development and suggest that the number, size, type and distribution of employment areas is inadequate to meet the Council's over-arching aspirations in two main respects. Whilst the emerging Local Plan correctly notes the attractiveness to employment developers of sites close to main transport links (and the A1 corridor is mentioned) and identifies a need to attract footloose businesses, the range of sites proposed for employment development does not respond to either of these factors. Footloose businesses by their very nature can pick and choose between sites to achieve their optimum location. If suitable sites in one area are not available, the businesses simply locate in areas where they are. This suggests a need to allocate as wider a choice of sites as possible consistent with other Local Plan objectives. Paragraph 5.1.57 notes the potential for economic growth above that provided for in the Local Plan with particular reference to strategic logistics growth (i.e. growth related to the transport and distribution sectors) and, at paragraph 5.1.58, notes the increasing prominence of the A1 corridor. The location</p>	<p>The rural policy is considered to address the points raised. The site was considered in the Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>The site was identified as having largely negative effects with regards to a higher number of the SA objectives</p> <p>It was therefore determined that it was not a preferred option for taking forward for allocation when compared to other alternatives.</p> <p>The SA assessment considered that although the site is located close to the A1, it is isolated and poorly located in relation to the local labour supply. In addition, no significant housing growth is being proposed in the area to support a large allocation for employment.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST8 - PROVISION OF LAND FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT			
		<p>of a proposed new settlement in the draft Plan reflects the importance of the A1 corridor and no issue is taken with the strategic approach to meeting a significant proportion of the District's housing and employment needs in a new settlement. If the new settlement is to be a truly sustainable and integrated community rather than a series of separate housing and employment sites, the lead time to deliver the concept will be considerable. Section 5.3 of the Local Plan which describes the new settlement – the Bassetlaw Garden Village – fully recognises this is a long term proposal which will involve development beyond the current Plan period: that proposals are at a very early stage. The Plan confirms the highly accessible location of the proposed new settlement (paragraph 5.3.14). In strategic locational terms, the site of the new settlement is no more accessible than the area surrounding the Markham Moor interchange. Given the long lead time the new settlement achieves the sustainability credentials required by Local Plan policy, the Local Plan needs to provide for what might be termed "opportunity sites" either by specific additional allocations or by introducing greater flexibility within Policy ST1(B)(2)(d) to bridge the gap. Within the rural areas (as the draft Plan notes, comprise the majority of Bassetlaw District), linkages between sites and settlements should be recognised where the links are supported by viable public transport or where additional development along established public transport routes could safeguard and/or enhance public transport services. The Plan as currently drafted fails to do this. Object to Policy ST1A which is over-restrictive. The policy should read: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy will focus on delivering sustainable development and growth which in the main will follow the hierarchy set out below and be appropriate to the size of each settlement that meets the evidence need..... (or words to that effect) Policy ST6A and B should be amended to include the site which is the subject of these representations. Alternatively, Policy ST10B (1-3) should be amended to permit new employment development outside the allocated employment sites either where (as currently drafted) there are no significant adverse impacts or (to be added) where adverse impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated. The land edged red on Drawing No. JJ/15/01 should be allocated for employment development with preference to developments which maximise the excellent transport links offered by the location. The site is available and there are no ownership or technical constraints to development. Access is available from the adjacent motorway service area at the points asterisked on Drawing No. JJ/15/01 and could be provided direct from the A57 road. As to the suitability of the location, will be aware of the significant commercial developments which have taken place around the former "Markham Moor roundabout" during the last 30 years or so, precisely as a consequence of its pivotal location adjacent to a key element of the national highway network. Developments have included a busy truck stop and lorry park, the redevelopment of a former petrol filling station, the development of a significant motorway service area, the development of a new employment site on the A638 approach to the interchange and major highway works to improve capacity and safety on the A1 and to improve access to and egress from the A1 for cross-country traffic at what is now a major transport node. Some of these developments were carried out pre-2000 with the major highway works being completed in the mid 2000s. Somewhat less commercial development has taken place since then, as shown on the attached Google images of 2000, 2010 and 2017. The reasons for constraining employment growth at Markham Moor, in contrast with other transport nodes along the A1 where commercial development has been encouraged, are unclear. The need to pursue sustainable patterns of development is understood, Markham Moor interchange is no – or not significantly – further from centres of population than other greenfield sites which have been developed in the interim or which are proposed for development in the emerging Local Plan. The proposed employment site is accessible by public transport from Retford and Newark and from intervening settlements including the market town of Tuxford. The bus service is hourly from early morning to early evening at times suitable for journeys to and from work, including Saturdays. Development as proposed would support the continuation of this service which would provide journey to work times well within normal parameters for rural areas (20-40 minutes from, respectively, Retford and Newark – correspondingly less from intervening villages). The site is not identified in the emerging Local Plan as being subject to any environmental constraints and does not lie within an area at risk from flooding. It is large enough to offer a range of plot sizes to suit developers' requirements within a pleasant landscaped setting. In this connection, the draft Plan foreshadows the requirements of the imminent Environment Act which require development proposals to provide net gains for biodiversity. It is relevant to note that the owner of the site owns other land in the immediate vicinity of Markham Moor interchange including land defined as a Local Wildlife Site (edged blue on the attached plan). The current ecological value of the Local Wildlife Site is limited to its boundary vegetation although the site itself retains remnants of ridge and furrow. The reason for its description as a wildlife site is entirely unclear. The blue edged area could be made available for any biodiversity offsetting needed to meet the requirements of the Environment Bill – soon to be – Act in connection with the development of the red-edged area, to be managed for 30 years as required by the imminent legislation. Part of the (blue edged) site could be retained at ridge and furrow, boundary vegetation retained, enhanced and managed with the balance laid out and managed to increase/enhance biodiversity. Public access could be provided via a new footpath within the red-edged area to link with the existing public footpath shown running between Points A and B on Drawing No. JJ/15/01 and/or from the motorway service station to the west. My Client confirms her undertaking to make the blue-edged area available as described above in the event the area edged red is allocated for employment development. This would be secured by a S106 Agreement. Other land</p>	<p>The Bassetlaw Site Allocations Landscape Assessment identifies that due to the site's rise in topography, development here could negatively impact the local landscape character of the area.</p> <p>Significant negative effects were also identified for biodiversity. Cliff Gate Grassland Local Wildlife Site is within the site option and Beacon Hill Grassland is adjacent to the site.</p> <p>Significant negative effects for land and soil (loss of Grade 2 and 3 agricultural land).</p> <p>The majority of this site is within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.</p> <p>The site is also located within the setting of several listed buildings, including Markham Moor Hotel, Markham Moor House and the Milestone (all Grade II) and development could harm the settings of these.</p> <p>The site lies close to shrunken medieval settlement of West Markham, a Scheduled Monument.</p> <p>The majority of this site is within Mid-Nottinghamshire Farmlands Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone MN11 and is classified for conserve and reinforce.</p> <p>The Submission Local Plan allocates over 287 ha of employment land which the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment 2020 has assessed as the needs of the District to 2037. The Local Plan allocates a range of sites capable of meeting the need of a range of business in locations close to the Main Towns and along the A1/A57 growth corridors.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST8 - PROVISION OF LAND FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT			
		<p>in the same ownership is available for any required biodiversity off-setting if for any reason the blue edged area is considered unsuitable for this purpose. The area including and surrounding the proposed employment site is not identified in the draft Plan as an area of particular landscape sensitivity and parts of the site – particularly the rising land to the east – are visible from the A1, much of the site is already well screened from the A1 and A57 roads by the site's boundary hedgerows. Considerable additional planting was carried out along the south side of the A57 road in the vicinity of the site and along the northern margin of the A1 east of the interchange as part of the highway improvement works. In a short time, this planting will enclose views of the site from surrounding roads and, with one exception, from all public vantage points. Internal site landscaping and careful siting of buildings can mitigate much of the impact of any employment development from the public footpath (A-B on the plan) to the east. Inclusion of the red-edged site as an employment allocation in the Local Plan would support the economic growth aspirations of the Council, would not undermine the overarching spatial strategy, would support local public transport, would provide ecological and public access benefits and accordingly is worthy of support.</p>	
REF184	Doncaster Council	<p>There remain concerns around Duty to Cooperate and the absence of a Statement of Common Ground that covers detailed issues relating to the Local Plan. Reliance on the SCR Statement of Common Ground is considered insufficient in respect of the strategic employment policy ST8. The draft plan recognises at paragraph 5.1.17 that the Council will work with neighbouring authorities to undertake additional work to further consider the impacts of the strategic employment site, no discussions or Duty to Co-operate engagement has been undertaken on this matter following the concerns expressed in relation to the January 2020 draft. NPPF (para 82) states that planning policies should recognise and address the specific locational requirements of different sectors including logistics. The NPPG on Housing and Economic Needs Assessment (Paragraph: 031 Reference ID: 2a-031-20190722) states that where such a need for strategic facilities exist, strategic policy making authorities should collaborate with other authorities to identify the scale of need across relevant market areas. This process has not been undertaken either regionally or for the Bassetlaw Local Plan. The SCR Strategic Employment Land Appraisal Summary Report (May 2020) (which went to the SCR Infrastructure Board on 2nd July 2020) states that collaborative work on logistics should be undertaken in the future. This work has yet to take place and it is considered that the allocation of the site and its regional importance is a duty to cooperate issue and should be addressed as one. Regional work on this issue would also address if there is justification/need for a regional site. The South Yorkshire authorities would welcome the opportunity for engagement on these issues at the earliest opportunity. The authorities continue to have concerns that the amount of strategic employment land proposed does not appear to be sufficiently justified by the evidence base. There are concerns at the significant difference in the job requirements identified between the demand and supply led approaches. Based on the supply side approach, the economic evidence highlights that the provision of the additional strategic employment site at Apleyhead could almost double the number of jobs accommodated within employment sites in the draft plan (the site potentially providing 3,857 - 5,358 jobs compared to 5,878 jobs for all other employment sites). The draft plan is based on a housing requirement of 589 dwellings per annum and meeting the full extent of jobs growth (11,236 jobs) identified by the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA) Update 2020. This assumes the higher of the jobs range for the Apleyhead site would be met. The HEDNA demonstrates that the Apleyhead site will generate a significant level of commuting into the District from neighbouring areas. The HEDNA concludes at paragraph 5.21: The higher jobs at Apleyhead Junction, which are ambitious, should only really be countenanced with changes to commuting. This alternative commuting pattern results in housing need of 562 dwellings per annum. If this approach is taken forward there would still be a need to agree, through the Duty to Cooperate, with neighbouring authorities for them to take a greater share of the housing need associated with the higher jobs growth. Given the likely draw of employment from outside of Bassetlaw to Apleyhead, then this further supports the concerns previously identified that this site could have a detrimental impact on economic development within other authorities, and the stance previously requested by South Yorkshire authorities that policy ensures that delivery of economic development on employment allocations within other boroughs is taken into account. This is compounded by the change in emphasis between the previous and current draft Policy ST8. The previous draft identified Apleyhead for logistics uses; whereas the current draft widens this to allow employment uses within key sectors identified in the D2N2 Local Industrial Strategy (LIS). It is unclear from the policy which sectors this includes, however footnote 13 of the LIS identifies priority sectors as creative and digital, transport equipment manufacturing, visitor economy, transport and logistics, professional and scientific services, construction, and food and drink manufacturing. The authorities remain concerned that there is insufficient justification to support the significant allocation of a strategic employment site and that outstanding cross boundary and strategic issues have not been appropriately addressed through the Duty to Cooperate. It is acknowledged that previous suggested policy changes were not supported and that in response the Council had concerns that requiring consideration of other sites within D2N2 or Sheffield City Region prior to development on the strategic allocation would amount to a sequential approach which is not evidence based or justified. The South Yorkshire authorities remain of the view that given the significant potential cross boundary impact of the site, and that it is proposed as a strategic site accommodating development which would</p>	<p>Through Duty to Cooperate the Council have worked with Doncaster and the other South Yorkshire authorities to agree an evidence led approach to the progressing Apleyhead. The policy will be re-worded to be identified as a logistics site, that should not adversely impact upon the growth strategies of authorities in logistics property market area. This should address the concerns of the authorities. A draft Statement of Common Ground will be prepared with neighbouring authorities.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST8 - PROVISION OF LAND FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT			
		<p>not normally be accommodated within general employment allocations, then the policy should provide significantly more certainty than in its current format.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.1.25 of the draft Plan is welcomed, which states that: "The Council will continue to work collaboratively with neighbouring authorities to ensure any benefits associated with this policy are not lost at a strategic level to D2N2 or Sheffield City Region, and at a local level do not adversely impact upon the economic growth strategies of the District or any other authority." The policies as currently drafted do not provide an appropriate mechanism for the impact on the economic strategies of other authorities to be taken into account. Should the site remain proposed for allocation then the following changes are requested: Policy ST8 C. To develop the role of the A57/A1 growth corridor the development of a strategic employment site, SEM01: Apleyhead Junction (118.7ha) will be allocated to accommodate <u>sub-regional and/or regional</u> employment growth in accordance with Policy ST10. Development <u>should will be required to:</u> 1. provide E(g)/B2/B8 employment functions connected with <u>key sectors identified by the D2N2 LEP Local Industrial Strategy</u>; 2. demonstrate D2N2 LEP support for delivery; 3. be supportive of the role of key urban centres, such as Worksop; 4. have the ability to deliver significant economic development benefits in terms of development value and gross value added for the District, D2N2 and Sheffield City Region; 5. not adversely impact upon the economic growth strategies of the District or any other authority; 6. not compromise the viability or deliverability of other employment allocations identified by this Plan or in Local Plans adopted by other authorities within D2N2 or the Sheffield City Region; 7. demonstrate that, in the case of a major inward investment, the needs of the business cannot be reasonably met on allocated employment land within either D2N2 or Sheffield City Region; 8. be satisfactorily accommodated by critical infrastructure, in terms of capacity and timescales associated with investment works; 9. have good access to key strategic transport routes; 10. provide a significant number of new permanent jobs including skilled employment..</p>	
REF158	Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council - in agreement with Rotherham and Doncaster Councils	<p>Remain concerns around Duty to Cooperate and the absence of a Statement of Common Ground that covers detailed issues relating to the Local Plan. Reliance on the SCR Statement of Common Ground is considered insufficient in respect of the strategic employment policy ST8. Whilst the draft plan recognises at paragraph 5.1.17 that the Council will work with neighbouring authorities to undertake additional work to further consider the impacts of the strategic employment site, it is noted that no discussions or Duty to Co-operate engagement has been undertaken on this matter following the concerns expressed in relation to the January 2020 draft. NPPF (para 82) states that planning policies should recognise and address the specific locational requirements of different sectors including logistics. However the NPPG on Housing and Economic Needs Assessment (Paragraph: 031 Reference ID: 2a-031-20190722) states that where such a need for strategic facilities exist, strategic policy making authorities should collaborate with other authorities to identify the scale of need across relevant market areas. This process has not been undertaken either regionally or for the Bassetlaw Local Plan. The SCR Strategic Employment Land Appraisal Summary Report (May 2020) (which went to the SCR Infrastructure Board on 2nd July 2020) states that collaborative work on logistics should be undertaken in the future. This work has yet to take place and it is considered that the allocation of the site and its regional importance is a duty to cooperate issue and should be addressed as one. Regional work on this issue would also address if there is justification/need for a regional site. The opportunity for engagement on these issues at the earliest opportunity would be welcomed. There remain concerns that the amount of strategic employment land proposed does not appear to be sufficiently justified by the evidence base, as well as concerns at the significant difference in the job requirements identified between the demand and supply led approaches. Based on the supply side approach, the economic evidence highlights that the provision of the additional strategic employment site at Apleyhead could almost double the number of jobs accommodated within employment sites in the draft plan (the site potentially providing 3,857 - 5,358 jobs compared to 5,878 jobs for all other employment sites). The draft plan is based on a housing requirement of 589 dwellings per annum and meeting the full extent of jobs growth (11,236 jobs) identified by the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment Update 2020. This assumes the higher of the jobs range for the Apleyhead site would be met. The HEDNA demonstrates that the Apleyhead site will generate a significant level of commuting into the District from neighbouring areas. The HEDNA concludes at paragraph 5.21: The higher jobs at Apleyhead Junction, which are ambitious, should only really be countenanced with changes to commuting. This alternative commuting pattern results in housing need of 562 dwellings per annum. If this approach is taken forward there would still be a need to agree, through the Duty to Cooperate, with neighbouring authorities for them to take a greater share of the housing need associated with the higher jobs growth. Given the likely draw of employment from outside of Bassetlaw to Apleyhead, then this further supports the concerns previously identified that this site could have a detrimental impact on economic development within other authorities, and the stance previously requested by South Yorkshire authorities that policy ensures that delivery of economic development on employment allocations within other boroughs is taken into account. This is compounded by the change between the previous and current draft Policy ST8. The previous draft identified Apleyhead for logistics uses; whereas the current draft widens this to allow employment uses within key sectors identified in the D2N2 Local Industrial Strategy (LIS). It is unclear from the policy which sectors this includes, footnote 13 of the LIS</p>	<p>Through Duty to Cooperate the Council have worked with Barnsley and the other South Yorkshire authorities to agree an evidence led approach to the progressing Apleyhead. The policy will be re-worded to be identified as a logistics site, that should not adversely impact upon the growth strategies of authorities in logistics property market area. This should address the concerns of the authorities. A draft Statement of Common Ground will be prepared with neighbouring authorities.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST8 - PROVISION OF LAND FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT			
		<p>identifies priority sectors as creative and digital, transport equipment manufacturing, visitor economy, transport and logistics, professional and scientific services, construction, and food and drink manufacturing. The authorities remain concerned that there is insufficient justification to support the significant allocation of a strategic employment site and that outstanding cross boundary and strategic issues have not been appropriately addressed through the Duty to Co-operate. Previous suggested policy changes were not supported and that in response the Council had concerns that requiring consideration of other sites within D2N2 or Sheffield City Region prior to development on the strategic allocation would amount to a sequential approach which is not evidence based or justified. The authorities remain of the view that given the significant potential cross boundary impact of the site, and that it is proposed as a strategic site accommodating development which would not normally be accommodated within general employment allocations, then the policy should provide significantly more certainty than in its current format. Paragraph 6.1.25 of the draft Plan is welcomed, which states that: "The Council will continue to work collaboratively with neighbouring authorities to ensure any benefits associated with this policy are not lost at a strategic level to D2N2 or Sheffield City Region, and at a local level do not adversely impact upon the economic growth strategies of the District or any other authority." The policies as currently drafted do not provide an appropriate mechanism for the impact on the economic strategies of other authorities to be taken into account.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST9 - SITE EM008: HIGH MARNHAM GREEN ENERGY HUB			
REF188	Emery Planning on behalf of J.G.Pears Property Ltd.	<p>We note typographical errors with the referencing of the High Marnham Green Energy Hub allocation on pages 182 and 212 where the site reference is given as 'EM007'. At page 190 the site reference is given as 'EM006', each of these errors should be corrected to read 'EM008'.</p> <p>These drafting errors are also reflected in other evidence base documents such as the Sustainability Appraisal and Habitat Regulations Assessment.</p>	These have been addressed within the revised version of the Local Plan, The SA and the HRA.
REF003	Canal & River Trust	We appreciate that it is intended for the redevelopment to be managed by means of a Local Development Order, and that matters raised in our previous response may be considered within a future consultation on a LDO.	Thank you for your comments.
REF060	Notts County Council	NCC would request that reference is made to the protection and enhancement of the Local Wildlife Site along the western extent of the northern boundary of the allocation.	This has been included within the supporting text and Policy
REF071	Minerals and Waste, NCC	Allocation EM008 (High Marnham) lies with MSA/MCA for sand and gravel. As per Policy SP7, any applications will need to demonstrate the need for non-mineral development and where this is shown, the applicant should consider the feasibility of prior extraction and so prevent the unnecessary sterilisation of the mineral resource.	Thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST9 - SITE EM008: HIGH MARNHAM GREEN ENERGY HUB			
1658674	D2N2	<p>D2N2 is keen to promote the use of existing sites such as High Marnham to bring higher value jobs to the area. We encourage the adoption of innovation that can help tackle climate change across all sectors, but in particular in construction and manufacturing. Both of these ambitions require a significant investment in skills infrastructure to ensure that we have the right people in the right places to lead that innovation and to implement those new ways of working. We would therefore be delighted to work with Bassetlaw DC to support the development of the proposed employment and skills strategy.</p>	Thank you for your comments.
REF074 map of assets is included with submission	Avison Young on behalf of National Grid	<p>Proposed development sites crossed or in close proximity to National Grid assets:</p> <p>Following a review of the above Development Plan Document, we have identified that one or more proposed development sites are crossed or in close proximity to National Grid assets.</p> <p>Details of the sites affecting National Grid assets are provided below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> High Marnham Energy Hub (ST6 and ST7) XE ROUTE: 275Kv Overhead Transmission Line. Route: High Marnham – Thurcroft – West Melton 4ZV ROUTE: 275Kv Overhead Transmission Line. Route: CHESTERFIELD - HIGH MARNHAM 1 ZDF ROUTE TWR (002 - 057): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line. Route: COTTAM - STAYTHORPE 1 ZDA ROUTE TWR (254 - 311): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line. Route: COTTAM – GRENDON ZDA ROUTE TWR (248B - 248F): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line. Route: DISC HIGH MARNHAM ROUTE ZDA ROUTE TWR (247-248A-251A-252B-252A): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line. Route: HIGH MARNHAM - WEST BURTON ZDA ROUTE TWR (252C - 253A): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line. Route: HIGH MARNHAM 400/275KV SGT2 Electrical Substation: HIGH MARNHAM 400KV <p>Electrical Substation: HIGH MARNHAM 275KV A plan showing details of the site locations and details of National Grid's assets is attached to this letter. Please note that this plan is illustrative only.</p> <p>Please also see attached information outlining further guidance on development close to National Grid assets.</p> <p>Further Advice</p> <p>National Grid is happy to provide advice and guidance to the Council concerning their networks. If we can be of any assistance to you in providing informal comments in confidence during your policy development, please do not hesitate to contact us.</p> <p>To help ensure the continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect their assets. Please remember to consult National Grid on any Development Plan Document (DPD) or site-specific proposals that could affect National Grid's assets. Guidance on development near National Grid assets National Grid is able to provide advice and guidance to the Council concerning their networks and encourages high quality and well-planned development in the vicinity of its assets.</p> <p>Developers of sites crossed or in close proximity to National Grid assets should be aware that it is National Grid policy to retain existing overhead lines in-situ, though it recognises that there may be exceptional circumstances that would justify the request where, for example, the proposal is of regional or national importance. National Grid's 'Guidelines for Development near pylons and high voltage overhead power lines' promote the successful development of sites crossed by existing overhead lines and the creation of well-designed places. The guidelines demonstrate that a creative design approach can minimise the impact of overhead lines whilst promoting a quality environment. The guidelines can be downloaded here: https://www.nationalgrid.com/document/130626/download</p> <p>The statutory safety clearances between overhead lines, the ground, and built structures must not be infringed. Where changes are proposed to ground levels beneath an existing line then it is important that changes in ground levels do not result in safety clearances being infringed. National Grid can, on request, provide to developers detailed line profile drawings that detail the height of conductors, above ordnance datum, at a specific site. National Grid's statutory safety clearances are detailed in their 'Guidelines when working near National Grid Electricity Transmission assets', which can be downloaded here: www.nationalgrid.com/network-and-assets/working-near-our-assets</p> <p>High-Pressure Gas Pipelines form an essential part of the national gas transmission system and National Grid's approach is always to seek to leave their existing transmission pipelines in situ. Contact should be made with the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) in respect of sites</p>	<p>The existing electrical infrastructure and access will be safeguarded as part of the Local Development Order. The National Grid will form part of the development group as it is a stakeholder or has land assets on the affected site. The production of the LDO will be undertaken in partnership with relevant stakeholders like yourselves.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST9 - SITE EM008: HIGH MARNHAM GREEN ENERGY HUB			
		<p>affected by High-Pressure Gas Pipelines.</p> <p>National Grid have land rights for each asset which prevents the erection of permanent/ temporary buildings, or structures, changes to existing ground levels, storage of materials etc. Additionally, written permission will be required before any works commence within the National Grid's 12.2m building proximity distance, and a deed of consent is required for any crossing of the easement.</p>	
REF101	East Markham Parish Council	<p>Travel infrastructure from Retford and Tuxford could support green modes of travel to the planned 'High Marnham Green Energy Hub', with very little effort. The last thing we want to encourage is commuting to a 'Green Energy Hub' via motorised transport, especially given that it is 5-10 miles from the large residential areas of Tuxford and Retford.</p>	<p>Although this site will see some job generating employment, it is not expected to be of a high level. The majority of development on this site is for renewable energy or low carbon which is often supported by a smaller number of employees than more traditional employment uses such as storage, warehouse or distribution. A Transport Assessment and Travel Plan will be required as part of any planning application.</p>
REF106	Water Management Consortium	<p>The Boards are primarily concerned with the rate of flow and volume of water to our network of maintained watercourses, therefore the Boards support the preference for sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) and recommends that SUDS are incorporated into all developments where feasible. SUDS should be designed to mimic the pre development 'greenfield' surface water regime and must be agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority. The Boards recommend including in this section that drainage design needs to take into account climate change by allowing for an expected increase in the volume of rainfall, when assessing the storage and conveyance requirements for potential development sites. The site lies within the Board's district, the Board maintained Marnham Drain is located through the eastern side of the site. The Board's consent will be required prior to any works in, under, over or within 9 metres of the bank top of the watercourse. The Board requires an easement strip along the Board maintained watercourse in order to allow for continued maintenance and future works. The Board's consent will be required prior to any increases in surface water discharge from the site being made to any watercourse, other than a designated main river.</p>	<p>Thanks for your comments. These issues are noted and can be addressed through the development of the Local Development Order.</p> <p>The Bassetlaw Strategic Flood Risk Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the flood risk to the site and includes the impact of climate change. The assessment provides recommendations for how the redevelopment of the site can be undertaken to provide a safe and sustainable development that minimises the risk from flooding.</p>
REF142	Retford Branch Labour Party	<p>High Marnham is a former coal power station with a historically significant contribution to climate change. It is also a former source of employment and income to the District. A Green Jobs Hub can be part of a range of measures for the District in addressing Climate Change and to provide new employment for areas like Retford. However, the Plan does not seem to go far enough in stating its ambition for the site - particularly in terms of jobs. As a result, we would strongly question any job creation opportunities which may be used to justify housing growth in the District. The Branch feel that a major manufacturing or high skilled employment centre needs to be at least mentioned in the plan to help justify the homes being built in Retford.</p> <p>For this reason and we wish for the Plan to be explicit in:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Setting the principles for any LDO 2. Stating that Bassetlaw needs to take a leading role at a National level in creating Green jobs for the decarbonisation and rebalancing of 	<p>The Plan cannot be too specific in the principles for the LDO due to these being explored further in terms of the suitability and their capability. An area like this needs flexibility due to the constant changes to national guidance and policy on green and low carbon technologies.</p> <p>Although there was a rail link to the Power Station, there is no longer this capability.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST9 - SITE EM008: HIGH MARNHAM GREEN ENERGY HUB			
		<p>our economy</p> <p>3. Putting an ambitious vision forward for the Green Jobs Hub.</p> <p>Suggested changes to the plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 6.2.1 is reworded as follows: ○ Land at the former High Marnham Power Station provides a long-term opportunity to positively re-use a longstanding significant brownfield site and facilitate its redevelopment. With the capability of connecting directly into national grid infrastructure, as well as strong rail/water links, the site offers a unique opportunity to support significant employment uses within the renewable energy and low carbon technology sectors and their supply chain, making a significant contribution to this D2N2 growth sector. This includes manufacturing facilities in sectors such as solar, wind, batteries and EVs. ● 6.2.3 is reworded as follows: ○ Due to its rural location in eastern Bassetlaw, any development on the site will need careful consideration of its impacts, particularly upon local communities, the environment, rail network, water, and the highways network. ● Add a new clause 6.2.2 as follows: ○ The Council has not identified a plan for local renewable energy generation to meet all of the demands of the District. To meet net zero goals the District needs to find ways of offsetting emissions, such as manufacturing, developing, or consulting on low carbon technology. ● Add a new clause 6.2.3 as follows: ○ The creation of a large employment centre at the site would help to address job shortages in Bassetlaw. Manufacturing at the site would be able to leverage the highly skilled manufacturing workforce in the District. ● It may also be worth the Council including a case study outlining the size of manufacturing facilities relative to the size of the site. A good case study would be a Tesla "Gigafactory" which is 139ha. This is important to inform what may be built at the Green Jobs Hub. ● We also request that the Plan identifies how local experts may be consulted on the Green Jobs Hub. Bassetlaw has significant skills on how to maximise the potential for Green Jobs, but the Plan as written does not explicitly state how these might be accessed in any consultation, development or LDO. 	<p>In addition, there is no current water access to the site.</p> <p>We have included further detail about the sites potential impact on nearby communities, heritage, landscape, flooding and transport.</p> <p>Further work is needed between the Council, site promoters, community and the green and low carbon industry.</p> <p>The Local Plan will not identify a specific energy target as this will be difficult to implement due to viability.</p> <p>There is still uncertainty about what level and type of jobs will be located at the site. This will depend on the employment uses. Green energy jobs tend to have a fewer number of employees than your more typical employment uses.</p> <p>The LDO can be amended (separately) if Government regulations change during the Plan period.</p>
REF153	Natural England	We welcome the opportunity that this proposal presents in meeting Net Zero Carbon targets.	Thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST9 - SITE EM008: HIGH MARNHAM GREEN ENERGY HUB			
REF165	Dunham-on-Trent with Ragnall, Darlton and Fledborough Parish Council	<p>Although this site is not within our Parish Council, development of this site will have significant implications for our four villages. Firstly we are delighted that the District Council is not using the long disestablished Power Station as a benchmark for development and that the site in its current 'state' i.e. flat, and now considerably naturalised, is the benchmark. As the Power Station has been gone for approximately 20 years we agree that this is the appropriate approach to take to the site. The revised plan makes reference to a Masterplan that will be produced in partnership with the developers. From the recent Bassetlaw Council presentation our understanding was that the site would be developed under a Local Development Order (LDO) and would the developed would be shaped by the developers and the local community. This is not reflected in the current iteration and we feel that it would remove ambiguity if the wording could be updated. The Local Plan mentions the close proximity of High Marnham village but does not reference Fledboorugh village to the north of the development site which is as near, and at some points nearer than High Marnham village. This is very important when considering the site development in terms of visuals/height of potential buildings, noise factor of proposed businesses, light factor of proposed businesses and traffic movement. Light pollution is a particular issue since JG Pears Ltd has been granted 24hr access and use of the site, the attached photos show the impact of lighting at the JG Pears site which is at Low Marnham, i.e. further away. Shielding against any new development at the High Marnham Energy Hub is paramount to the residents of Fledborough and High Marnham parishes. Can Bassetlaw please incorporate Fledborough village in any future plans presented including expanding the maps included in those plan to include the village in the same way that High Marnham village is included. This needs to be considered in the LDO.</p> <p>On the site itself there needs to be consideration given to the changing environment whereby a natural wildlife corridor has been established along the new cycle track. Any development on the site adjacent to the track, needs to take into account the established existing wildlife. We mention this because the Bassetlaw Plan had industrial type buildings next to the track. Clearly this is at odds with the wildlife corridor although we understand from the consultation that this is something which will be revised in the LDO and we welcome this as a necessary change. We welcome the positivity of the site owner/developers to consider a car park at the site supporting the use of the cycle track as both a cycling route but also as a car park for walkers which is enjoyed by many. If this has the future potential to be expanded to include a picnic area/cafe, it could also be a resource for the businesses on the site and their staff. We are pleased that Bassetlaw District Council are potentially working with Nottingham University who are developing green energy sector activities and possibly using some of the site for green houses. However the concerns of our parishes, particularly Ragnall, is of potentially significant increases in road traffic movements. We are currently attempting to get a speed reduction through the village because of existing concerns about traffic speed, any increase of traffic numbers will only exacerbate the situation. Our community is small and as a consequence our voice may not seem very loud, but we are deeply worried about the increase in traffic. A suggested figure of 500 new jobs on the site, is wonderful for the local economy, but would be disastrous for Ragnall Village.</p> <p>At the presentation it was made clear that Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC) would undertake a full traffic assessment regarding traffic movements etc. Our worry is that NCC undertook a traffic assessment when JG Pears submitted their Plans for the development of their site and Highways saw no problem with heavy goods vehicles travelling/passing on bends at Grassthorpe and through Ragnall. The road infrastructure cannot support developments that require regular heavy goods vehicles constantly travelling through our villages. To increase job opportunity on one hand and destroy quality of life for others, is not progress. It is a judgement that has to be made and our homes and communities have existed over hundreds of years, this has to take precedence when considering sustainable development.</p> <p>The other concern is the quality and safety of Ragnall crossroads. Again we are currently seeking speed traffic reductions along the A57 to increase the safety of this junction. It is noted that the BDC Plan acknowledges improvements are needed at the crossroads if there is to be an increase in traffic. And it isn't only Ragnall and Fledborough that would be impacted: additional traffic heading north will pass Dunham Primary School, travelling east would impact on Dunham village where we already have regular road accidents and travelling west will go through Darlton, another small village divided by the A57 making movement across the village very difficult. So when Highways do their impact assessment they need to consider Ragnall, Fledborough, Dunham and Darlton. Traffic travelling due south will impact on villages within Newark and Sherwood District Council's (N&S DC) administration. We are pleased that it is Bassetlaw's intention to include N&S DC in the consultation regarding this site development. We are also pleased to hear that it is Bassetlaw DC's intention to reinstate the community consultation group established at the beginning of this process.</p> <p>In Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We welcome the reduced Housing Allocation • We welcome the fact that the planning for this site will now include clear guidelines and criteria under the LDO • We welcome the fact that the Power Station will no longer be used as a benchmark 	<p>Due to its scale, the redevelopment of this site will need to be carefully planned. The site has a number of constraints such as flooding, the environment, heritage, landscape, private amenity, existing electrical infrastructure and poor accessibility to the nearby major road network and these issues will need to be assessed through the production of the LDO and through future planning applications. The uses on the site will need to be appropriate to their location in rural Bassetlaw. The Site is not suitable for your more typical employment uses such as warehouses, storage and distribution.</p> <p>References to all five nearby villages; Ragnall, Fledborough, High and Low Marnham and Normanton on Trent has been added to the supporting text. We have also included more text in relation to the potential impact on other issues such as heritage, transport and the environment.</p> <p>This includes the protection of the Local Wildlife Sites that runs along part of the northern and eastern boundary of the site. This will help maintain a green buffer between the site and the surrounding countryside, including the former railway track.</p> <p>The Highway Authority have stated that a full transport Assessment and Travel Plan is needed to identify any issues and what, if any, mitigation is needed to appropriately manage the impact of traffic on the local road network.</p> <p>These can only be undertaken when there is a good understanding of the type of uses and likely level of employment generating traffic.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST9 - SITE EM008: HIGH MARNHAM GREEN ENERGY HUB		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We welcome the inclusion of a carpark at the site for recreational purposes • We remain supportive of the focus on green and renewable energy but concerned about the scale of this development • We are encouraged by the emphasis on buffer zones, the wildlife corridor and the broader environmental considerations at the site. • We are concerned about the potential noise and light pollution • We are very concerned about the number of traffic movements, particularly heavy goods vehicles to the site and in the wider domain including Ragnall, Fledborough, Dunham and Darlton. • Finally we are pleased about the reinstatement of the Community Consultation Group. <p>As a community and as a Parish Council we recognise the need to develop and to move forward and as such we recognise the opportunity presented by the High Marnham site, but it is also important to recognise heritage, rurality and our indigenous agricultural life style.</p>	
REF182	Anglian Water	<p>POLICY ST9: Site EM008: High Marnham Green Energy Hub (page 62) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Anglian Water is the water undertaker for High Marnham and has no objection to the principle of employment development on this site and would wish to be consulted on the Local Development Order for this site.</p>	Thank you for your comments and AW will be consulted and involved within the development of the Local Development Order.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST9 - SITE EM008: HIGH MARNHAM GREEN ENERGY HUB			
REF149	Stone Planning Services Limited on behalf of Charterpoint (NG22) Limited	<p>Policy ST9 - Site EM008: High Marnham Energy Hub This is a significant employment site covering some 60 hectares. Policy EM008 with regard to High Marnham Energy Hub sets out some criteria that must be met. However, the full list of development requirements is not set out and are to be contained within a Local Development Order which is not yet available for consideration. This should form part of the Regulation 19 consultation and should be fully costed so viability can be assessed.</p> <p>The previous policy set out a requirement relating to the need for contributions to the A57/Durham on Trent/Ragnall crossing. Delivering this very large site will require significant front-loaded infrastructure investment. The Council will need to be satisfied that the site is capable of being delivered and is viable. The previous Draft Plan consultation highlighted that delivery of High Marnham was partly dependent on the submission of a Flood Risk Assessment; we are disappointed that this work has not been undertaken prior to allocation. It may well affect the degree of delivery.</p> <p>The policy, and presumably the LDO, will set out the range of employment activities that will be delivered at the site. It is clear that this site is for a niche of uses and we consider that it should be excluded from the general employment requirement as set out in Policy ST8. It is not generally available.</p>	<p>The Local Development order, although linked to the Local Plan, is a separate planning policy document and will need to go through its own process.</p> <p>Reference to the former high marnham power station and the site is now included within Policy ST53 Renewable Energy and Low Carbon Energy Generation.</p> <p>Strategic issues such as Transport and Flooding have been addressed within the Bassetlaw Transport Assessment and the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment where recommendations have been provided.</p>
REF201	Severn Trent	Severn Trent understand the benefits of utilising the existing energy infrastructure at High Marnham to develop a green Energy Hub, We would note that we do not have any Sewerage infrastructure located within the existing power station area, and anticipate that there would be a significant need for additional capacity	Thank you for your comments. These issues are noted and can be addressed through the development of the Local Development Order.
REF203	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	<p>A green energy hub at High Marnham indicates innovative thinking of which we are supportive. An Ecological Impact Assessment (EiCA) will be required however, to assess the ecological impacts of the proposal.</p> <p>We note that in this current draft no specific mention is made to the Fledborough to Harby Local Wildlife Site and Old Trent Local Wildlife Site. Local Wildlife Sites are afforded protection due to their substantive nature conservation value. Their selection takes into consideration the most important, distinctive and threatened species and habitats within a national, regional and local context, making them some of our most valuable urban and rural wildlife areas. We are of the opinion that it is not sufficient to just protect the LWS. We advocate significant buffering to enhance its wildlife value. An appropriately sized buffer zone should be evidenced through the EiCA. Buffer zones vary depending on their focus on the landscape, habitat and/or species conservation, each of which demands a different approach for their creation.</p> <p>Planning application 19/00818/FUL was accompanied by a Preliminary Ecological Assessment (BSG ecology 2019). Section 4.5 states 'the wider survey area (former power station site) has potential to meet the criteria for open mosaic habitat on previously developed land (OMH)'. This is a Habitat of Principal Importance under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006. Section 41 of The Act requires the Secretary of State to publish and maintain lists of species and types of habitats which are regarded by Natural England to be of "principal importance" for the purposes of conserving biodiversity in England. Section 4.6 states 'The site itself shows limited spatial variability, mainly supporting ephemeral short perennial vegetation / sparsely vegetated bare ground and hard standing. It is not assessed to form a particularly important area of habitat given the abundance of this type of habitat within the context of the former power station site; however, it does form part of the wider OMH habitat component'. It is recognised therefore, that development of this site will result in a net loss in the extent of this habitat. Any development of the site would need to consider and evaluate the OMH habitat.</p>	<p>The following text has been added to the supporting text:</p> <p>'The Local Wildlife Sites; Marnham Railway Yard and Fledborough to Harby Dismantled Railway are within 100m of the site and run along the northern and eastern boundary towards the lagoons and River Trent – a Main Green Corridor. These areas will be protected from development and an appropriate 'green buffer' between the development on site and the Local Wildlife Sites and River Trent will need to be incorporated into the design of the site'.</p> <p>It is likely that due to its size, an EIA will need to be undertaken as part of the planning for the site.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST9 - SITE EM008: HIGH MARNHAM GREEN ENERGY HUB			
REF211	National Trust	<p>National Trust supports in principle the concept of redeveloping the former High Marnham Power Station to create a green energy hub, bearing in mind its existing grid connections and contaminated status. However, this is subject to the development being of an appropriate scale in order to keep impacts on the neighbouring hamlet, road network, landscape, heritage and the River Trent within acceptable limits. We are concerned that the Council has hollowed out the policy in favour of a Local Development Order. While an LDO may be a useful mechanism for granting consent for a site, it does not prevent a developer from coming forward with their own alternative proposal (i.e. if it does not precisely meet the requirements of the LDO). It would therefore be helpful if the Council set out its policy position in relation to key constraints of the site and its surroundings. For example, it may require flood betterment bearing in mind the proximity to Flood Zone 3 and a landscape buffer to protect the Local Wildlife Site nearby.</p>	<p>The Council believe the Local Development Order process is most appropriate mechanism for such a unique site. The type of use and the viability of uses are important, especially within the green energy sectors. An LDO provides flexibility in the sense that they can be revised if required over the plan period. This can be done outside the local Plan process.</p> <p>Permission will only be granted if developments comply with the contents of the Local Development Order.</p>
REF214	Historic England	<p>Policy ST9: EM008: High Marnham Green Energy Hub - There are inconsistencies in the SA text relating to heritage, and the negative impacts on heritage are not addressed in the justification text and this will need addressing ahead of the next round of consultation on the Plan.</p>	<p>These heritage assets have been included within the supporting text of the Policy and are recognised within the Sustainability Appraisal.</p>
1670549	Resident	<p>The road network around High Marnham is very poor. Thought should be given to promoting wind turbines on this site which would help provide low carbon energy without traffic disruption.</p>	<p>A Transport Assessment will be undertaken to inform the development and where appropriate mitigation is needed. This will include assessing the impact of proposed traffic movements on the existing road network and through existing villages.</p> <p>Wind Turbines are not appropriate for the site due to the proximity of the overhead electricity pylons.</p>
1670869	Resident	<p>Why is High Marhnam, and not Cottam PS site considered for green energy surely the same considerations apply to both sites. the use of the word 'unique' in para 6.2.1 is misleading!</p> <p>Para 6.2.4 refers to using the LDO mechanism - this process can circumnavigate the statutory need for full local consultation, and allows for the Authority, and developers, to avoid due process, so why is is deemed the most appropriate mechanism for this site? the plan should be clear on the cons as well as the pros of utilising this option for this or any other site identified in the plan.</p>	<p>The land owners and interested parties are promoting the former High Manham Power Station for renewable energy uses. The site has direct connectivity into the national grid and therefore any excess energy produced can go directly back into the grid without a significant level of new connective infrastructure needed.</p> <p>The landowners at Cottam are promoting this site as a new settlement.</p>
REF093	Resident	<p>My main concern regarding the High Marnham development is that the present road system is not adequate for any further heavy traffic, especially around Grassthorpe which is in need of a bypass. It will probably also increase the traffic through Ragnall and Fledborough if vehicles approach from the north. This community has already the nuisance of many heavy lorries heading for Pears factory day and night. I hope this will be taken into consideration when any new development takes place.</p>	<p>A Transport Assessment will be undertaken to inform the development and where appropriate mitigation is needed. This will include assessing the impact of proposed traffic movements on the existing road network and through existing villages.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST9 - SITE EM008: HIGH MARNHAM GREEN ENERGY HUB			
REF174	Resident	<p>Despite these issues being highlighted in past by residents we are very concerned by the effects of further building and heavy goods vehicles on the hamlet of Ragnall. Classed as countryside and unsustainable it's fragile infrastructure is unsuitable to cope with increases, which seem to be ongoing. The Drainage system is already overloaded resulting in repeated flooding of some properties and there have been numerous accidents on the windy country roads, yet traffic flow will only get heavier with future plans. Whilst the sustainable energy hub is very worthy in itself we hope the council will look to create a more suitable route for the sheer amounts of traffic from both industrail sites, bypassing the unsafe and unsuitable residential roads. Preserving the open spaces and wildlife corridors, enhancing the well used bike path, river walks etc would be greatly appreciated. As well as retaining the character and distinctiveness of the area it helps offset the noise, disruption and loss of amenity that have a cumulative effect on health and wellbeing of residents.</p>	<p>The redevelopment of this site will need careful consideration in terms of its impact on the highway network and the environment. A detailed Transport Assessment will be produced once further information is provided in terms of the type of development uses on the site. The Bassetlaw Transport Assessment has made assumptions based on the information we have at this stage. The Transport Assessment will provide information on any mitigation that is required in terms of minimising the developments impact.</p> <p>The existing Local Wildlife Sites to the north and east of the site will be protected to preserve biodiversity. Any impact to the River Trent will be minimised.</p> <p>In addition, further enhancements to local biodiversity will be undertake though extensive tree planting and landscaping, particularly around the lagoons and the edge of the site.</p>
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	<p>This site has stood vacant for a considerable time now which would indicate that it is not attractive in terms of location and cost or ownership for it to be brought forward. The suggestion that it could in some way add to the green economy is a good idea but an idea is all it is. Its location means that vehicular traffic to and from the site has to pass through very sensitive receptor areas and for this fact alone its use as general B2 and B8 is not to be supported. However, the use of the site with the green economy is to be welcomed. According to government guidelines, we are now trying to provide electricity storage facilities (big batteries!) whereby spare generation can be stored for reuse later on, a good idea and this site with its current links to the national grid would be ideal. It could also provide a site particularly on the old railway sidings area for a large scale solar farm, again both of these would provide benefits without the requirement for vast numbers of vehicular movements. If Policy ST9 is to be retained it should only be on such a basis.</p>	<p>The Council are looking at options for the site in terms of appropriate uses for the area. These will be detailed within the Local Development Order.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST9 - SITE EM008: HIGH MARNHAM GREEN ENERGY HUB			
REF188	Emery Planning on behalf of J.G.Pears Property Ltd.	<p>The allocation of this site is in line with the NPPF's encouragement of LPA's to identify suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy sources and supporting infrastructure, where this would help secure their development (NPPF, paragraph 151). We would support the comment that the site provides a unique opportunity to support this expanding market given its optimal location: with direct connection to the national electricity grid from the high voltage electricity infrastructure that remains on site. This is further supported by J G Pears own direct grid connection from their nearby combined heat and energy (CHP) plant at Low Marnham, which currently inputs surplus energy into the grid, but could be harnessed directly by future development on this site. The allocation also serves to meet a priority of the D2N2 Strategic Economic Plan and emerging Local Industrial Strategy. We endorse D2N2's recognition of the 'significant potential' the site can make to the green economy, whilst contributing to national and local objectives to reduce carbon emissions, reduce energy demand through on-site efficiencies, and reduce excess energy waste through the site's circular energy potential. We acknowledge the need for careful consideration of the impacts arising from the redevelopment of the site, particularly upon local communities, the environment and the highways network and our clients have already commissioned extensive technical work in order to ensure any potential impacts are minimised and where necessary mitigated. J G Pears are committed to working with the LPA and other stakeholders to see the successful delivery of this site. The proactive approach to the development of the site now taken by the LPA in their commitment to delivering the site rapidly through a Local Development Order (LDO) is strongly supported. An LDO will provide an appropriate mechanism for the management of such a specialist employment site enabling growth by positively and proactively shaping sustainable development. We welcome the fact an LDO will serve to incentivise development by simplifying the planning process and making investment more attractive to businesses in the green energy sector. The landowner will work proactively with the LPA to complete the draft LDO by the end of 2021 and facilitate delivery of the site from early in the plan period.</p>	Thank you for your comments.
REF224	Sheffield City Region	Proposals for a new Garden Village in the Draft Plan as well as the Renewable Energy Hub are also supported. These are exactly the type of innovation needed to help close the divide between north and south and level up our areas.	Thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST10 - EM001: APLEYHEAD JUNCTION, WORKSOP			
REF087	Highways England	A minimum of 168 ha of land has been allocated for employment along with at least 118 ha of employment land to accommodate future sub-regional/regional employment land growth at Apleyhead junction.	Comments noted.
REF146	Elkesley Neighbourhood Plan Group	'Given its location, the Apleyhead site could prove attractive for logistics and distribution'. There will be an obvious increase to traffic; this is referenced in the Local Plan but no mention is made of the potential to move goods by rail – is this something that can be encouraged as it will pass the site. Cycle access should also link to garden village and beyond to Elkesley – supporting 9.1 Healthy & Active lifestyle	It is not possible to have rail access to the site. The policy requires cycle access to the site and allows for discussions to take place in the future relating to connectivity to the Garden Village.
REF153	Natural England	Welcomes the inclusion of point (1d) which outlines the requirement for an Air Quality Management Strategy and Landscape Visual Impact Assessment to protect the special characteristics of Clumber Park SSSI and the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. Welcome the requirements set out within the section on Green Infrastructure & Biodiversity including a project level Habitats Regulations Assessment (note this would be a "shadow" HRA) and winter bird surveys to ensure there are no adverse impacts upon Clumber Park SSSI and Sherwood Forest ppSPA. Note that in the same section (2b) that there should be green infrastructure connectivity to neighbouring sites and suggest that this could include the green infrastructure planned for the adjacent Garden Village. Integrated water management could also potentially be feasible across both sites for greater climate resilience.	Support for the policy approach is welcome. Green infrastructure connectivity will be added to the policy, integrated water management to the supporting text.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST10 - EM001: APLEYHEAD JUNCTION, WORKSOP			
REF172	Elkesley Parish Council	'Given its location, the Apleyhead site could prove attractive for logistics and distribution'. There will be an obvious increase to traffic; this is referenced in the Local Plan but no mention is made of the potential to move goods by rail – we would like to see the use of rail encouraged, within the plan as it will pass the site. Cycle access should also link to garden village and beyond to Elkesley and further afield – supporting 9.1 Healthy & Active lifestyle	It is not possible to have rail access to the site. The policy requires cycle access to the site and allows for discussions to take place in the future relating to connectivity to the Garden Village.
REF149	Stone Planning Services Limited on behalf of Charterpoint (NG22) Limited	<p>Apleyhead Junction sets out a long list of criteria to be satisfied if planning permission is to be forthcoming. Part 3 of the policy sets out Transport & Movement requirements and in addition to the creation of a safe access onto the A57 also requires financial contributions to the A57/B6040 roundabout, the A614/A57/A1 junction and unspecified capacity improvements on the A57. Delivering this very large site requires significant front-loaded infrastructure investment. The Council will need to be satisfied that the site is capable of being delivered and is viable.</p> <p>The Council needs to be very cautious on delivery rates from this site. Set out our concerns about the delivery of employment land at a number of the allocations: 1. The Strategic nature of some sites will need a significant amount of front loading to deliver the infrastructure. The Viability Assessment does not give confidence that delivery will be attainable. 2. The impact of Brexit and Covid 19 on the public funds. It would appear that a number of sites will require public support. Are all of the sites viable? Covid will have long lasting impacts on the economy which will potentially extend beyond the Plan Period. 3. High Marnham is for a niche operation in an emerging sector. 4. Cottam Regeneration Area is not a Sustainable location. Consider that land for additional smaller employment sites need to be identified in Policy ST6 with regard to land East of Markham Moor (LAA263).</p>	The Logistics Study confirms a demand for a site of the scale of Apleyhead. The timing of infrastructure provision will need to be agreed with the Local Highways Authority, there is no evidence to suggest it all needs to be front loaded. The Council is confident the site can be delivered through a viable scheme. A number of employment allocations have planning permission and are being actively moved through the decision making process indicating there is market demand for the sites. Evidence indicates that for logistics the market is stronger than previously as a result of Covid. High Marnham will have an LDO to facilitate its delivery. Cottam is a broad location identified for growth after this plan period should the policy criteria be met. The policy identifies a range of smaller sites to support a range of business opportunities across the District.
REF201	Severn Trent	Generally supportive of the principles outlined within Policy ST10 in particular the approach for development to meet BREEAM for water efficiency, and the approach to incorporate Green infrastructure and Biodiversity within the employment landscape. Encourage that these areas incorporate SuDS such that surface water can be safely managed and conveyed through the development to mitigate the impacts of climate change and flood risk on and off site as a result of the development.	The flood risk and water quality policies cover SUDS. These are strategic policies so would cover development at Apleyhead. His position has been agreed with Severn Trent.
REF203	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	<p>6.3.3 This 71ha semi-natural broadleaved woodland is designated as Top Wood/Great Whin Local Wildlife Site. Development of the site will be sensitive to its nature conservation interests which must be preserved and enhanced during and post-construction. A full arboriculture survey and ecological survey will be required to ensure the qualities of are adequately considered, mitigated and compensated for, and so that future maintenance and management is agreed. Elsewhere on site, mature hedgerows and hedgerow trees that exist along field boundaries should be incorporated sensitively into the design. Biodiversity net gain will be required. Welcome the amendment within the current draft 'Biodiversity net gain will be required'. This is in line with Paragraph 174 NPPF (2019) which states 'identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity'. Advocate the removal of the wording 'ecological survey will be required to ensure the qualities of the are adequately considered, mitigated and compensated for' and replaced with 'an Ecological Impact Assessment will be required. EIA is a process of identifying, quantifying and evaluating potential effects of development-related or other proposed actions on habitats, species and ecosystems. The findings of an assessment can help competent authorities understand ecological issues when determining applications for consent. EIA can be used for the appraisal of projects of any scale including the ecological component of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). When undertaken as part of an EIA, EIA is subject to the relevant EIA Regulations. Unlike EIA, EIA on its own is not a statutory requirement. It is an evaluation process undertaken to support a range of assessments'. Would like to see the inclusion of 'the future maintenance and management is agreed' within the policy text. 2. Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity a) Be supported by an ecological survey and arboriculture plan which protects and enhances the qualities of Top Wood/Great Whin Covert Local Wildlife Site; future maintenance and management should be secured through the planning system.</p>	The policy has been amended to make reference to ecological impact assessment and reference to future management and maintenance.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST10 - EM001: APLEYHEAD JUNCTION, WORKSOP			
REF211	National Trust	For reasons set out in our response to Policy ST8 Employment Land, National Trust objects to the unjustified allocation of 118.7ha of greenfield land at Apleyhead junction.	Comments noted.
REF214	Historic England	The SA indicates that there would be a significant negative effect in respect of archaeology and that a DBA would be required for the site. If the HER has not been consulted as part of the evidence base for the Plan it is not clear at this stage whether the Plan would be able to achieve its aspirations for the site. The Historic Environment Site Assessment (November 2020) does not assist further with any analysis of potential impacts on harm. It is not clear how the impacts on the nearby registered Park and Garden have been considered either. There are concerns about the soundness of this site being taken forward in the Plan. If it can be demonstrated through further work as part of the Plan process that the anticipated development could be achieved at the site it may be necessary to revise the policy text of Section 1 of Policy ST10.	A Heritage Paper has been prepared and agreed with Historic England evidencing the approach taken to site selection and how the historic environment has been considered. HER have been consulted on the sites. The emerging Heritage Paper update has made sure to include consideration of potential impacts on setting of Clumber Park and Garden (Grade I Listed).
1658674	D2N2	Clearly it's a site of sub-regional importance and could support a number of our growth sectors and our ambitions on skills and low carbon, so it's another site we'd be delighted to work with you on to help bring it forward.	Support noted and welcome.
1670549	Resident	Opposed to the policy of developing green fields when there is a brownfield alternative at Bevercotes Colliery.	Bevercotes has planning permission for employment development so should come forward for development outside the Local Plan process.
REF110	Resident	Would the Business development Zone at Aplyhead be started prior to the Garden Village, Peaks Hill Farm or Ordsall South or after?	The timing of Apleyhead will be determined by the Local Plan's adoption and the site gaining planning permission. The submission of a planning application is dependent on the site promoter's timescales.
REF129	Resident	Read these proposed developments with genuine disappointment that projects such as these, requiring large areas of countryside space, are deemed acceptable in modern times given the environmental pressures to maintain what is left of our open space. The area is largely surrounded by open country and forestry and indeed, one of the few spaces that retains its rural feel. Any development in this area will have a heavy visual impact. Have excellent historical assets close by including Sherwood, Clumber and the Dukeries which are internationally respected and require special preservation and enhancement rather than projects that could impact negatively and move to a more urban feel in the area. It is a great pity rely on international hotel and leisure companies to promote these great assets and should be doing more in my view to develop this in environmentally sustainable ways which would go hand in hand with natural development. Compare Sherwood forest with the New forest in the South which retains much of its historical and natural character. Given that Sherwood is arguably the most famous forest in the world, it is rather pitiful what remains and how little has been done to restore and enhance this amazing legacy. The Bassetlaw area is changing and developing, increasingly losing its rural character. Housing and commercial development should only be permitted within (or be part of) existing settlements. Remaining open country should be preserved and ecologically enhanced at all costs, without presuming that undeveloped land is a useable commodity. There should be no removal of mature trees and extra space made available for forestry and biodiversity to offset any negative impact. This is more important than ever, given the dire state of our natural world and rapid loss of natural species, not least through loss of habitat. This is especially important for this area which could be of greatly increased benefit and a valuable asset as we move to an increasingly developed and urban environment. We can and must do better than this to preserve our precious and unique resources.	The site is heavily screened by woodland from the A57 and the policy will require an appropriate buffer to screen the site from the A1 appropriately. There is not enough land available to meet the District's growth needs in existing settlements. Inevitably some trees may be lost to development but the Plan requires these to be replaced on site to ensure no overall loss. Biodiversity net gain will be required.
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	This employment allocation could be reduced considerably if the residential aspect of the "Garden Village" on the opposite side of the A1 was to be removed. This particular site forms an incursion into a large previously wooded area and its development would have a strong negative influence upon wildlife and ecology. Its location is good, if combined with the site on the opposite side of the A1, the amount of land take-up could be reduced.	Inevitably some trees may be lost to development but the Plan requires these to be replaced on site to ensure no overall loss. Biodiversity net gain will be required. The two sites will support different markets and will address different needs therefore it is not possible to combine the sites.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST10 - EM001: APLEYHEAD JUNCTION, WORKSOP			
REF224	Sheffield Region	City <p>Whilst supporting the Draft Plan's overall approach and much of the specific policies, it is also important to repeat some of the comments made by the LEP/MCA on strategic employment sites in February 2020. Proposals for the Apleyhead site and the associated policies for this in the Draft Plan require further discussion. Whilst supporting this aspect of the Draft Plan in principle, there are some practical changes which could help to strengthen the way that the Apleyhead site is presented in Policy ST8 so that it more closely aligns with our priorities in South Yorkshire. Apleyhead has a potentially important role to play in helping to attract large scale inward investment to the benefit of South Yorkshire as well as D2N2. Implementation needs to be more carefully considered as the Plan develops. There are some important changes in emphasis to Policy ST8 between the previous draft and current draft of the Plan. The previous draft identified the strategic employment site at Apleyhead for logistics uses; whereas the current draft widens this to allow employment uses within any key sector identified in the D2N2 Local Industrial Strategy (LIS) – presumably sectors listed in the LIS like creative and digital, transport equipment manufacturing, visitor economy, transport and logistics, professional and scientific services, construction, and food and drink manufacturing. The evidence presented for the Plan also suggests that new jobs at Apleyhead Head would rely on increased levels of commuting from outside of Bassetlaw, ie residents from South Yorkshire travelling to occupy these jobs. Given this, and the broader range of uses proposed for Apleyhead, must work together to ensure this site does not have a detrimental impact on economic development within other authorities as well as create unsustainable patterns of commuting. There is an opportunity for us to undertake further collaborative work so that we can address cross boundary and strategic issues between Bassetlaw and South Yorkshire. This would benefit from all four South Yorkshire local authorities being involved and could add further detail to the Statement of Common Ground agreed by the MCA and other authorities in the wider city region (approved by the MCA in June 2020). This would also be in line with Paragraph 6.1.25 of the Draft Plan which explains how the Council is working collaboratively with neighbouring authorities, which I also welcome.</p>	Through Duty to Cooperate the Council have worked with SCR and the other South Yorkshire authorities to agree an evidence led approach to the progressing Apleyhead. The policy will be reworded to be identified as a logistics site, that should not adversely impact upon the growth strategies of authorities in logistics property market area. This should address the concerns of the authorities. A draft Statement of Common Ground will be prepared with neighbouring authorities.
REF209 Apleyhead	NJL Consulting on behalf of Caddick Developments	<p>These representations demonstrate the Apleyhead Junction site continues to be suitable and appropriate for major employment led development and has no insurmountable constraints. The site is owned by a willing and established developer with a track record of delivering major employment schemes. The site was previously assessed by the Council and then proposed for allocation in the previous draft local plan (2020). It is now controlled by a willing and able developer, with a strong track-record of delivery, who can now bring the site forward. Require continued confirmation, through a Local Plan allocation, that the Council maintains their support of this key opportunity. Demonstrate the site is suitable, deliverable, and viable for allocation within the emerging plan. The site is in line with the growth strategy of the area and will deliver a range of key benefits to Worksop, Bassetlaw District, and the wider Sheffield City Region. The Apleyhead Junction site. The site is capable of delivering up to approximately 4.75m sqft of flexible market leading and market facing employment space. This can be delivered in a range of configurations, from smaller units through to Gigafactory-type space of upwards of 4m sqft in a single unit. The site is regionally unique in this context, in being able to meet the widest range of occupier needs including the largest floorspace and site requirements in the market. Previous local plan representation (February 2020) provided a detailed description of the site and its surrounding context including relevant planning and environmental designations. These representations do not repeat the details already provided, it is relevant to note the following key points which are pertinent when considering the suitability and deliverability of this site. This site is a strategically important opportunity that is: 1. Within the strategic A1 and A57 corridor identified in the draft plan 2. Close to existing major employment locations, including proven locations for major logistics, warehousing, distribution, and other employment facilities- including occupiers such as DHL, B&Q, and Wilko; 3. Immediately adjacent to a main junction on the strategic road network; 4. Flat and therefore capable of accommodating the largest units; 5. Relatively unconstrained in the main developable area; 6. Deliverable from an infrastructure perspective, in terms of access, utilities, etc; 7. Close to suitable residential populations and local labour; and 8. Capable of providing sustainable transport links, including pedestrian and cycle access and infrastructure to support public transport provision; A Site Location Plan is enclosed. This means the site is attractive to occupiers from a national and regional catchment, whilst also enabling the major expansion of local businesses whose needs cannot be met by the currently available opportunities. The potential importance of this site has been accepted at a Sheffield City Region and local evidence base level, which reinforced the entirely correct allocation of the site in the draft local plan. The evidence presented in section 3 shows the demand for sites such as this is only likely to increase. This places a clear requirement to find suitable sites at the earliest possible opportunity, which can then be brought forward at pace. Previous representations also identified a range of significant benefits, which are reflected in the plan that can be achieved through the delivery of this site. An outline planning application, can assist in early delivery of these significant benefits which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Delivering major investment in the strategically important A1 and A57 corridor;• Providing major new	Comments noted and welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST10 - EM001: APLEYHEAD JUNCTION, WORKSOP			
		<p>opportunities for larger footprint units that cannot be accommodated elsewhere in the Plan area;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approximately £435m direct and indirect GVA per annum from the fully operational development; • Between 4,400 and 7,700 new full time equivalent job roles, depending on the mix and scale of units and uses; • Upwards of £35m direct and indirect GVA per annum during the construction phases (approximately £280m for an eight year build out) alone; • Construction value of upwards of £275m; and • Upwards of 500 jobs created in the construction phases and associated construction supply chain. <p>Ongoing work, and the current development programme. To provide confidence to interested occupiers and to bring forward the significant benefits of development, the planning programme envisages an outline planning application for submission at the earliest opportunity in Q1 of 2021. Caddick has commissioned a range of logistics and employment use research pieces to assess and evidence the significant local and regional benefits which could be realised from development at Apleyhead Junction. These reports consider a range of issues including; the market demand for the type of units proposed, the locational benefits of development at the site, the economic benefits which can be realised, the effect of macroeconomic changes on the sector, and the regional role of this major scale development. The initial findings show there is significant demand for the types of units proposed in this location, and that the site (and indeed Bassetlaw) has the potential to meet a wide spectrum of demand on a sectoral and geographic basis. For example, it is expected that the site can satisfy occupier demand in both the East Midlands and Yorkshire & North East as two of the three most in demand regions for employment space. Further detail on economic and market related matters is provided in Section 3. It is expected that Caddick's ongoing work will be made available to the council at the appropriate time, in order to inform any further local planning authority led site assessment work. A significant level of detailed technical work has been undertaken to understand how the site could be delivered. This work has included: Early local consultation (with wider public consultation planned in early 2021); Highways and transport assessments; Ecology surveys including but not limited to: Site walkovers and initial appraisals; Nesting, breeding and seasonal bird surveys (including wintering birds); Nightjar and woodlark; Bats; Badgers; Amphibians and eDNA; Specific assessment of Sherwood Forest ppSPA; Habitats Regulations considerations; Biodiversity Net Gain; Drainage and flood risk appraisals; Landscape masterplanning; Ground conditions assessment; Agricultural land classification reports; Initial air quality assessments; Baseline noise assessment; Heritage appraisals; Initial archaeological trial trenching strategy(s); and Landscape and visual impact. This technical work will continue to be refined and updated. EIA Scoping The Scoping Response issued by the local planning authority on 8th December 2021 confirmed the scope of the Environmental Statement to be submitted with a future planning application. Further information on technical matters such as ecology, arboriculture and highways are set out in Section 3 of this report. A formal pre-application submission is currently with the local planning authority for consideration and a written response is anticipated in January 2021. Wider consultee engagement is ongoing and has sought to agree key technical items prior to the submission of a planning application. This has included agreement of the transport assessment principles with Highways England, initial discussions with Nottinghamshire County Council, and engagement with Natural England regarding key ecological and habitat matters including the adjacent Sherwood Forest ppSPA. This is in addition to any local plan led engagement by the local planning authority. It is anticipated that, as things stand, an outline planning application could be readied for submission at the earliest opportunity in Q1 of 2021. There will be ongoing dialogue with the council and consultees, including detailed community engagement, in advance of submission of a planning application.</p>	
REF209 Apleyhead	NJL Consulting on behalf of Caddick	<p>Given the importance of major logistics and employment opportunities in the Sheffield City Region, the SCR Combined Authority commissioned a Joint Sheffield City Region Strategic Employment Land Appraisal ('SELA'). The SELA seeks to provide a more coherent understanding of current strategic-level employment land across all nine districts in the SCR, specifically Barnsley, Bassetlaw, Bolsover, Chesterfield, Derbyshire Dales, Doncaster, North East Derbyshire, Rotherham, and Sheffield. The study identified a 'strategic-FEMA' for the wider region different to that of the Local Plan defined FEMA's; one which would enable the SCR to offer the optimum supply of land to address large scale or strategic inward investment requirements that would otherwise be above the indigenous needs of one district. When applied to the Apleyhead Junction site, the needs of the strategic FEMA are important in addition to the local indigenous need; as the site represents a large-scale B-Class development with the potential to provide vital economic benefits for the region. The SELA identified Bassetlaw as a district which could meet these needs, due to the availability of suitable land, access to suitable local employment, and proximity to the strategic road network. By providing space for such uses in Bassetlaw, SCR could then protect existing high value manufacturing areas and maximise the use of such land to meet advanced manufacturing ambitions in other districts. The study concluded that local indigenous need for employment land should not be the sole driver when planning for large-scale strategic developments that have the potential to support the wider region. The footloose nature of the logistics uses that would be accommodated on the site at Apleyhead Junction and the uniqueness of the locational characteristics at the site, means that a regional perspective should be used when considering its allocation. Apleyhead Junction, and land south of Worksop, is then identified as a strategic logistics node in the SCR SELA. Risk of missed opportunities for Bassetlaw If the local plan did not allocate Apleyhead Junction there is potential the District (and indeed</p>	Apleyhead is being promoted by the Local Plan as a strategic site for logistics employment.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST10 - EM001: APLEYHEAD JUNCTION, WORKSOP			
		<p>the region) would miss major investment opportunities that could deliver significant economic benefits. In the last 18 months there have been live interest for sites of this nature however the investment has gone elsewhere due to the lack of suitable allocated or consented sites. These missed opportunities show the types of economic benefits a large-scale development can have on the wider region. Aware that Tesla were presented with a range of UK site options (including Apleyhead Junction) for their European Gigafactory for the advanced production of electric cars. Tesla instead opted for a similar site in Berlin, Germany, where a 300ha (gross) facility is under construction. In terms of jobs created, Tesla predict the Berlin factory will employ up to 12,000 persons from both the local area and across Europe in order to secure persons with the necessary skills and expertise. Aware the Apleyhead site was presented to Britishvolt, for their leading Gigafactory, yet a site in Blyth (Northumberland) was selected instead. Britishvolt aims to establish the UK as the leading force in battery technology, with the green automotive industry of paramount importance. The proposed factory could create up to 3,500 jobs across over 2m sqft of floorspace. The economic benefits of a development on the scale of the Tesla Berlin and Britishvolt Gigafactory can be put into context when observing the economic impact of Tesla's first Gigafactory in Nevada, USA. Research by the Nevada Governor's office (2018) indicated Tesla brought \$6 billion in capital investment to the state of Nevada and created upwards of 7,000 jobs. This generated very significant regional economic growth and created an annual economic impact of \$3.56 billion across the region. This indicates that the economic benefits of a site such as that which can be accommodated at Apleyhead Junction are likely to have a major impact on the wider region. The knock-on effects of developing a site of this scale were also highlighted, as other major technology companies were attracted to the region. The economic impact of these additional companies has resulted in higher employment rates, higher personal income, and greater economic diversification in the region; with employment in the region growing by 34,500 jobs since 2014. The improvements associated with the Apleyhead Junction site could greatly enhance the competitiveness of the surrounding region for manufacturing, data centres and other types of economic development projects. This means sites such as this can be major catalysts for other major regional scale growth. Without a site such as Apleyhead Junction being allocated, there is a risk of major logistics requirements being lost not only from Bassetlaw, but also from SCR and D2N2 areas. The average size of logistics and distribution requirements is rising and deals in the 500,000sqft to 1m sqft size range are increasingly common (there were 9 such deals in the East Midlands alone in 2020). It is necessary for the occupier market to have some choice of locations, and if the right site cannot be provided to meet their needs, those requirements may be lost to regions that can supply the right sites. Opportunities further south in the East Midlands are currently being created to attract some of these market requirements, although it understood that the current supply could only accommodate 3 such units ibid. The Plan needs to ensure that the residents of Bassetlaw, SCR and D2N2 areas are able to benefit from the job creation, investment and GVA these market opportunities can bring. The Plan can only do so by having locally allocated sites that could meet this need, in addition to some choice in locations provided by other authorities in the wider sub-regions. The area has already lost major inward investment opportunities because of lack of suitable land supply. The Plan needs to address this fundamental requirement to avoid this happening further during the remaining Plan Period, hence the importance of allocating land at Apleyhead Junction.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST10 - EM001: APLEYHEAD JUNCTION, WORKSOP			
REF209 Apleyhead	NJL Consulting on behalf of Caddick	<p>Apleyhead Junction can meet occupier needs in multiple geographic markets whilst also satisfying key locational requirements such as access to labour and proximity to the strategic road network. This is further reinforced by the SCR Strategic Economic Plan recognition of the A57 Corridor as a key growth area. The growth in and increasing prominence of the A57 corridor is exemplified in the scale and range of development which has been delivered to the south of Worksop. This is none more so evident than in the ongoing development of almost 1m sqft of logistics space for DHL at Manton Wood, and previous major regional and national distribution and head office facilities for B&Q and Wilko. The importance of this area of the district was identified in the previous Draft Local Plan evidence base as a part of the District which is in high demand due to its strategic position and locational advantages. The previous draft local plan evidence also identified the importance of A57 and A1 corridor, something which is carried forward into the draft local plan. The importance of the A57 Corridor, and Apleyhead Junction, in meeting this demand for major employment sites is recognised in the evidence base which concludes Apleyhead Junction is the only site in the area which can meet a strategic need as it is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is in close proximity to key transport corridors, namely the A1/A57 which provide connectivity to urban areas, ports, and air freight opportunities; • Can provide B2/B8 employment functions connected with key sectors identified by the D2N2 LEP; • Can benefit from LEP support for delivery; • Supports the role of the key urban centre of Worksop, by providing locally accessible employment and opportunities; • Is of a large scale offering occupier flexibility and large-scale investment potential for locally grown businesses or for inward investors if appropriate; • Can deliver significant regeneration or economic development benefits; and • Can benefit from specific on-site infrastructure which has the ability to attract a specific type of occupier. <p>Sites such as Apleyhead Junction can attract major leading investment which can act as a catalyst for growth within the locality and wider region. The correct type and scale of investment in the appropriate site (and location) there can be significant benefits to the wider UK economy through, for example economic growth, attraction of associated companies and sectors, and the creation of new markets. The Draft Local Plan is correct to allocate Apleyhead Junction as a major employment site. If this site were not allocated, it would create a major issue for land supply locally and mean that the Plan area is forgoing the potential for major investment and job creation, which is necessary given the likely local impacts of the current recession on an already deprived local population.</p>	Comments noted and welcome.
REF209 Apleyhead	NJL Consulting on behalf of Caddick	<p>The allocation of Apleyhead Junction is supported in principle. Without an intervention of this nature it would not be possible to achieve the step change regeneration which is clearly sought by the draft plan, nor would it be possible to deliver the jobs target set in draft Policy ST1. Concerned the wording of ST10 is overly prescriptive and includes unnecessary detail which is better placed in the development management process (for example the list of highway interventions). Whilst the principle of an allocation is supported and Caddick will continue to work with the local authority, without the amendments as below would object to ST10. Continue to welcome that the draft plan and evidence base recognise the success of Worksop, and importance of the A57 corridor, in delivering significant employment growth, job opportunities and major investment. The plan and the evidence base note the potential for a corridor or cluster of similar uses, and this is welcomed. There are sites and units for smaller occupiers and 'local market' churn, those sites do not meet the requirements for the larger units (particularly of 1 million sqft+). The Apleyhead Junction site is a unique opportunity for a market leading development that meets the specific requirements of a range of occupiers including large scale occupiers who often seek sites on a regional, rather than local, basis. There are no other locations in Bassetlaw, nor in the sub-region, that can deliver the scale or quality of flexible employment land in such an accessible location. Sub-regionally, this scale of development could only likely be achieved with sizeable additional Green Belt releases. This is relevant when considering the strategic need and demand for sites such as Apleyhead Junction and its relationship with other employment sites and aspirations in the local plan. The benefits of allocating this site can only be realised with a flexible and responsive policy approach that reflects the market appetite to invest and which does not frustrate the objective by putting in unnecessary barriers. Notwithstanding the general in principle support for allocating the site, concerned the policy detail could create onerous requirements which inhibit the ability to properly deliver the site. Instead, the policy should set a flexible and supportive framework for development. For example, Part A of the policy refers to the development including 'natural greenspace uses' yet no detail is provided on this matter. Green space will be incorporated into the development but the term 'natural greenspace uses' suggests a more formal designation within the site which is not shown in the allocation and does not form part of the anticipated development proposals. Consider green space issues should be dealt with under specific green space policies, or within the development management criteria in ST10 Part B (as amended). Part 3(iv) of the policy requires 'A financial contribution towards the new Bassetlaw Garden Village rail station for use by occupiers of the site'. A requirement would be addressed through a planning application where the requirements for such a contribution can be properly assessed. Would be premature for the draft local plan to place financial contributions on an emerging allocation (Apleyhead Junction) when there is no evidence the contribution would meet the necessary legislative tests. Part 3 also includes references to requirement agreement, or at least incorporating advice, from the local highway authority (LHA). Continue to seek engagement with the LHA as part of the ongoing pre-application advice, the Transport Assessment should not be forcibly</p>	<p>It is important that the site allocation policy clearly identifies the Council's planning objectives for the site and also identifies the infrastructure needed to mitigate potential impacts in the locality. This provides future developers with clarity over likely costs associate with development and the community and stakeholders that potential impacts will be appropriately addressed. It is also necessary to evidence infrastructure requires for the Council to identify that the site can be delivered as part of a financially viable scheme. However, the policy will be re-visited to ensure there is a clear link between the infrastructure requirements and the proposal. The requirement to address impacts on the ppSPA are necessary to address the individual potential impacts from this development upon Clumber Park as a result of its proximity. The biodiversity policy is a strategic policy to provide the policy framework for applications District-wide. Links to the Garden Village will be re-visited appropriately.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST10 - EM001: APLEYHEAD JUNCTION, WORKSOP			
		<p>bound by emerging policy to take on the LHA advice in full, particularly if the advice were to place unrealistic expectations on the scope and content of a Transport Assessment. Part 3 then identifies a range of highways improvements which should be undertaken (or contributed to) as part of the development. Consider that any such requests should be considered through a planning application where detailed trip generation and associated analysis can be used to set an appropriate scope of works or contributions. Further changes are also required to ensure ST10 is aligned with other development management policies. For example, ST10 places a more onerous requirement on the need to avoid adverse effects on the nearby ppSPA than is required in Policy ST42: Biodiversity and Geodiversity. Other policy amendments are suggested in a similar context, in order to ensure the policy avoids onerous requirements which could delay or prevent development. Generally speaking, content the policy supporting text sets an appropriate framework of, and explanation for, the policy. Minor changes are required to the wording to ensure consistency with other policies. Should avoid inferred linkages between the proposed new settlement (policy ST3) and Apleyhead Junction, it should also avoid placing onerous requirements to agree certain infrastructure items with other landowners and developers. For example, draft local plan paragraph 6.3.8 states: The site is also expected to benefit from the provision of a new railway station at the nearby Bassetlaw Garden Village. Its proximity will prove attractive to future occupiers and employees, Therefore, developers should work with the promoters of the nearby Garden Village to ensure that the sustainable and public transport provision is complementary and that appropriate links are made. This includes access via the land adjoining the railway line for pedestrians and cyclists.' Neither ST10 (Part 3(iv)) nor the supporting text identify how this could be delivered. There is no identification of costs for such infrastructure nor any indication of the programme for delivery although it is assumed the new settlement station would be provided towards the back end of the plan period at the earliest. Such a timeline does not fit with the development aspirations for Apleyhead Junction where development could be completed in the plan period. Can consider appropriate, proportionate, and reasonable requests where they relate to new settlement delivery provided it does not unnecessarily affect the delivery of Apleyhead Junction. The plan must be realistic when setting policy expectations and aspirations. Suggest the following amended wording to Policy ST10, and it should be noted that the amended part A of ST10 includes the various economic criteria previously listed in draft policy ST8.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST10 - EM001: APLEYHEAD JUNCTION, WORKSOP			
REF209 Apleyhead	NJL Consulting on behalf of Caddick	<p>Policy ST10: Site EM010: Apleyhead Junction, Worksop Land at Apleyhead Junction, Worksop (118.7ha) as identified on the Policies Map will be developed for major employment (Class E(g), B2 and B8) and will deliver a safe, sustainable, quality working environment. Development should as appropriate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Key economic considerations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide E(g)/B2/B8 employment functions identified by the D2N2 LEP Local Industrial Strategy; 2. Be supportive of the role of key urban centres, such as Worksop; 3. Deliver significant economic development benefits in terms of development value and gross value added for the District, D2N2 and Sheffield City Region; 6. Have suitable access to key strategic transport routes; 7. Provide a significant number of new permanent jobs including a mix of appropriately skilled employment. B. Development Management considerations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Good Quality Design and Local Character <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Incorporate sensitive design and location of buildings that supports the positive development of the site; b) Be supported by a detailed lighting strategy that minimises light pollution on the natural environment; c) Achieve BREEAM very good standards (or any successor scheme) for energy, water efficiency and sustainable construction; d) Be supported by an Air Quality Management Strategy and Landscape Visual Impact Assessment which consider and outline appropriate measures to protect the special characteristics of Clumber Park SSSI and the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. 2. Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Be supported by an ecological survey and arboriculture plan which appropriately manages the qualities of Top Wood/Great Whin Covert Local Wildlife Site; b) Provide an appropriate level of green infrastructure connectivity within the site and to neighbouring green infrastructure assets to support climate resilience; c) Provide an appropriate landscape buffer between the site and the A1 to the east and to the railway line to the north; d) Be supported by a project level Habitats Regulations Assessment, including winter bird surveys to ensure there are no significant adverse impacts upon Clumber Park SSSI and Sherwood Forest ppSPA. 3. Transport and Accessibility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Be supported by a proportionate Transport Assessment and Travel Plan which considers the potential effect of development on surrounding highways and outlines potential mitigation measures as necessary, b) Consider proportionate transport and highways measures such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Enabling safe access to the site from the A57 for vehicles, public transport, cyclists, and pedestrians; ii. Relevant and proportionate mitigation measures including financial contributions to the local highway network as agreed through any future relevant planning application for the site; iii. Quality, safe, and direct pedestrian and cycle links: a) Along the A57 to connect with existing development; b) Which allow for possible future connections to the location of the new settlement; iv. A proportionate financial contribution to support an appropriate frequency bus service connecting the site to Worksop town centre, supported by appropriate public transport infrastructure within the site; v. Appropriate servicing and parking provision for each development parcel. (no changes proposed). 	The policy will be revisited to reflect all comments made and to achieve a sound basis from which to proceed. The policy requirements will be those that are considered necessary to facilitate a sustainable development on site.
REF209 Apleyhead	NJL Consulting on behalf of Caddick	<p>Comment on the suitability of the allocation of the Apleyhead Junction site Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan (November 2020) and related key draft policies. Continue to support and welcome the allocation of land at Apleyhead Junction for major employment development to help achieve the local plan vision. The site is suitable for development and is controlled by Caddick as a willing and established developer with a proven track record of delivering major employment sites. The local plan and its evidence base, along with regional studies and documents such as LEP Strategic Economic Plans, all show a clear upward trajectory for logistics sector growth. Reinforced by research which identifies 2020 as a record year for major employment space demand and take-up, and this trend will continue. Is ideally located to meet employment space demand in two of the post sought after market areas (East Midlands and Yorkshire & North East), and its position on flat non Green Belt land close to the strategic road network and near to suitable residential populations is highly attractive for occupiers. The local plan recognises the need to boost employment land supply and focus growth primarily within Worksop, and particularly to sites close to the urban area (such as Apleyhead Junction). The Council must ensure suitable employment sites remain allocated to help meet the need identified within Bassetlaw, and the allocation policies must not place unrealistic burdens on developers. No technical constraints which cannot be appropriately mitigated, it is still suitable for employment uses, has a willing developer attached and is in line with the growth strategy for Bassetlaw, wider Sheffield City Region and D2N2 areas. Welcome the approach to identifying a new settlement as a means of delivering major sustainable co-located growth. This would be best achieved through a 'broad location' rather than a specific 'Garden Village' allocation.</p>	Comments noted and welcome. The Garden Village is expected to be taken forward as an allocation.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST11 – Existing Employment			
REF071	Minerals and Waste, NCC	This Policy seeks to protect existing employment sites and several of the listed sites contain permitted waste management facilities. The County Council welcomes this policy which relates to Policy WCS10 of the Waste Core Strategy which seeks to safeguard permitted waste management facilities and potential future sites from sterilisation from other development uses.	Support noted
REF092	DHA Planning	<p>"Explore Industrial Park - Policy ST11: Existing Employment Sites and Buildings</p> <p>Firstly we support the removal of the EIP site from this policy and its transfer to the more appropriate Policy ST8, as discussed above. However, we note that our previous concerns over the current drafting of part C of the policy have not been addressed. Whilst we continue to have no objection to the main principle here, the wording as drafted may have unintended consequences by preventing otherwise acceptable employment uses. As drafted, this part of the policy states that any change of use or redevelopment to a non-E(g), B2 or B8 employment use would only be permitted where certain criteria are met. It is not currently clear whether all the criteria must be met in order to accord with the policy.</p> <p>As an example of why this matters, it is entirely conceivable that a non-B1, B2 or B8 employment use, such as a <i>sui generis</i> employment use was proposed, which would have the same benefits as a standard B-class use. As worded, the policy would require evidence of 12 months' marketing and a viability assessment, which would seem unnecessary. However, if the word "or" was added to the end of each criterion, in this example it would still accord with the policy as the second criterion would be complied with. We request that the policy is amended in this way."</p>	<p>Policy ST8 Identifies Explore Industrial Park as a general employment site and shows that there is land available for development on the site. This is reflected in the latest evidence the 2020 HEDNA. See Appendix A – site supply.</p> <p>Support the allocation of the site for general employment development under Policy ST8 (B) is noted.</p> <p>"and/or" has been added to the end of each criterion to clarify that not all of the criteria would necessarily need to be satisfied.</p>
REF035	Resident	Policy ST10 – Existing Employment Sites should therefore include Gamston Airport as a fully functioning aviation facility, justified and in accord with the NPPF Section 9, paragraph 104(f).	<p>Gamston Airfield Business Park is safeguarded as an existing employment site under Policy ST11.</p> <p>The remainder of the airfield functions as an operational as a general aviation airfield and is not considered to sit within any of the employment uses classes. The airfield is protected as such by national planning policy.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST11 – Existing Employment			
REF171	Lichfields on behalf of land owner	<p>Policy ST11: Existing Employment Sites</p> <p>As part of our February 2020 submission, we had welcomed draft Policy ST10's support for new and extended employment development, subject to various criteria being met. This has not been carried forward as part of the new Policy ST11 however and, thus, the draft Local Plan is now silent in terms of providing any guidance for new employment development on unallocated sites in non-rural locations or within existing employment areas. To ensure that the policy is effective, the original text from Policy ST10 should be reinstated so as to ensure flexibility in the employment land supply and avoid it being over-reliant on the delivery of proposed allocated sites.</p>	<p>Amendments to Policy ST12 Policy -- Rural Economic Growth And Economic Growth Outside Employment Areas - has now been revised to clarify the position in relation to new employment development on unallocated sites in non-rural locations or within existing employment areas.</p>
REF177	Axised on behalf of FCC Environment	<p>"1.5 ST11 – Existing Employment Sites</p> <p>1.5.1 Policy ST11 has been revised and no longer includes for the provision for new employment development outside of allocated employment sites subject to the development satisfying a number of criteria. The revised supporting text confirms that Policy ST11 enables sustainable economic growth where appropriate outside of the existing employment sites and in the rural area in association with Policy ST12.</p> <p>1.5.2 For the reasons we set out below in our response to Policy ST12, this change is not supported as it no longer provides a policy framework for any employment development within the rural area unless it is for the growth of an existing business. This is not consistent with the NPPF which promotes making effective use of land and supporting a prosperous rural economy."</p>	<p>Policy -- Rural Economic Growth And Economic Growth Outside Employment Areas - has now been amended to refer to the delivery of any local employment opportunities that support the diversification of the rural economy, and not just to existing businesses.</p> <p>Proposals for the growth of businesses in the countryside and outside established employment areas/allocations, that deliver local employment opportunities, including support the diversification of the rural economy, will be permitted.</p>
REF205	Heatons on behalf of Tarmac Trading Ltd	<p>Tarmac benefit from freehold ownership of land at Chainbridge Lane, east of Lound, approximately 4km north of Retford. Tarmac would like to submit 17.5 hectares of land at Lound for employment uses over the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan period. The land itself consists of a Charcon precast concrete facility and associated adjoining land, as shown on the accompanying Plan (Drawing No. L023-00288-1). The employment uses a Chainbridge Lane are long-established and have expanded in recent years. The land is located adjacent to the Idle Valley Nature Reserve, with Local Wildlife Sites (Draft Local Plan Policy ST36) located to the north and east. The Charcon precast concrete facility benefits from a permanent planning permission. Furthermore, permission ref. 13/00874/COU for the change of use of land adjoining the precast facility to land for the storage of HGV trailers and precast concrete products in connection with the precast facility was issued in September 2013. This permission was without any 'end date' and represents a permanent planning permission. Submit that Tarmac's freehold landholding a Chainbridge Lane currently contributes to the portfolio of employment sites within the District and should be recognised within Policy ST11 'Existing Employment Sites' within the Local Plan. Given the presence of a wider Tarmac landholding, the site retains the potential for expansion/diversification of its uses to support economic growth for the area in accordance with the objectives of NPPF and Policy ST12 'Rural Economic Growth and Economic Growth Outside Employment Areas' of the Draft Local Plan.</p>	<p>The site has permission for extension of sand and gravel extraction and retention of existing processing plant and ancillary facilities at Lound Quarry, Chainbridge Lane, Lound, Retford.</p> <p>It is a minerals extraction site making pre-cast concrete and should be restored following completion of operations. It is therefore a countryside location with the operation being in the interest of minerals and quarrying extraction. It is therefore not considered appropriate to allocate as a general employment site under Policy ST11.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST12 - RURAL ECONOMIC GROWTH AND ECONOMIC GROWTH OUTSIDE EMPLOYMENT AREAS			
REF101	East Markham Parish Council	Concerned that there is no provision in the plan for Small and Medium Enterprises to locate in villages like East Markham. The plan is in danger of ensuring villages become nothing but bed and breakfast communities with residents commuting out for work. There needs to be a greater emphasis on providing opportunities for small start-up businesses with high speed internet connections and excellent connectivity to the wider area.	The plan is supportive of the the diversification of the rural economy, and the establishment of rural enterprises and housing development in suitable locations. Employment policies provide opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Policy ST59 requires developers to engage with broadband providers to ensure that full fibre, or the fastest, most up to date technology, is installed in premises/homes.
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Area Plan	Page 67, Para 6.5.4 – Supporting employment opportunities (albeit on a much smaller scale) is welcomed and supported. This can only ensure the longevity of the small rural settlements as long as it is in keeping with that area.	Support noted
REF149	Stone Planning Services Limited on behalf of Charterpoint (NG22) Limited	This policy states: A. Proposals for the growth of business in the countryside and outside established employment areas/allocations, including the development of education facilities that provide training for role and heritage professions, will be supported where all of the following are met: 1. There is a proven need for the development in terms of business opportunity or operational requirements; 2. The proposed development cannot physically and reasonably be accommodated within the curtilage of the existing site; 3. The scale of development is appropriate in the proposed location; 4. The development has no adverse impact on the character of the location, the surrounding townscape or landscape, the forming character of the settlement or biodiversity and heritage; 5. There is no unacceptable impact on the safe operation of the highway network and that safe access can be achieved by vehicles, sustainable and public transport; 6. The development generates no adverse impact on residential amenity Generally support the thrust of this policy. However we suggest the Council reviews criteria 2 which refers to the 'existing site'. Suggest that there is a recognition that there may not be an 'existing site'. As the policy is constructed, with all criteria to be satisfied, the policy would exclude other sustainable sites that are not 'existing'.	Noted - criteria 2 has been amended to refer to existing sites
REF171	Lichfields on behalf of land owner	Support Policy ST12, the wording of criterion 4 and 6 should be amended to reflect the NPPF's recognition that potentially adverse impacts associated with new development can often be addressed through appropriate mitigation. Our proposed revised wording is as follows: 4. Subject to appropriate mitigation, the development has no adverse impact on the character of the location, the surrounding townscape or landscape, the form and character of the settlement or biodiversity and heritage. 6. Subject to appropriate mitigation, the development generates no adverse impact on residential amenity. The draft policy should also be revised to make clear that criterion 2 is only applicable to existing employment sites. These amendments will ensure the effectiveness of the policy, in line with the tests of soundness set out in paragraph 35 of the NPPF.	It is not considered necessary to amend the Policy as it already provides sufficient safeguards, and there are other specific policies in the Plan relating to design which will also be taken into account. Satisfactory mitigation which enables development to proceed will be supported. Criteria 2 has been amended to refer to existing sites
1669241	Resident	Objected to the previous draft policy (ST11) version sought to restrict economic growth in rural areas by imposing a criterion which required that - It is directly related to agricultural, horticultural or forestry operations, or other activities, which by their nature would require a rural location; which would have stifled wider rural business expansion counter to paragraph 83 of the NPPF. Note that this criterion has now been dropped and can support the revised policy.	Support welcome and noted
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	This should have a more positive spin and include a section on new rural based industries which can be limited by size rather than use.	All proposals are assessed in terms of their suitability, balanced against benefits and environmental impacts.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST12 - RURAL ECONOMIC GROWTH AND ECONOMIC GROWTH OUTSIDE EMPLOYMENT AREAS			
REF099	Consultant on behalf of land owner	<p><i>These comments were made in reference to Policy ST11 "Rural Economic Growth" in the January 2020 Draft Local Plan</i></p> <p>Paragraph 3.2 of the Draft Local Plan sets out a fundamental concept:- "3.2 The performance of the local economy is a key driver that shapes Bassetlaw into a successful and growing location" and then in Paragraphs 3.4 and 3.5 draws attention to the fundamental changes in the structure of the economy. Paragraph 3.5 notes:- "...The logistics sector continues to grow, with significant investment taking place and market interest evidenced along the A57 and A1 corridors" But given the extent to which Bassetlaw is an Authority with a substantial rural area it is surprising that Draft Policy ST11 does not address the extent to which the rural economy has been and will be called upon to support economic growth. Generally and partly by its very nature the A1 would normally be more associated with rural Bassetlaw than urban Bassetlaw. But there a few locations that exemplify the changes from a rural area more than "North Blyth" given the extent that the developments already present are changing and the development permitted but yet to come will continue to significantly change the character of the area. Rural economic growth in bassetlaw has a different dimension than might normally be expected in a rural authority. "North Blyth" offers an outstanding opportunity to not only strengthen the local economy but also appropriately locate other key elements of employment infrastructure i.e. housing without harm to any issue of normal importance.</p>	Policy ST12 and the plan in general strike an appropriate balance between encouraging a thriving rural economy, maintaining, or improving the sustainability of smaller rural settlements, and conserving the character of the District's much valued countryside.
REF208	P&DG on behalf of Welbeck Estate	<p>As explained at the previous stage of the Local Plan consultation do not believe that the draft policy highlights the importance of the diversification and business growth which occurs on this Estate specifically. Welcome the references to support growth where it supports a country estate. In this draft Plan, the description of Policy ST12 briefly mentions the Estates' rural businesses, including those linked to food production and agriculture. The wording of the policy itself is restrictive to economic growth of the Estate and does not provide the Estate with the tools to continue its role as a place of enterprise for business as a whole that may locate themselves there. The Estate's lack of a specific mention within Economic Growth Policy is not surprising given that in this draft of the Local Plan, Policy ST1 does not distinguish Welbeck village as a district settlement in Bassetlaw. P&DG must highlight the made Cuckney, Norton, Holbeck and Welbeck Neighbourhood Plan, which does designate Welbeck as a settlement.</p> <p>P&DG suggests there needs to be alignment to the Neighbourhood Plan in this regard, as the Sustainability Appraisal of the Draft Plan suggests it should do as far as possible, by distinguishing Welbeck as a settlement for growth opportunities on account of its potential for tourism, leisure, limited rural housing and rural enterprise.</p> <p>To address the potential limitations, recommend the inclusion of a site-specific policy for rural economic growth across the Welbeck Estate. A policy drafted in this way would allow the Estate to diversify more businesses across the site, employing more local people and contributing towards Bassetlaw's objective of promoting the visitor economy. Notwithstanding this, the current employment offer within the Estate is already significant, with over 300 employees and tens of external businesses located in premises on site. On those numbers alone, this is profound and easily equivalent to a conventional business park that would ordinarily be considered for allocation. Given the Estate's contribution to the rural and visitor economy within Bassetlaw, a Policy directly relating to Estate and its diversification and reuse of heritage assets on it would be warranted and beneficial. This policy suggestion would be subject to ensuring development meets the expectations of other policies to be adopted Local Plan and other material considerations. The suggested wording for the proposed policy could be as follows: The District Council will work with the Welbeck Estate and other partners to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the diversification of land uses across the site encompassing opportunities for tourism, economic development, leisure and accommodation, limited housing where permitted by the other policies of the Local Plan and community uses; • Support the diversification of land uses on the site that deliver the objectives of the Local Plan for both the rural and visitor economies; • Encourage the development of businesses and companies locally which harness the education potential of the Welbeck Estate or local community, and secures the long-term future and positive redevelopment of heritage assets; • Ensure that new development, where permitted by this policy, does not prejudice other policies of the Local Plan. 	<p>The Council will work with all stakeholders, partners landowners and developers to realise the objectives of the Policy. It is not considered that a site-specific policy is required for the Welbeck Estate. The Policy as well as other policies and LP objectives provide for economic prosperity and inward investment, support the positive re-use of heritage assets and the appropriate provision of housing in the countryside as well as supporting job growth and upskilling of residents. This is considered sufficient.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan is a separate development plan and has been created by the local community. The existing plan is currently being reviewed alongside the Local Plan and is due for its Regulation 16 consultation later this year.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST12 - RURAL ECONOMIC GROWTH AND ECONOMIC GROWTH OUTSIDE EMPLOYMENT AREAS			
REF177	Axisped on behalf of FCC Environment	<p>The NPPF states that the Government is committed to securing sustainable economic growth in order to create jobs and prosperity. It also reinforces the position that planning applications must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. FCC's site lies outside of the defined settlement boundary of Worksop and therefore whilst it is most closely related to the urban area of Worksop, from a policy perspective it is located within the rural area. Despite its rural location, the site has the potential to support economic development in the District and contribute to the economic aims of the District and the wider area. Policy ST12 supports proposals for the growth of businesses in the countryside and outside established employment areas / allocations subject to the development meeting a number of criteria. The previous wording within the January 2020 draft Local Plan provided support for 'development that will generate employment opportunities, proportionate to the rural location'. The revised policy wording goes on to provide support for the development of educational facilities that provide training for rural and heritage professions. The Policy and supporting text appear to only provide support for the growth of existing businesses within the countryside or outside established employment areas / allocations. Given that this version of the Local Plan has removed the wording within Policy ST11 in relation to employment development outside of the existing allocated sites and Policy ST12 only provides support for the growth of existing businesses in the countryside, there is no policy framework for the development of 'B' use classes within locations in the countryside or outside of the established employment areas / allocations. This is a significant failing of the Plan which makes it unsound. Clearly it should not be the case that any economic development within the countryside or outside employment areas would need to support the growth of an existing business. Whilst it is acknowledged that the acceptability of a proposal will be viewed against other relevant policies of the Plan, it is essential that there should be a provision within the economic policies of the Plan to allow sustainable, acceptable employment development proportionate to its location within the countryside or outside of employment areas. Sites that are located within sustainable rural locations have the ability to contribute to the Council's employment land supply and could perform a strategic function in contributing to rural economic growth. Planning policy should seek to secure economic growth to create jobs and prosperity which would bring forward significant, inward investment opportunities to the District. It is considered that the current wording of the policy would not facilitate this in line with national policy. The wording of the policy should be revised to recognise that there are instances when economic development in the countryside or outside established employment areas is acceptable and should not be limited to existing business growth. The NPPF promotes the effective use of land, including providing support for the development of under-utilised land and buildings. In line with the NPPF, the policy criteria should be amended to provide support for economic development on under-utilised / previously developed sites in sustainable locations. FCC's site is previously disturbed land and part previously developed, the entire site is of low environmental value and currently underutilised. Paragraphs A1-A6 provide a number of criteria which development proposals under Policy ST12 are expected to meet. This includes demonstrating a need for the development in terms of business opportunity or operational requirements and demonstrating that the development cannot be accommodated within the curtilage of the existing site. It is considered that these two requirements would not necessarily be applicable to all new development in the countryside, such as for B2/B8 uses at FCC's site. The site is under-utilised and could contribute to the Council's employment supply without any significant impacts on the surrounding environment. However, at present, with the exception of the limited wording within Policy ST1 which promotes the efficient and effective use of land, there is no clear policy framework within Chapter 6 (Delivering Economic Prosperity) of the Local Plan which supports the re-use of land for economic development within the rural area unless it relates to an existing business.</p>	<p>The Policy has been modified to make reference to the re-use of existing buildings in the countryside, and to sustainable growth outside of existing sites and established employment areas.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST13 - VISITOR ECONOMY			
1666840	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Welcome the recognition that Bassetlaw has the potential to expand its tourism sector. Aware from personal business dealings that visitors are surprised by the attractions within the area. Hope that going ahead there is a SPOC in relation to planning/development issues around tourism to ensure that opportunities for growth are not missed.	Welcome and support is noted

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST13 - VISITOR ECONOMY			
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Area Plan	Pages 68_69, and Para E – Visitors to rural Bassetlaw are always welcomed particularly in respect of the huge historical impact certain parts of Bassetlaw have and have had (e.g. Scrooby and the Pilgrim Fathers of America). However, there is a big alarm ringing in Para D when it talks about conversion of touring to static lodges or pods or caravans. Recent events have shown that this is viewed by certain businesses as a way of providing permanent homes and it is up to the local citizens to police that is not happening. This policy MUST be reinforced to state this conversion must NOT be used as a means of creating permanent dwelling without the requisite building planning approvals.	The policy only supports conversion to static caravans or pods where it helps the expansion of an existing business. Conversion to permanent homes will be resisted. This is given further support in the policy text which states that planning conditions will be used to restrict the use of buildings to holiday accommodation only.
REF153	Natural England	Welcome the additional safeguards set out at point 3 to ensure the scale of tourism development does not adversely impact on landscape and biodiversity. Note that this policy has been considered within the Appropriate Assessment regarding its potential to impact on the Sherwood ppSPA.	Welcome - noted
REF211	National Trust	Supports Policy ST13 which supports the visitor economy of the district, particularly Part F which supports developments that will enhance the environment or bring neglected or underused heritage assets back into appropriate economic use.	Support is noted
1669638	Norton Cuckney Parish Council	This policy does not take into consideration that visitors to rural areas of the District will require local car parking and public toilets. Both are lacking in rural areas, and funding for these facilities is non existent, at district and county level. There is already pressure on rural settlements for parking, and whilst we are keen to encourage visitors, there should be support from district in the local plan.	The Local Plan supports the improvements to visitor facilities and infrastructure. Infrastructure provision will be sought where appropriate through on site delivery, developer contributions and CIL.
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	Tourism in Bassetlaw should be encouraged and highlighted. This local plan will be read by developers looking to locate or develop in this area. This section of Visitor Economy should also be a “shop window” with greater emphasis on support and encouragement for new facilities rather than this brief section. The formation of Springvale Fishing Lakes was a tortuous long winded route with opposition all of the way. It is now one of the premier angling venues within the UK and regularly attracts 60+ anglers on a daily basis. The year 2020 saw a closure of the premises due to Covid for a period of 9-10 weeks yet still attracted 18,500 visitors to the facility which equates to 62 per day. There are 2 further ponds to finish so the venue will not realise its full capacity for another 12 months. However, on good days throughout spring, summer and autumn 140-160 anglers on the lakes is common. All of this has been achieved with no assistance whatsoever from the Council. Think what could be achieved if there was serious consideration and support from a vibrant Tourism section within the authority.	The Plan provides support for the visitor economy. Through support for development and regeneration; partnership working; and the use of CIL and developer contribution the Council will seek to enhance infrastructure, and attractions to increase visitor numbers for the benefit of the District’s economy.
REF208	P&DG on behalf of Welbeck Estate	Support the role of the above policy to include visitor accommodation as it is acknowledged there is great potential for additional amenities in the Dukeries and great untapped potential to enhance the visitor economy here. The individual characteristics that support such proposals in rural Bassetlaw is supported including the recognition in favour of development where it is forming a functional link with a specific local attraction, bringing heritage assets back into use or is necessary to diversify a country estate, farm enterprise or tourism offer in the District.	Support for the Policy is noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST14 - TOWN CENTRES, LOCAL CENTRES, LOCAL SHOPS AND SERVICES			
1652721	Resident	There is no mention of car parking facilities being increased in Retford. Where are all the probable extra cars going to park? There is already a major parking problem at the weekends, and one new resident of the flats at Beardsalls Way is already complaining of nowhere to park.	No issue in terms of town centre capacity with existing car parks has been raised. However, the Retford Town Centre Neighbourhood Plan has

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST14 - TOWN CENTRES, LOCAL CENTRES, LOCAL SHOPS AND SERVICES			
			been recently designated to look at the town centre in more detail and the issues it faces.
1656935	Resident	The clustering of non-F2a uses, such as banks, cafes and takeaways, can reduce the attractiveness of a Primary Shopping Area and can create 'dead frontages'. Unfortunately the Harworth and Bircotes town centre is primarily made up of these non-F2a uses, with every other shop a takeaway or hairdressers. More needs to be done to develop footfall in the town and attract more shopping and leisure opportunities as the population of the town continues to grow. Without this we will see any money from the town be spent in shops within Doncaster, or leisure opportunities in Bawtry.	A Masterplan for Harworth Bircotes centre is being prepared. This will look at local issues affecting the area including opportunities for improving public realm, shop frontages and other regeneration.
REF041	Retford Civic Society	<p>It is disappointing to see that the Draft Plan says very little about Retford town centre. The problems, opportunities and potential of this area are barely mentioned. The Council has committed resources to a study of central Worksop, has identified this area as a 'Priority Regeneration Area' and is to prepare a development plan document to guide its future. The Draft Plan proposes that a neighbourhood plan be produced for Retford town centre, led by the Business Forum. Retford Civic Society will do all it can to assist in, and contribute to, this work. The neighbourhood plan process is complicated particularly in a town centre and is very lengthy. The production by the Council of a development plan document, as in Worksop, could well be quicker and more effective involving just as much community input. The Society urges the Council to keep the neighbourhood plan preparation under review and to consider an alternative approach if it fails to make rapid progress.</p>	<p>There is a difference between Retford and Worksop Town Centres in the fact that Worksop has a substantial amount of vacant or underused brownfield land. The regeneration of these sites is a Council priority and as it is linked to infrastructure social and physical regeneration, it needs to be comprehensively planned alongside other developments.</p> <p>Retford Town Centre has less of a physical or social regeneration need as the issues it faces is similar to other town centres such as a declining retail core. The Retford Neighbourhood Plan could focus on these issues at a more local level without the need for an additional development plan document.</p>
REF047	Resident	<p>The Plan fails to address the problems, opportunities and potential of Retford town centre. This is in contrast to Worksop where the Council is developing a 'town centre masterplan'. The proposal for a Neighbourhood Plan passes responsibility for Retford town centre to others. It is much more difficult in a town centre to produce a Neighbourhood Plan than in a village. The process is likely to take a long time, and in the absence of central involvement by Council planners will probably require the involvement of consultants with little local knowledge or loyalty. The Council could deal with Retford town centre in the same way as it is dealing with Worksop town centre; this could involve at least as extensive community involvement as is likely with a Neighbourhood Plan; a Plan produced this way would carry just as much weight as a Neighbourhood Plan. This option should be pursued if there is any delay with the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>There is a difference between Retford and Worksop Town Centres in the fact that Worksop has a substantial amount of vacant or underused brownfield land. The regeneration of these sites is a Council priority and as it is linked to infrastructure social and physical regeneration, it needs to be comprehensively planned alongside other developments.</p> <p>Retford Town Centre has less of a physical or social regeneration need as the issues it faces is similar to other town centres such as a declining retail core. The Retford Neighbourhood Plan could focus on these issues at a more local level without the need for an additional development plan document</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST14 - TOWN CENTRES, LOCAL CENTRES, LOCAL SHOPS AND SERVICES			
REF190	Babworth Parish Council	The Parish's main service centre is Retford which the Parish is reliant upon for the provision of most of its day to day needs. The vision for Retford within the Local Plan is that "Retford will have retained and enhanced its character through a significant public realm intervention strengthening its town centre offer and providing an attractive base for cultural and visitor economy events". Support the delivery of town centre improvements and public realm strengthening. The vitality and vibrancy of the town is reliant on an appropriate level of growth being delivered at the town.	Noted. Thank for your comment.
REF214	Historic England	Proposals for a local centre within the Bassetlaw Garden Village will need to take into account comments made in relation to Policies ST3 and ST4 and the historic environment.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
1670549	Resident	Town centres in Bassetlaw are dying, not helped by parking charges and never ending roadworks which drive shoppers away. The pandemic has opened the door to online grocery shopping and it is likely going forward visits into the town centre will get less. A wide diversity of shops is what is required to tempt shoppers back and applications for further supermarkets should be refused.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
1670589	Resident	6.7.10 It is asked that more development in Small Rural Settlements is allowed, reflecting the need to sustain and create local 'corner' and village shops, many of which have ceased trading a number of years ago.	Development in rural areas is dealt with through Policy ST2 Rural Bassetlaw.
REF054	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Of course the need for a master plan for Retford town post COVID. Interested to know how the year of the pandemic will shift some of the priorities for the plan to enable development of town centres?	The Retford Town Centre Neighbourhood Plan could focus on the town centre post-covid. The Neighbourhood Plan is being developed by a group of businesses and local people. More information can be found at: Retford Town Centre Neighbourhood Plan Bassetlaw District Council

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 - MANAGEMENT OF TOWN CENTRES			
1652721	Resident	Increased residential facilities in the Retford town centre will obviously require spaces to park the occupants cars. There does not appear to be any consideration to the requirement for additional car parking within Retford. This would also need to be massively increased if Retford is to attract more visitors and greater footfall to boost the town's economy.	There is no evidence to suggest there is a deficiency in car parking provision within Retford Town Centre.
REF041	Retford Civic Society	Contains several references to Class F2a, notably in Policy ST15. It is unclear what this means. This Use Class relates to what could be described as village shops. Town centre uses generally now fall into either Class E or Class F. Because of this, it is impossible to know what the Council is proposing in relation to uses within town centres. This is an important area of policy and clarification is required.	The Council will clarify this within the updated version of the Bassetlaw Local Plan.
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Area Plan	Page 74, Para C, Upper Floor Areas – Whilst the use of Upper floor areas of shop buildings is supported in a city / town environment it must not be allowed to "creep" into rural areas.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF142	Retford Branch Labour Party	Retford Primary Shopping Area Boundaries mentions shops and businesses in a designated area of the town. The development of dwellings over business premises is supported, but there will be locations within that area that will support ground floor dwellings - will that be part of the Plan?	This is largely covered by changes to National Planning Policy and permitted development rights for change of use. However, more detail on local planning issues may be developed as part of the Retford Town Centre Neighbourhood Plan.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 - MANAGEMENT OF TOWN CENTRES			
REF169	Resident	page 74, para D.2b Welcome projects to improve pedestrian and cycle links in Retford.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF197	Resident	(6.8.10) Do you mean "Retford Business Forum" or the Retford Town Centre Neighbourhood Planning Group...or both? Upper floor uses – what guidance will be issued to prevent town centres being populated with overly dense, small flats which have the danger of creating problems within the town?	Retford Town Centre Neighbourhood Plan is a recently designated Neighbourhood Plan Area where a group of local businesses and residents have come together to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan for the town centre. The Neighbourhood Plan will likely provide more detail on local planning issues for the town centre such as public realm, retail and residential development.
REF214	Historic England	This policy is welcomed and would assist with retaining character and vibrancy of high streets within the District.	Noted. Thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST16 - HOUSING DISTRIBUTION			
REF014	Resident	Whatever the number of houses required in the district, I strongly believe that before greenfield sites are considered there should be maximum re-use of both brownfield sites in town and village centres, and creation of dwellings over shops in town centres or in redundant bank premises. For example, Retford has great scope for both of these types of development, and could be aligned with consolidation of retail onto the market square and Carolgate. This would release adjacent streets such as Bridge Street for more dwellings. I also suggest that the latest government initiative on tree planting should result in mass tree planting on the edges of towns and villages, for example on the fields at the end of Bigsby and Palmer Roads in Retford.	The Council has assessed all available sites – see Bassetlaw Land Availability Assessment. Brownfield sites have been taken forward as allocations where they are suitable and deliverable. Worksop Central DPD is proposing to allocate land for up to 700 new homes on brownfield sites. There are currently not enough brownfield sites available to meet the housing need in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate suitable greenfield sites. Bassetlaw Local Plan is proposing to deliver/plant new trees at a rate of 5 trees per new dwelling. Policy ST52 Reducing Carbon Emissions, Climate Change Mitigation and Adaption requires development to deliver 5 trees per dwelling or per 1000 square metres of non-residential floorspace i.e. employment development.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST16 - HOUSING DISTRIBUTION			
REF026	Rampton and Woodbeck Parish Council	Will the right sort of dwellings be provided? At a national level it can be argued that we do not have a housing crisis in terms of the number of individuals and families that require accommodation and the number houses and apartments that currently exist in the country as they are roughly in balance. The problem is the type of housing. These problems include second home ownership which often inflates local property prices driving out local people and high-end properties bought by investors left unoccupied and mothballed in the hope of future profits. Neither of these problems are a significant issue in Bassetlaw though they are in the major cities and popular holiday areas. They are also beyond the remit of a District Council to address and are a matter for national government to address, assuming there is the political will to do so. The problem that should be addressed locally is whether the right sort of houses are being created, for example affordable entry level homes for first time buyers rather than expensive "executive" houses. Once again, conversion of redundant existing buildings rather than new builds would be cheaper and more affordable for first time buyers or renters.	Bassetlaw Local Plan contains policies that are aimed at delivering a range of different housing in the District. There are a number of smaller brownfield sites proposed for residential development in Worksop and Retford. Also, there is strong support for conversion of buildings. However, there are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed. The Council is proposing a range of mechanisms to deliver affordable housing, both through the Local Plan and via other Council projects.
REF041	Retford Civic Society	Retford Housing The scale of house building proposed in the Draft Plan is over ambitious. If it was closer to that produced using the 'standard method' recommended by the government for assessing housing need, perhaps there would be no need for the large allocation now proposed at the south of Ordsall. The Society has some reservations about this proposed allocation. Ordsall was once a relatively small village. It has seen a massive amount of house building in recent years which has put strain on its infrastructure and facilities. Traffic into and out of the area is largely confined to three routes. The narrow river bridge restricts traffic flow on Goosemoor Lane. West Carr Road is restricted by a railway bridge wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. Ordsall Road has a narrow carriageway, particularly at its northern end. Although it may be possible to improve the capacity of the junction at the end of Ordsall Road, we are not at all sure there is scope to significantly improve the roads themselves. A further 800 houses to the south of Ordsall would put the road system under stress, probably leading to congestion. It would also harm the living conditions of people living along the main roads. The proposed cycle lane markings along the roads would bring little if any benefit unless kerbside parking is removed but this would adversely affect the many residents with nowhere else to park. Brecks Road would be particularly affected. It is very narrow and any additional traffic from the new houses and/or measures to prioritise cycling would adversely affect residents there. If, notwithstanding the Society's concern about lack of need and inadequate roads, the Council decides to proceed with the proposed Ordsall development, the Local Plan should make it clear that the development must not start unless and until there are arrangements in place to secure the funding and provision of all the additional retail and community facilities, including a school, referred to in the Draft Plan and supporting documents. The facilities in Ordsall at present are very limited and there must be no risk that the additions to them promised in the Draft Plan fail to materialise.	Government guidance indicates that the Standard Method should be used as a starting point to determine the number of homes needed. The Housing and Economic Needs Assessment Planning Practice Guidance advises that other factors should also be considered, such as economic growth, affordable housing need and past housing delivery rates. The method used for determining the Housing Requirement (see Bassetlaw Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (November 2020)) accords with the PPG. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment which assesses the impact of proposed development on the District. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways have agreed the assessment, which indicates that the proposed development at Ordsall is suitable subject to highway improvements. The Council has also worked with other infrastructure providers, including Notts County Council Education, to determine the necessary infrastructure improvements associated with proposed site allocations. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan provides details of infrastructure requirements, including trigger points for contributions to/investment in infrastructure. The Policy for Ordsall South indicates that development is required to provide financial contributions towards infrastructure improvements, including highways. The policy also has a requirement for community consultation on future proposals.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST16 - HOUSING DISTRIBUTION			
REF060 - implies to all housing allocation sites	Notts County Council	Worksop Allocations - It is noted that all Worksop allocations include a requirement to make provision for primary and secondary school education infrastructure through an appropriate financial contribution. It is agreed that this is necessary and should be included. Retford Allocations - It is noted that none of the Retford allocations include a requirement for financial contributions towards education provision. Whilst current pupil projections show that the proposed number of dwellings could be accommodated within existing provision, it should be noted that this is subject to change in the future, especially as the local plan period is longer than the projection periods. It is therefore requested that a caveat is included within the policy to state that financial contributions towards education provision may be required if there is a demonstrable need at the time of a planning application being made.	Bassetlaw District Council will continue working with Nottinghamshire County Council Education to agree an appropriate approach to education provision in relation to development proposals in Bassetlaw Local Plan. This will be set out in relevant policies in the Local Plan and agreed through the Statement of Common Ground.
1666018	Resident	(7.1.3 page 77 refers to Harworth) Growth should be supported by infrastructure that address the needs and the impact on the community when development is allowed to run out of control in Harworth and Bircotes. False due to our town councils failure to provide an up to date neighborhood plan Harworth and bircotes this has been exploited on the highest level councilors planning officers all allowed this to happen instead of offering support. In a recent zoom meeting the person representing the council confirmed no infrastructure will be implemented because the local plan is not proposing growth in the town. I think 20500 housed and 3000 people is growth. Proactive intervention would save this disaster instead of reactive.	The Local Plan can only require infrastructure needed to deliver the site allocations in the Local Plan. The development earmarked for Harworth all has planning permission. The infrastructure has been agreed through those planning permissions. Outside of the Local Plan process, the Council has worked closely with Nottinghamshire County Council and other partners to identify the necessary infrastructure required to deliver development in Harworth. As the Education and Highway Authority, Nottinghamshire County Council has responsibility for delivering said infrastructure. Bassetlaw will continue to work closely with the County Council to ensure all necessary infrastructure is delivered.
REF121	Harris Lamb on behalf of Muller Property Group	In response to Policy ST1, generally supportive of the spatial strategy for development both in terms of the quantity of new housing proposed and the quantum that is to be directed to Retford. However, have concerns about how the new houses that are planned are to be delivered, which focuses on the Council's choice of its draft allocations. In our response to Policy ST3 outlined concerns about the inclusion of 500 dwellings coming forward on the Garden Village site in this Plan Period, noting that it would be in our view be more robust to delay these until the next Plan Period. In doing so, there would be a need to identify an alternative site or sites to deliver in the region of 500 dwellings. In addition, Policy ST16 identifies sites HS7 – HS13 as draft housing allocations in and around Retford to deliver 1,181 dwellings. Policy ST1 identifies a requirement for 1,800 dwellings to be delivered in Retford over the Plan Period. Whilst there are likely to be some outstanding commitments that are yet to have been started, consider that there are potentially over 600 dwellings that will need to come forward as windfalls within the town to meet the Town's needs in the period up to 2037. Rather than relying on windfalls to meet this need, should identify other draft allocations to meet this identified need. North of Bigsby Road is one such that is considered suitable to meet these needs. Has been the subject of two planning applications, with the latest application (19/01360/OUT) submitted in outline and proposing up to 170 dwellings. The application was a resubmission of an earlier application that had been refused by the Council on landscape and heritage grounds. Worked with Officers to resolve the reasons for refusal, and following the submission of updated evidence on landscape and visual impact, which was independently reviewed for the Council, the application was recommended for approval by Officers. The Committee Report (copy attached) confirmed that there were no technical, physical or environmental reasons that would prevent the delivery of the site and that on balance the benefits of granting planning permission would outweigh the harm of doing so. The site has therefore, been through the application process and demonstrated that it is capable of accommodating development without any adverse impacts. The site has been deemed suitable for development by Officers and could contribute to the delivery of new housing to meet the Borough's needs. Whilst Officer's were satisfied that the site was capable of accommodating development, Members refused the grant of	The site at Bigsby Road has not been taken forward as a site allocation as it was considered unsuitable. This site has subsequently been the subject of a Public Inquiry in May 2021 (Appeal Ref: APP/A3010/W/20/3265803 Land to the North of Bigsby Road, Retford, Nottinghamshire DN22 6SG). The application was dismissed at appeal in June 2021. With regard to the landscape the Inspector found: "having had regard to the above and all other related landscape matters, I conclude that the appeal scheme would have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding landscape and area. It would not protect or enhance the natural and local environment and would fail to recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside. As a result, the scheme would not comply with Paragraph 170 of the Framework".

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST16 - HOUSING DISTRIBUTION			
		planning permission. An appeal has been submitted and is due to be heard later this year. Contend that the site subject to planning application 19/01360/OUT is suitable for development and should be allocated as such in the Local Plan.	
REF159	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>Whilst it is accepted that the plan outlines no further development of housing within the life of the plan there remains question in terms of the number of houses required by Bassetlaw. If the number required across the borough is to change in any way will this have a significant impact on the embargo on further allocations within H&B who have subsequent number of developments with both outline and reserved matters outstanding and indeed have taken the largest per capita increase within the area. Whilst there is an outline proposal to initiate a Master Plan for H&B there is a degree of skepticism in regards to this providing the required infrastructure that the piecemeal development to this point has brought forward. There is a requirement for an overall review of ALL existing roads, drainage, education and all other fundamental facilities which support the sustainability of this community. Indeed, albeit not related to the local plan there is currently further erosion of existing facilities in terms of public transport and education. This does not allow local residents to have a voice and it does not empower them to feel their voices either matter or are heard; this plan only progresses part way to alleviating residents fears for the future. The Masterplan should be issues alongside the Local Plan; without this happening we once again address half of the outstanding issues. Our residents fear the erosion of public space and facilities for young and old to access green spaces, excercise and in turn improve their mental health. There is no ease of access to walking, cycling and the previously floated green wheel is a partially conceived facility which requires more spokes. There is little in the way of readying our community for the ageing population and providing ease of living for disabled people. We do not have a plan for employing our increasing population. Command the plan in terms of understanding at this time the need for improved in structure should are precedence and that this Town is currently at development saturation point.</p>	<p>The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate land in Harworth and Bircotes within the current plan period which runs to 2037. National policy (NPPF) requires Local Planning Authorities to review Local Plans at least every 5 years to ensure that they are still meeting the requirements of the District. The Council will need to review the Plan by 2025. The results of the review will determine if any changes are required to the policies in the Local Plan. The Masterplan for Harworth & Bircotes Town Centre is being prepared and a consultation is imminent. This will complement relevant policies in the Local Plan. Officers will work with the Town Council to ensure that where appropriate and deliverable the Local Plan policy approach reinforces the priorities of the Masterplan.</p>
REF132	JVH Planning on behalf of Kilner Estate	<p>The Plan period goes from 2020 to 2037 and seeks to make provision for 10,013 new homes. This is derived from the demographic calculation of 288 dwellings per annum, with an economic uplift to 589 dwellings per annum. The Plan does not set out where in the calculation the affordable housing need has been included, as this is a need of 2,814 new homes, which is a significant amount of the proposed total. The Plan should set out the calculation in a simple table which identifies the required elements and how much they have added over the base calculation. At the moment it is not clear how the figures have been arrived at and if they are adequate to meet the need identified. The calculations should be in the plan so that it is clear and not in an accompanying document.</p>	<p>The supporting text will be amended to include details of the evidence documents underpinning the affordable housing requirement (HEDNA and Whole Plan Viability Assessment). The affordable housing calculation is a complex process which needs a full and thorough explanation. It is not considered necessary to include this level of detail in the Local Plan. Instead it will be set out in the HEDNA and relevant background papers.</p>
REF166	Fisher German on behalf of land owners	<p>As shown by the Housing Allocations table within this policy, there are no proposed housing allocations outlined for Harworth & Bircotes. For the reasons set out in response to Policy ST1, it is considered that additional housing should be directed to Harworth & Bircotes in the emerging Local Plan and site allocations for the town be included within Policy ST16. The land south of Common Lane is a suitable site for housing development and would be a deliverable allocation.</p>	<p>The Council considers that the housing commitments can sufficiently address housing need in Haworth and Bircotes without the need to allocate more land.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST16 - HOUSING DISTRIBUTION			
REF167	Marrons Planning on behalf of Vistry Homes Limited.	<p>It is crucial that a robust assessment is undertaken of the capacity of the proposed allocations, deliverability and developability as this will inform whether the housing requirement of 589 dwellings per annum in the Plan can be met. It is common for housing trajectories for individual sites to be reduced under close scrutiny during an Examination in Public. Therefore, it would be reasonable to employ a well evidenced but cautious approach, informed by discussions with landowners and developers of their intentions and applying a degree of independent judgement. This should also take into account realistic lead-in times and infrastructure requirements. It would be helpful at the Regulation 19 stage for an updated trajectory to accompany the Plan that sets out expected completion rates by year for each allocation. Taking into account the above points, it is noted that the Local Plan proposes to make housing allocations at Retford as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · HS7 – Trinity Road (10.7ha, 244 dwellings) · HS8 – Milnercroft (0.45ha, 5 dwellings) · HS9 – Former Elizabeth School, W Furlong (1.3ha, 46 dwellings) · HS10 – St Michael's view, Hallcroft Road (0.37ha, 20 dwellings) · HS11 – Fairy Grove, Grove Road (2.7ha, 61 dwellings) · HS12 – Station Road (0.1ha, 5 dwellings) · HS13 – Ordsall South (103.4ha, 800 dwellings) <p>There is a significant reliance on the draft HS7 and HS13 allocations to meet the housing needs of Retford, and the housing trajectory shows that development at site HS13 (Ordsall South) is not expected to start until at least 2027 and is dependent on off-site junction improvements. Any delay in that site coming forward would have an impact on housing delivery late in the plan period. Allocating additional land for development at Retford would provide an appropriate buffer and certainty that housing needs will be met.</p>	<p>The Council has undertaken a robust assessment of housing delivery. This includes working with land owners and developers to determine the timescale for delivery. This has also been backed up by evidence of current delivery in Bassetlaw (See: Bassetlaw Five Year Housing Land Supply position statement). Over the past five years the district has experienced a significant increase in housing delivery. There is no evidence to suggest that this will not continue as the housing market continues to be buoyant even through the lockdown period. Housing delivery will continue to be monitored and the Local Plan will be reviewed within five years, in accordance with the NPPF.</p>
REF201	Severn Trent	<p>The majority of the sites are the same as were detailed in the previous draft of the local plan we have not re-reviewed these sites, Please refer response (Bassetlaw 19 for details).</p> <p>RAG Status • High Risk – High likelihood that Capacity improvements will be required, this does not prevent development but additional time may be required to implement improvements further consultation with Severn Trent is recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medium Risk – Capacity improvements may be required, further consultation with Severn Trent recommended. • Low Risk – Capacity improvements are not likely to be required In terms of the new sites <p>• HS3 Radford Street – there are no known downstream constraints therefore we would assess this site a Low Risk</p> <p>• HS8 Milnercroft – there are no known downstream constraints therefore we would assess this site a Low Risk</p> <p>• HS9 Former Elizabethan School – there are no known downstream constraints therefore we would assess this site a Low Risk</p> <p>• HS10 St. Michael's View – there are no known downstream constraints therefore we would assess this site a Low Risk</p> <p>• HS11 Fairy Grove – There are several known downstream constraints that are likely to be impacted by the proposed development therefore this site would be categorised as High Risk.</p> <p>• HS12 Station Road - brownfield development no significant risks anticipated, potential for betterment through good Surface water management.</p> <p>• HS13 Ordsall South Road – There are known Downstream constraints, development categorised as High Risk, therefore we would recommend early consultation with Severn Trent by developers and the LPA where this site is proposed to be brought forward.</p>	<p>Thank you for your detailed response. The Council will continue to work with STW through the Local Plan and Development Management processes to ensure any constraints are appropriately addressed.</p>
REF214	Historic England	Historic England has concerns in respect of the approach to the historic environment in relation to Policies 17 and 22.	<p>Thank you for your detailed response. The Council has closely liaised with Historic England throughout the development of the Local Plan, and will continue to do so to ensure any concerns are appropriately addressed. The Heritage Assessment has been revised following discussion with Historic England to clarify that all sites have been robustly assessed, with input from the Historic Environment Records, Bassetlaw Conservation and Lincs Archaeology. Further, none have objections to the</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST16 - HOUSING DISTRIBUTION			
			proposed site allocations subject to appropriate mitigation.
REF109	Resident	HS7 Trinity Farm, Retford 10.7 HA, 244 houses The first phase is now showing as 196 houses, rising to 440 when the second phase is completed	Comments noted.
REF195 PHF	Freeths on behalf of Hallam Land Management	Supported in conjunction with Policy ST1 in its proposals to provide a minimum of 3,080 new homes to 2037 and particularly, the allocation of 1,000 dwellings to site HS1 Peaks Hill Farm, Worksop. Noting these figures are a minimum, so flexibility is provided such that if delivery at Peaks Hill Farm is stronger than projected, then the total delivery of dwellings on the site may be more than 1,000, noting the reference to the allocation in total being 1,120 houses and 10.6 hectares of employment land at Peaks Hill Farm some of which the plan anticipates will be delivered beyond 2037.	Comments noted.
REF073	Grace Machin on behalf of land owners	The local plan identifies (paragraph 3.14) that those aged 65 and over is projected to increase by 47% during the plan period (to 2037) and of these, the population over 85 will double. The plan states that ensuring there is appropriate housing, care and social infrastructure for this age group is a priority for the Council. Paragraph 3.16 identifies that in 2018, 67% of the population were living in the three largest towns of Worksop, Retford, and Harworth & Bircotes. Paragraph 3.23 identifies that the as the economic base has changed, Worksop has expanded, with the population growing alongside. The delivery of new homes has spearheaded the regeneration of the many parts of the District – acting as a catalyst for physical change and often well-needed investment in social and environmental infrastructure. The first objective of the Council (Paragraph 4.15) is to locate new development in sustainable locations that respect the environmental capacity of the District. Furthermore, to provide a choice of land to ensure that the Districts housing stock better meets local housing needs. Paragraph 5.1.36 identifies to meet the housing shortfall, the most sustainable solution in Worksop is the allocation of one edge of urban site: The LAA concludes that the site in Worksop is that which will cause least harm to the environment, is suitable for development and would create a defensible urban edge – the site is Peaks Hill Farm (REF: HS1 – a site of 54Ha and a minimum number of dwellings – 1,000). BDC consider the site along with a site in Retford to be the most appropriate and suitable locations for the future expansion of the existing towns in the District along with a new ‘Garden Village’. Paragraphs 5.1.39 & 40 identify that Worksop is the principal town in the District and the most sustainable location for significant growth. Paragraph 7.2.5 identifies the complex nature of delivering Peaks Hill Farm, Worksop. Aware that a ‘concept plan’ is being consulted on as part of this pre-Reg 19 Consultation. Land within the ownership of my clients should not be discounted on the basis that the basis of promoting the Peaks Hill Farm Site is still focused upon the need to provide “a high quality, landscape led design influenced by its wider rural fringe location, prominent natural assets and heritage associations” (Paragraph 7.2.8) It is not considered a robust planning strategy to only seek one greenfield allocation on the edge of Worksop to 2037 and re-examination of the previous development areas submitted in Gateford is now needed. It is a comparable area with a woodland setting and new woodland could be delivered as part of new scheme at Gateford. Peaks Hill also requires more historical and archaeological assessment which has not yet been ‘benchmarked’ against my clients proposed development areas on the edge of Gateford / Worksop.	The submitted site at Gateford Hall Farm has been reviewed, as requested. The three parcels of land have been considered and assessed (LAA491a, LAA491b, LAA491c) through the Bassetlaw LAA review process. The LAA assessments conclude that all three sites are unsuitable for residential development due to heritage, highways, and landscape constraints.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST16 - HOUSING DISTRIBUTION			
REF117 Ordsall Rep	Barton Wilmore on behalf of land owners	<p>Chapter 7 of the Local Plan begins by dealing with housing distribution across the District and identifies site allocations for housing development. Paragraph 7.1.1 explains that additional housing is required to meet the changing housing needs across the District, however we believe the number of housing to meet this need is understated. In addition, reiterate that maintaining the housing requirement of 87.4dpa for Retford as set out in the adopted Core Strategy is insufficient to meet these growing housing demands. Policy ST16 should be renamed as it is not about housing distribution, it sets out the required yield from the 'new' allocations. Welcome the table as a useful summary, but it should not be conflated with the distribution model set out under Policy ST1. Support the reference in the final column that the stated number of dwellings is a 'minimum'. Set out our comments regarding the uncertainty of delivery at the Garden Village above and consider that 500 dwellings from that site is not achievable in the plan period.</p>	<p>The housing requirement and supply for Retford was sufficiently increased to meet the requirements of the community following the January 2020 consultation (included in the November 2020 Draft Local Plan consultation document). No amendments are considered necessary to the housing requirement up to 2037. Housing supply has been increased to cover the period beyond 2037. It is proposed to amend the title of the Housing Distribution policy to 'Provision of land for Housing'.</p>
REF180 Trinity Farm	Fisher German on behalf of Avant Homes	<p>The identification of land at Trinity Farm, Retford for residential development is supported. As detailed in response to Policy 23: Site HS7, the site is sustainably located and can deliver a comprehensive development responding to its gateway location to Retford. The site is however capable of delivering a higher number of units than currently proposed. Whilst we accept the Policy uses 'minimum' to express the number of dwellings deliverable, it is considered that the policy should be amended to reflect the true capacity of the site more closely. The removal of former site HS7: Leafields Retford is supported. The allotments at Leafields are a much-valued community facility, and to remove established allotments from the site, to Trinity Farm as previously proposed, would have been unsound and damaging to the local community.</p>	<p>As this is a minimum figure, it is not considered necessary to increase the site capacity from 244 to 297 dwellings. This can be dealt with at the Development Management stage if necessary.</p>
1671323	William Davis	<p>While there are no objections to the proposed housing allocations it is considered that additional housing allocations are required to provide flexibility given the reliance on new settlements and sites to be allocated by Neighbourhood Plans; this will ensure that the housing requirement is met. As set out in the Spatial Strategy, Worksop is the most sustainable settlement in the District and will experience substantial employment growth and regeneration during the plan period. Additional housing allocations in appropriate edge of settlement locations can help provide this buffer, contribute to providing a mix of dwellings across the area and assist in improving the vitality and viability of the town centre. As such it is considered that land north of Mansfield Road (LAA206) should be allocated for residential development. The recent planning application (Ref 17/01356/OUT) robustly demonstrated that the site was sustainably located and could be accommodated in the landscape through good design with a less than substantial impact on nearby heritage assets subject to an appropriate design response being followed. No technical objections or reasons for refusal were also raised in respect of access, drainage or impact on local infrastructure.</p>	<p>The site has been assessed in the LAA and is considered to be unsuitable for development/allocation due to heritage impact. Planning application 17/01356/OUT was refused on heritage grounds, detailed as follows: The proposed development would result in the loss of the open agricultural landscape, that currently forms the historic setting of the Grade I listed Manor Lodge and the Grade II listed Lodge Farm. The encroachment of further residential development into the setting would distract from the isolation and openness the Grade I listed building, resulting in harm to the historic significance of Manor Lodge. The harm is deemed to be less than substantial. Policy DM8 of the Bassetlaw Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD states that proposals that fail to preserve or enhance the setting of a heritage asset will not be supported. Section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires a special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings, while paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework expects that the more important the heritage asset the greater the weight should be to its</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST16 - HOUSING DISTRIBUTION			
			conservation. Paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires that where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits. The minimal wider public benefits of the proposal are not considered to outweigh the less than substantial harm caused. The development, if permitted would be contrary to section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, policy DM8 of the Bassetlaw Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD and paragraphs 193, 196 and 200 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
REF170	A&D Architecture	4) Policy ST16 should be modified to include sites to be allocated for Park Home static caravan site development. Preferably these should be new sites to ensure competition and choice of location in the market.	It is not considered necessary to specifically allocate land for Park Homes. All sites are allocated for housing and will include a mix of homes in accordance with the Housing Mix Policy. Should one of these sites be proposed for Park Homes that proposal will be considered on its merits. This approach is consistent with other site allocations – the housing mix is not identified for any of the other allocations providing flexibility to the market.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
1638201	Resident	Too many houses too far away from the centre of Worksop; despite all the policies discussing sustainable transport, etc, most people living here would use their cars to complete most of their journeys. There are no secondary or primary schools within any reasonable walking or cycling distance, which will further increase traffic; nor are there any shops within easy reach, again leading to increased car use, traffic and pollution. I don't see any benefit to be gained from the new link road, which will merely transfer traffic from one single carriageway road to another.	A package of measures is required to deliver sustainable development at Peaks Hill Farm. The Local Plan policy for Peaks Hill Farm (Policy 17) requires development to deliver a new distributor road which can accommodate a bus service. A new school, local centre and community facilities are to be provided on site and improvements to walking and cycling routes are required. There are not enough suitable, available and deliverable sites within Worksop's development boundary to accommodate the required amount of new housing. The Council considers that this site offers the best opportunity to deliver a sustainable development and provide strategic infrastructure contributing to meeting local needs up to 2037.
REF004	Resident	Strongly oppose this plan, my reasons are: Environmental impact, there will be more countryside wiped out. Where will all the wild life go for their habitat, the deers that roam & all the wild birds will have nowhere to go. Air pollution from the construction of the infrastructure. All the houses with at least 1,2 or 3 cars, atmospheric pollutants from these vehicles. All the surfaced areas will increase surface run off, so risk of flooding increases straight away on to the existing homes on Colsterdale & surrounding areas. Traffic flow from these houses, noise and congestion. Local services will be overrun, Bassetlaw is a small hospital as it is & not enough GP'S now, to get a doctors appointment is shocking. Small town centre, no investments other than bus station & pictures in the last 15 years, not enough employment for current population.	A number of assessments have been undertaken to assess the suitability of the site for residential and other uses. An initial ecology assessment has been undertaken and further ecology assessments will be required. No significant constraints have been identified in relation to ecology. 10% biodiversity net gain will be sought to add value to the local ecology. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has been undertaken by the Council which shows that the site is in the lowest flood risk area, as such, there are no significant constraints in this respect. A flood risk assessment will be required as part of the planning application to show how surface water will be managed. The Council's Environmental Health state that there are no air quality issues in Worksop and none are expected to be generated by the development. The health service (Bassetlaw Clinical Commissioning Group) support the provision of a financial contribution to address potential impacts on the doctors and the hospital from the development. The Worksop Town centre DPD seeks to regenerate the town centre and deliver a mix of uses, including housing, commercial uses, recreational uses etc. Investment is underway at Middletons and the WASH for example.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
1643802	Resident	<p>Reading the comments regarding the proposed development at Peaks Hill Farm, I can see that there is plenty of opposition to it from local residents. Focus only on the following: That there have been a number of deaths on Carlton Road in recent years. It sends a chill down my spine that when a man and his fiancée are buried on the day that they should have been married, another man is decapitated on his motorbike, that someone should then propose to build hundreds of homes nearby. Carlton Road is a dangerous road due to its intrinsic dips and bends, even at the current speed limit. Even if new speed restrictions were introduced, the sad fact is that not everyone will stick to this limit. Common sense needs to be born in mind when considering the increase in population density and also the possibility of a new road and junction. Carlton Road approaching Owday Lane does flood. Will the loss of adjacent countryside associated with this development increase surface water from rainfall? It obviously will and this needs to be considered. Travel from Gateford to Carlton twice a day so have seen it in all weathers and conditions. During the floods early in 2020 one of my colleagues could not pass Carlton Road to return home to Worksop. The woods adjacent to the new development in Gateford have become a swamp, despite the best intentions of the developers with a pond to attempt to manage excess rain water. It seems obvious that any development at Peaks Hill will come with the same problems despite the promises of the developers. The rest of the Bassetlaw Plan seems very sensible.</p> <p>Conclude with my own views on a Worksop Guardian article dated the 6th Feb 2020, where it was implied that the government would force building on areas that hadn't reached certain construction targets.</p> <p>If central government has intentions of forcing development onto the council against the wishes of residents, then it is the council's duty to take legal advice. The idea that government planners would dump houses onto an area is somewhat spurious, given that we could have had four different governments by 2037. And finally the question on everyone's lips is when does the building on the green belt stop?</p>	<p>The Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) state that the Peaks Hill Farm development can be accommodated safely with mitigation, including the new link road.</p> <p>The site is located within the lowest risk flood zone (Floodzone 1). A flood risk assessment will be required for the site. This will set out measures to manage surface water run off to ensure there are no adverse impacts on or off site. The Environment Agency, Nottinghamshire County Council, Severn Trent Water and Anglian Water identify that the proposal is capable of addressing flooding issues.</p> <p>The Local Plan is required to align with national policy and guidance. When the Local Plan is submitted for examination, the independent Planning Inspector will need to ensure that the Plan complies with national policy. When a plan is not consistent with national policy it is likely to be found unsound. There is no Green Belt land in Bassetlaw.</p>
REF008	Resident	<p>Our opinion of the development hasn't changed. As we're both key workers, myself being a bereavement support officer I don't have time to attend any further meetings. Have to say after reviewing the plans I'm a little disappointed. Understand the pressure to build the extra housing has come from the housing secretary but nowhere in the plans does mention the fact that Bassetlaw is a ex miner's community and with this sadly in 10-15 years' time many elderly's who own miners housing will be sadly passing away and leaving them to their heirs. Presently Worksop has 1500 empty homes. Since the average life expectancy is approximately 80 years old it would be good to consider how many people are now 65 and owning their homes and basing the figures from there. Can see that there are plans to build on many of Worksop's Greenland but no consideration for expansion of bereavement and cemeteries. As my job as a bereavement support officer the above are part of my day to day, I'd like this to be reviewed and considered because this effects all families. In relation to the actual plans. I'm in two minds regarding this but also a little frustrated. Myself and my fiancé bought our first home on ... and specially asked our solicitor regarding the belt of land behind our home and were advised it would be very difficult for planning permission to be obtained to build. With this we "overpaid" for our home by an extra thousand pounds and since then have invested an extra ten thousand pounds into making our house a home. The reason we had chosen ... as our forever home was because of the peace and serenity the views and the bench at the bottom of the garden gave us. My fiancé suffers badly with anxiety and depression and the idea of possibly up to 4000 people living behind us is upsetting him tremendously. Wish along with these plans you could invent a time machine so we could turn back time and have never made this mistake of purchasing this property. You state that you want to build affordable housing, but can confirm the prices that the Gateford properties were going for (£150,000.00 for a 2 bedroom house) was never going to be affordable for a young working couple starting out in life. Living in our home has meant we have been close to family and with my Grandma being seriously ill I can be close to her supporting her as she does not have a carer and still able to commute to work. Worry with the expansion of the housing the increase this will have on traffic I need to be able to get out of Worksop quickly and be with my grandma some days in less the 30 minutes but I highly doubt with affected road closures whilst disruptions occur for the next 15 years this would happen. Worry about the infrastructure of Worksop, in recent months there has been mass flooding. This flooding also affected Theivesdale. Don't believe anyone's home were flooded the drains simply were over flowing and the field which you're planning to build on also flooded. If more houses and drains were added to the already strained drainage system, I think this would cause more harm then good. Another thing which also concerns me is that it has been clearly stated the houses need to be built first before any support can be given to local schools and GP's. I'd like to raise right now that I am aware of a couple of children who have</p>	<p>The Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) state that the development can be accommodated by the road network with mitigation, including a new link road. The site is located within the lowest risk flood zone (Floodzone 1). A flood risk assessment will be required for the site. This will set out measures to manage surface water run off to ensure there are no adverse impacts on or off site. The Environment Agency, Nottinghamshire County Council, Severn Trent Water and Anglian Water identify that the proposal is capable of addressing flooding issues. The County Council state that there are sufficient school places in Worksop for primary school children. The development will provide land for secondary school facilities. There is not enough brownfield land available to meet the needs for new homes so greenfield land needs to be used. Biodiversity net gain will ensure a 10% increase in biodiversity on site. At least 20% of the homes will be affordable. A quarter will be for first time buyers.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
		<p>had to be schooled from home as there were no placements for them. So, with further increased population how do you plan to allocate education for these children without the funding? Living so close to Sherwood Forest and Clumber Park disappointed that the green spaces which form part of Worksop's charm will be taken away for more breeze blocked homes. Wouldn't class Worksop as a desirable place to live but would say it attracts tourism from the national parks with them being so close to Worksop. Taking away Worksop's inner community and extending it and changing the road system seems like an unwise decision and fail to see the benefits to the town centre which needs attention and funding, as its beginning to look like a ghost town. Also like to mention the wildlife. Although this will be the last of your concerns the last summer was beautiful, saw owls, hedgehogs, butterflies and have built a bee hotel for the creatures. Its already up there that the bees and butterflies are declining again I'm unsure why you would want to destroy more Greenland for housing where as stated in my first paragraph I don't think has been well thought out. Ultimately despite all my negatives against these new housing if you can ensure that housing will be affordable to young couples (2 bedroom house for £100,000.00, 3 for £125,000.00 ect) think it would be great but we had no support like this when we moved into our home. And as mentioned before paid over the odds. If the plans were to go ahead despite concerns I'd like to request the following terms if the plans were to go ahead. -A Green tree lined buffer between our homes and the new properties. -Any communal areas to be moved away from the green tree line buffer and placed centrally or at the other side of the development away from our existing properties. - like compensation for the disruption the new development will have on our lives. Already getting extremely frustrated with the existing development happening at the bottom of our road near Blyth road despite being 500 yards away from it. - like the new development to be a safe haven for the wildlife we have presently with this we want to see open spaces with wild flower seeds sown each year like near the hospital and we'd like more trees and shrubs to be planted and incorporated into the plans. - like minimal lighting near our properties. Many of us have built summerhomes/glorified sheds overlooking onto the field and have conservatories which to us are our relaxation rooms and don't want blinding lights disturbing our routines. Highlight that the new plans are going to affect all of the residents in our day to day lives. Worry what the increased traffic on A57 will mean for me commuting to work and getting to my grandma's home. But at the end of the day this decision will be decided by the council just hope that the decision is for the greater need and to not just tick a box to say you did the thing the home secretary asked.</p>	The site promoters concept plan identifies a green buffer between new and existing properties and this is a requirement of the policy. Detailed matters like location of communal areas and lighting are a matter for the planning application.
1653383	Resident	<p>Strongly object to the proposed road as this will result in noise pollution, light pollution, air pollution and ruin the view we have from my property. Strongly object to the proposed school being planned to be built as this will be directly behind my property which will mean noise pollution and ruin the view currently enjoy and will de-value my home. Strongly object to building houses in this area as currently enjoy a view overlooking fields and woodland, this will be removed and devalue our house. Strongly object to building houses in this area as this will adversely affect the local wildlife, we have encountered many different species such as deer, owl, buzzard including bats which are a protected species. You should find somewhere else to build.</p>	<p>The Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) state that the distributor road is necessary to enable a bus route through the site and to improve connections and reduce traffic impact on existing junctions. The Council's Environmental Health state that there will be no pollution impacts generated by the road. Loss of view and house prices are not a planning matter. The location of the new school is designed to ensure that existing and future residents are easily able to access the site. An ecology assessment has been undertaken and identified no significant constraints. Further assessments will be required at the planning application stage. 10% biodiversity net gain will be secured on site.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
REF025	Resident	<p>Live at Westerdale and would like to raise some concerns and suggestions regarding the new 1000 house development at Peak Hills Farm. For reference my house is located here, right on the tip of the new development: (picture included in representation). Like to log some suggestions regarding the dwellings and school proposed to be built on the site. Attended the council zoom meeting on 8 December 2020. Understand this building site has to happen due to government numbers ask if a few things could be considered. For instance: - The location of the Primary School. Whilst I am aware that this is part of the building site when needed (a few years after the houses are completed maybe) I wondered if it could be built at any other point on the site? Perhaps on the boundary of the red lines on the other side of the new road road? Nearer Peak Hill Farm boundary. I am worried of the noise created by parents dropping off children, children playing and screaming at break and lunch times, the bell going 8 times a day. There will also need to be a car park too for staff. Concerned by the view from the back of my house (bedroom 2, 4 and 5) as these will directly overlook the school and I'm sure will de-value my house due to its proximity. Understand will probably be the one most affected by the school there will be other houses (and the new houses) affected by the noise and car pollution and traffic. Wondered if it could be re-considered where the school is built before site construction begins? Concerned for the wildlife that live in the woods behind (deer, buzzards, birds) which would be again affected by the noise and cars in the current location mapped for the school. And from the map (whilst I understand it is a guide and not very detailed) it looks like the primary school will stretch from the woodland to the long plantation. Which would be a very very big primary school. - The boundary hedge. At the meeting it was discussed there would be some type of border between existing housing and new housing to give some privacy. From the photos you can see the view from my second (top) floor and the existing hedge which is about 6 foot high. Is there any thought as to what kind of border? Trees would give the best privacy. Concerned how much my garden will be overlooked so a border which will be x wide would give the feeling of more privacy. (I am unsure at the moment how far you intend to build new houses but I suppose there will be houses at the side of me, if not a school.) Think a hedge would be good for keeping new lighting (street lights/house lights) farther away from us so that our house remains dark at night time. - Was told the sports centre would be near the Gateford Hill and a new, small road to be built. Therefore, the playing field behind my house would be used for whatever is required. Concerned if this is a football/rugby pitch with goalposts and floodlighting. - The Long plantation. Concerned as was told the trees will stay but I don't understand how roads (from the new houses to the new road) will be able to go around the tree's perimeter, particularly if the Primary school is as big as made out to be.</p>	<p>Design comments welcome and will be fed into the masterplanning process. The location of the new school is designed to ensure that existing and future residents are easily able to access the site. An ecology assessment has been undertaken and identified no significant constraints. Further assessments will be required at the planning application stage. 10% biodiversity net gain will be secured on site. No decision has yet been made about the depth of the buffer or other detailed matters like lighting and boundary treatments. These will all be matters to discuss through the masterplan framework consultation and the planning application process which residents will have an opportunity to engage with.</p>
REF060	Notts County Council	<p>Requirement 4A, to make provision for primary education infrastructure though a financial contribution, is agreed. However, it is requested that this contribution should be expressed as "to extend local primary schools", rather than Gateford Park Primary School specifically to provide appropriate flexibility as it is not yet confirmed which school would be expanded. Requirement 4B, to safeguard serviced land to accommodate a one form entry primary school post 2037, and 4C, to make provision for secondary education through a financial contribution, are both agreed to be necessary.</p>	<p>The policy will be changed to refer: "to extend local primary schools" and remove the reference to Gateford Park Primary School.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
1662603	Resident	<p>Totally oppose the building of houses been built on prime farming land off Thievesdale Lane (Peaks Hill Farm propsed developoment). This land is used consistently throughout the year and is invaluable to the economy and welfare of the local population. Building houses on this land is criminal , loosing good sustainable farmland which is going to be a priority going forward in the UK nad locally in coming years where houses are not a major requirement . Houses do not provide jobs or sustainability to the local people. Farmland is at a premium and your prepared to forgo this for greed and money for houses which long term are going to be a drain on the area, we currently don't have enough doctors, dentists, schools to cater for the area as it stands plus all the building of houses which is already happening. Its no good saying this will follow and it will be to late as the area is too congested already.....you cant get a dental or doctors appointment inside a month in this area, that can only get worse. You are destroying good farming land and green space for immediate profit but long term you are dealing the area a death toll.... there will be no farming. no sustainable living . The whole area will only be a commuter belt so Worksop will die a death. To destroy green land that offers sustainable living , wildlife habitats that will be destroyed forever as once you start building that can never be replicated is reprehensible. The current building that has taken place has destroyed wildlife massively and has already created a massive ecological destruction with the removal of a huge willow tree illegally and now the road is closed and causing considerable issues as the junction of Farmers Branch . This is the start of your process and you are destroying nature and habitat and creating pollution, danger, and upheaval at every level . An access road linking A60 to Blyth road is dangerous and will not ease any pressure on the local roads , it will actually cause more accidents on the junctions as Blyth Road currently cant cope with the transport from Peppers as well as the large amount of traffic that travels to Blyth to access the A1, this has increased massively with the housing that has already been built in the area and by adding even more houses you are going to make this road a death trap. It can take 5-10 minutes to even get onto Blyth road from either Thievesdale Lane or Farmers Branch and you want to add to this without adding any infrastructure as a road linking to A60 will not help as traffic backing up from Cannon Crossroads area will then try Blyth Road and vice versa and these roads will just become gridlocked. The farming land was designated green belt land yet you can claim this no longer exists when it comes to been paid money this is wrong on every level. Bought our property safe in the knowledge that we were protected with the land been greenbelt, if i wanted to look at other houses then i would have bought a house that did that , you are devaluing my home and don't care about the people you are supposed to look after. Its all about the money not the area , the wildlife, the sustainability or the future development of farming and green cultureyou need to reconsider this complete idea . There are so many unused areas of land that are suitable and don't invade current properties and businesses ... you should look at these and develop them not destroy and devalue my home and the land around me.</p>	<p>National planning policy requires Local Planning Authorities to Plan for development over at least a fifteen year period. This Local Plan runs to 2037. National policy requires Councils to assess the need for housing and deliver the full objectively assessed housing requirement. There is not enough suitable, available and deliverable land available to deliver the housing requirement. Some greenfield land has to be used. The Land Availability Assessment identifies this site as being the most suitable site to deliver sustainable development to meet the development needs of Bassetlaw. The Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) state that the Peaks Hill Farm development can be accommodated safely with mitigation, including the new link road. A financial contribution will be sought to improve health care facilities in the area, including doctors and the hospital – that is set out in the policy. 10% biodiversity net gain will be required and the majority of the woodland will be protected. An ecology assessment has been undertaken. Further ecology work will be undertaken as part of the planning application process. Mitigation will be identified where necessary. House prices are not a planning matter. There is no green belt in the district.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
1662608	Resident	<p>parag 7.2.1 and map. Remain concerned about the number of homes to be built at Peaks Hill Farm(PHF). The map shows the existing construction site at Thievesdale Lane, which is small in comparison to the proposed PHF site. The number of houses, the impact on the open country outlook, the disruption of the road closure and the extent to which the boundary of the residential area of Worksop is being extended by the Thievesdale Lane construction site are significant. This is only a fraction of the impact which the PHF will cause but gives an indication of what would be caused. Many of the responses to the initial plan point out that there will be a relatively small number of affordable starter homes, social housing and homes for older residents - the types of housing that are needed locally. This does not address the national or local housing shortage for these types of home. Most of the PHF homes will be bought by people from Sheffield and other large conurbations, looking for cheaper housing. PHF is unlikely to address local housing need. 1120 new homes is excessive and unjustified. The council's responses to these comments in the first consultation are inadequate and do not address the concerns.</p> <p>parag 7.2.14. welcome the decision to retain the open field next to the A60 at PHF as publicly accessible green space and to protect this from any building. Would like to see this used as a wildflower meadow, similar to that adjoining the North side of Eddison Park Road , rather than just being open managed grassland. A meadow field would retain a rural aspect whereas managed grassland would look like the start of the housing estate - as is evident at Gateford with the large expanses of grass with no flowers and minimal benefit to wildlife.</p> <p>7.2.16. It is obvious that there will be huge increases in traffic from 1120 new houses. The link road would be a response to this but is most unlikely to improve the flow of traffic around Worksop and certainly not in the town centre - the link road is a response to the problem of additional traffic not something which will address existing traffic levels and congestion. Thought governments and councils had learnt by now that building new roads rarely alleviates traffic congestion, rather it attracts more traffic. Understand that the precise line of the link road is not yet fixed. Would be concerned if the road was other than adjacent to the southern boundary of the PHF site, close to the woodland near G4S. The road would otherwise cut through the field adjacent to the A60 and would affect the views due to street lights. Concerned by the prospect of a roundabout on the A60 where the link road joins. This could be hazardous for cyclists travelling into Worksop particularly if it is at the brow of the hill which means a cyclist setting off from stationary would initially be moving slowly. There would need to be separate cycle lanes with toucan crossings to navigate the roundabout safely. Pleased that the development will include children's play areas and allotments and assume these requirements will be insisted upon by the planning dept. and not overridden by developers claiming they cannot afford this. Pleased that there is a commitment to provide safe cycle and pedestrian travel routes and to link to existing rights of way. Pleased to see the requirement for a tree lined active travel corridor with species rich verges. Hope the council will follow "no mow" guidance for the spring and summer to protect and promote these species. The cycling routes need to be extended into Worksop and towards Carlton in Lindrick, rather than just ending when they reach the A60 or other main roads. This is an opportunity to look at safe sustainable travel between Worksop and Carlton. Traffic leaving PHF and travelling towards Sheffield or the A57 bypass, will either go through Gateford on Eddison Park Road or on Owday Lane. Both are problematic. The Gateford route ends with traffic lights to join Gateford Road. Already there are hold ups at peak times for the Gateford traffic and this would become worse with increased traffic. Owday Lane can be a dangerous road with the Z bends and ice near the wooded areas. Cars end up in the ditch every year. It is unsafe to overtake on this road other than on the straight stretch just before Owday lakes junction. It would not be safe to overtake there if traffic levels increased. There is nothing in the original or amended plan to indicate that this has been thought through.</p>	<p>A Landscape Assessment has been undertaken to inform the site selection process. This identified that the site could be accommodated sensitively in the landscape subject to mitigation which is identified by the policy. National policy requires Councils to assess the need for housing and deliver the full objectively assessed housing requirement. There is not enough suitable, available and deliverable land available to deliver the housing requirement. Some greenfield land has to be used. The Land Availability Assessment identifies this site as being the most suitable site to deliver sustainable development to meet the development needs of Bassetlaw. The Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) state that the Peaks Hill Farm development can be accommodated safely with mitigation, including the new link road. The road line for the link road has yet to be confirmed. Any provision for a new road requires safe cycle access to be designed in. The use of developer contributions are governed by national legislation; to that where there is a proven link to the impact generated by a development. Requiring the developer to fund a cycle lane into Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick would be unreasonable. Infrastructure requirements such as children's play, retaining the open field next to the A60 are identified by policy. On adoption, these policy requirements will be expected to be delivered as part of the planning permission. This is the advantage of having an up to date local plan in place. Speculative development does not provide the opportunity to plan ahead and identify the infrastructure required.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
1662636	Resident	<p>In response to the first Draft Local Plan, in January 2020, raised objections to the inclusion of the field adjacent to the A60, at the western end of the proposed Peaks Hill site. Objected (as did many others) to the loss of amenity from loss of beautiful countryside and open views. The wooded ridge, running NE from G4S on the A60 at south of this site to N of Peaks Hill Farm itself, was I felt, a natural topographical boundary between Worksop and the open countryside which slopes downhill towards Carlton in Lindrick. Very pleased that planners and developers have listened to reasoned arguments and have now designated the triangular field, adjacent to the A60, a piece of 'green infrastructure' (hope this will be managed as a flower meadow?) within the development site. Therefore the wooded ridge, referred to above, becomes the effective boundary of the residential development. It is vital, as the plan develops, to ensure that this field and the open views, are protected. Consideration should be given to designating the woods within the site as a community woodland, developing access paths, while at the same time enhancing the management of the woods for the benefit of wildlife. Covid lockdowns have shown how much access to nature, and woodland especially, is valued by people for exercise and mental health. Still have concerns and wish to make a number of points that hope will be incorporated into the design of the site – First, the new access road will still run through the field to join the A60. It remains to be seen what Highways engineers will say on the siting of this road but have concerns on a number of issues – This is a dangerous stretch of the A60, particularly on the hill/bend nr Peaks Hill farm with a history of fatal accidents. - There will also be considerable visual impact of the road on the landscape. - In addition, the road will create a new link to the A57, by traffic using the new road to bypass the north of Worksop, travel along the A60 towards Carlton, turning into Owday Lane, then Woodsetts rd to travel to the A57 roundabout. Both the A60 and the minor road of Owday lane (with two lots of Z bends) are very busy with frequent accidents. To minimise the impact of the above – the new road should take a line towards the south of the site, nearer to Worksop, so a new roundabout could be built at the new rd/A60 junction just south of Freshfields. Traffic will therefore be more likely to travel on the Eddison Park/Ashes Park road through Gateford estate to join Gateford Rd and then on to the A57. The road through Gateford, with its roundabouts and traffic lights at Gateford Rd junction, is a much safer route for any increased traffic than Owday lane. - To minimise the visual impact, the new road will need to be screened by planting large numbers of grown trees along its length, matching the species in the surrounding woods. In the plan, the northern boundary of the site is to be screened by a planted belt of trees, want to emphasise how important that is, in terms of visually screening the houses from Red lane to the north and creating that 'green buffer' between Worksop and Carlton – and also to act as a corridor for wildlife. Welcome aspect of the plan is to provide cycling and walking routes within the site. However, to realise the full potential for greener/active travel by residents, these cycle/walking routes will have to connect to the wider Worksop and Carlton communities. There should be a wide shared use cycle/pedestrian path alongside the new road and joining the A60. From there, safe cycle/walk crossing of the A60 and safe routes into Worksop/Carlton should be provided in both N/S directions. How that should be achieved is not relevant to this site but is relevant to the plans of both Bassetlaw District and Notts County Councils, so set out below in an appendix, some suggestions, but of course, it would need consultation with experts and landowners to achieve the connecting routes. Still have concerns about the large scale of this development in open countryside and the limited provision of affordable housing. Recognise that Worksop will need to grow to prosper and welcome the consideration that has been given to sustainable and landscape issues in this latest version of the plan. If my suggestions above are implemented then they will mitigate some of negative impacts and create positive opportunities in terms of creating a more sustainable and healthier community e.g. connecting cycle routes. Appendix – Cycle/walking routes connecting the site to Worksop and Carlton. The cycle route to Carlton would be simplest to achieve by widening the existing pavement alongside the A60 and re-designating it as shared use. An alternative, which would need the landowner's agreement, would be to establish a safe and durable surfaced route from the northern boundary of the site to Red lane, and then on to Carlton (it needs to be considered by experts on how practical it is to make this connection). A cycle route into Worksop could be achieved by a shared use path from the new roundabout on the A60, south alongside the A60 and along the wide pavements on Eddison Park Ave (re-designated shared use) to join the existing cycle route that goes through the Gateford estate, south to the Toucan crossing on Raymouth Lane and then the 'cycle lane' along Valley Rd to Valley School. The route would then have to be extended to provide safe access to the town centre. Hope the developers, County Council and District Council can cooperate to achieve this vision of safe, sustainable travel, connecting the site to the wider community, schools, shops and employment.</p>	<p>Support for retaining the open field next to the A60 and for the defensible northern boundary are welcome. The policy requires a community woodland on site. The Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) state that the Peaks Hill Farm development can be accommodated safely with mitigation, including the new link road. The road line for the link road has yet to be confirmed. Any provision for a new road requires safe cycle access to be designed in. The use of developer contributions are governed by national legislation; to that where there is a proven link to the impact generated by a development. Requiring the developer to fund a cycle lane into Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick would be unreasonable. But new and improved cycle routes which connect to existing routes are required by the policy.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
1664256	Resident	<p>Strongly OBJECT to your Peaks Hill Farm Project. This is prime farm land which is currently being used by a farmer to grow consumable vegetables and should not be used. . Under Government instructions this type of land should not be used to build housing and business. This type of land is to be preserved for farming only, due to us leaving the EU. The UK needs to increase its farming industry to provide its own food. The Council is using this land for 2 reasons and both are Lazy, irresponsible, selfish and are not in the publics' interest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The land owner is known to certain Worksop councillors from previous deals and this transaction will profit both parties rather than the public ii) This is an easy option rather than the 'correct' option. The correct option would be to use Brown land or unused green fields (NOT farmland). This land SHOULD NOT be used for your project because it is actively used FARM LAND. AGAINST the plan because you are using essential FARMLAND Wildlife The clue is in its name (Farm) I have read how you intend to protect the wild birds within your inept housing plan. What you fail to say is about the other wildlife within this area. You also fail to say about the noise pollution human pollution and building pollution your plan will create over a space of 10 years. Currently we regularly see peasants, woodpeckers, Goss hawks, rabbits & hares, foxes and even a deer frequents these fields. This is on top of the standard wild birds that feed off of this land. Can you honestly tell me you have planned to protect this wildlife from day 1 through your development until completion and onwards from there on. If so ... You clearly have either done no research OR you simply can't be bothered and just want your development and the money it will bring you. Strongly OBJECT to your plans because it does not even come close to protect the wildlife Current residents of Westerdale development will seriously and negatively affect the residents of Westerdale homes. Many homes back onto the farmland. A development which is the size of your inept design will have massive impact both financially and mentally on these home owners. i) The view these homes have will be taken away and replaced by ugly housing or industry. The wildlife from the gardens will be gone as well as the smell of fresh air. ii) the noise and air pollution of 10 years worth of building will be unbearable. who wants to be part of a building site against their will. iii) The property values of Westerdale homes will drop because of these houses will be facing onto a building site of a huge housing estate. The property values will drop because there will be too many available new houses to cover demand. The size of the plan is too Big and is irresponsible. It will be impossible to sell Westerdale houses going forward. AGAINST your plan because of the negative effects on existing home owners of Westerdale From the beginning the Worksop Council and the planners have acted irresponsibly towards their residents. This plan (ST 15) was original (2019-20) hidden from the public in order to get it passed through without objection. After residents complained and brought in the help of our MP Bredon C-S, only then did this plan get published in the correct way. Astonished that many of the councils team are still in employment further more still involved with this corrupt process. Was told by my councillor that they would object to the plan. They lied to me, will never forget that. This council and its planning team are not fit for purpose. ST 15 is not fit for purpose and should be suspended immediately. 	<p>The Council is required by national planning policy to identify and allocate enough land for housing for a minimum 15 year period. There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. All available sites have been assessed and the Land Availability Assessment states that Peaks Hill Farm is suitable and deliverable to accommodate the homes required. National policy does not prevent the use of agricultural land for development. Instead it requires that if considered necessary lower quality agricultural land is used. Initial ecology assessment has been undertaken. This did not identify any significant constraints to development of the site. Neither have Natural England and Notts Wildlife Trust. Further ecology assessments will be required through the development management process. 10% biodiversity net gain will be a requirement of the proposal to enhance biodiversity value on site. Loss of view and house prices are not planning matters. The Council's Environmental Health have not identified any pollution concerns relating to the proposed development. The Local Plan has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of national legislation, planning guidance and the Councils' Statement of Community Involvement. At each stage of the plan-making process, the Council has exceeded the guidelines in national legislation and its own local policy in the way it has consulted the community and stakeholders. Engagement with landowners has been transparent and appropriate. Councillor involvement in the process has been appropriate and in accordance with the councillor code of conduct.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
1664692	Resident	<p>Object to the local plan part ST15 because it makes no allowance for necessary additional health services. My doctors surgery (Larwood Practice) is struggling to cope with its current patient numbers. It's almost impossible to secure an appointment when needed. Your plan ST15 is directly in Larwood Surgery's captive area which means it will have up to an additional 3000 extra patients. This is beyond capacity and capability which means it is not in the public's interest. Your consultation advisor stated that it is neither the council's or developers' responsibility to increase local doctors' spaces. Your consultation suggested it is the responsibility of the NHS and Government. As you can not assure residents that additional improvements will be made to our Doctors and Dentist and Hospital services have to object to it. No additional school places. Object to the Plan because you have not made any arrangement for extra infrastructure to support it. In your consultation, the official stated that children will have to find school places outside of Worksop. The official said there would be a few spaces at Gateford school, Valley and Prospect but then back tracked when he was told these schools are already over-subscribed. He said children could travel outside of the area for their education. The plan also shows big housing developments in these surrounding areas which will also become oversubscribed. The official said that school places were not the responsibility of the planners or council planning and could not be taken into consideration. Objecting to the plan as it is not in the public's interest. The plan makes no allowance for health and now no plans for education. Use of farm land Why are you using essential farm land. Need our farmers and farmers need good farm land. This land is not fallow land. It is farmed every year. Once built on this can never be used for farming again. There are plenty of sites available around Gateford. A plot down the road from me was ready for use until someone found ancient remains on it. The Gateford sites have had builders on them for over 20 years and still have plenty of availability to use. Why are you not using the Gateford sites and completing that project. The fact that it has taken over 20 years to complete the Gateford project shows that plan ST 15 is excessive and not wanted. Please leave Peak Hill Farm as a Farm with fields full of crops and wildlife</p>	<p>The policy secures a financial contribution to improve health care facilities in the area to cope with the additional demand from the development. The Council will continue to work with Bassetlaw Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG - the Strategic Health Care authority responsible for NHS service provision in Bassetlaw) to determine the health facilities required to support the development. No evidence has been submitted by the CCG which has resulted in the site being considered unsuitable for development/allocation. Nottinghamshire County Council Education state that there are sufficient primary school places in Worksop for children to go to school. A new school will also be provided on site to support secondary education. The policy therefore ensures that the impact of Peaks Hill Farm on health and education infrastructure is appropriately mitigated. The Council is required by national planning policy to identify and allocate enough land for housing for a minimum 15-year period. There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. All available sites have been assessed and the Land Availability Assessment states that Peaks Hill Farm is suitable and deliverable to accommodate the homes required. National policy does not prevent the use of agricultural land for development. Instead, it requires that if considered necessary lower quality agricultural land is used.</p>
REF071	Minerals and Waste, NCC	<p>As mentioned in previous responses, the allocation is adjacent to the mineral and waste site of Carlton Forest, which was previously sand and gravel extraction, with the land restored through landfill. Importation of waste has now ceased, and the landfill area restored though a gas compound remains on site, which the County Council has an interest in. Mineral extraction has also now ceased at Carlton Forest, however part of the site is still to be restored as per the conditions attached to the permission granted by the County Council. The operator is currently working with the County Council on a new restoration scheme for this area and so the site remains of interest to the County Council who will also monitor the aftercare progress. Considering the proposed allocation and the above, providing any proposed scheme at the allocation site does not conflict with the restoration or aftercare process or the gas compound, the County Council does not wish to raise any concern with development at this proposed allocation site in terms of minerals and waste. Due to the proximity of the allocation to the now closed landfill, it is recommended that advice is sought from the EA and the County Council's Landscape and Regeneration Team to understand what site investigation may be required if the proposed site is impacted by landfill gas emissions.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Bassetlaw District Council's Environmental Health Team has been consulted and they have raised no objections. BDC Environmental Health has advised that this can be dealt with at the Development Management stage.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
REF086	Resident	<p>Totally against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm, within the Bassetlaw Local Plan. The proposal to build a new housing estate consisting of over 1000 houses, plus business premises will mean that residents in the area will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption, and inconvenience for many years to come. For many elderly residents, who cannot afford to move, the devastating impact of developing this estate will last for the rest of their lives. The Draft Plan does not appear to address the adverse impact caused by the massive increase in commuters going in and out of Worksop by road and rail if this new housing estate is built. The employment opportunities in Worksop are extremely limited and this will remain the case even if new businesses are developed on Peaks Hill. Most people buying these new properties will therefore need to commute to get to work. There are already huge pressures on Worksop's commuting infrastructure. For example, the connecting roads in and out of Worksop to the A1 and M1 are congested single lane, country roads that are already full of traffic during peak commuter periods. Also, the train service from Worksop to Sheffield is poor, unreliable, and often full to capacity during peak commuting periods. On many occasions I have witnessed people not being allowed on trains during peak times because the train was too full. Building over 1000 new houses on Peaks Hill will result in a massive increase in people commuting in and out of Worksop by road and rail. Building a new road on Peaks Hill and a few new roundabouts in the area will not resolve the significant congestion issues that will be created when the number of commuters using the roads around Worksop substantially increases. Also modernising Worksop train station or eventually building a train station in the new Garden Village will not improve the actual efficiency of the train service to and from Worksop when more commuters start to use it. Worksop Town Centre is very poorly maintained, with no major shops or restaurants to attract people to visit it. If over 1000 increase in people travelling by road and rail to other nearby Towns and Cities to shop and socialise, with only minimal benefit to the economy of Worksop. It is not clear how the housing requirement for Worksop in this plan has been determined. A huge volume of new housing has already been developed in Worksop in recent years e.g. in the Gateford area. The plan should explain in more detail why the Council believes Worksop needs thousands of additional houses on top of what it already has, and why other areas of Bassetlaw (e.g. some of the villages in the area) are not being subjected to such extensive development work. Developing a new housing estate on Peaks Hill Farm and destroying this greenfield area will significantly increase pollution in the area at time when Councils should be doing all they can to improve the environment and mitigate the impact of climate change. Developing a new housing estate on Peaks Hill Farm will have an adverse impact on the established wildlife in the area including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards, frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs, and insect population. The proposal to build a road across Peaks Hill to connect Blyth Road and Carlton Road will increase the pollution from noise and fumes in this area. Councils are supposed to be implementing plans to help to reduce the impact on Climate change and pollution (e.g. Clean Air Zones) and this is not in accordance with that approach. If my concerns are overruled, my feedback is as follows:-</p> <p>Totally against the development of a walkway between Westerdale and the new Peaks Hill Housing Estate. The proposal to develop an estate of over 1,000 new houses behind where we live is bad enough. However, building a walkway/cycle path to link Westerdale to this estate will attract anti-social behaviour to the front of where we live. The existing walkways in this area attract fly tipping, dog fouling, rough sleepers, graffiti, and a wide range of other anti-social behaviour. If my feedback re this is ignored and a walkway is developed it needs to be well away from my property and in a position where the public will not have to pass my property when they access it. There should be a green buffer zone between current homes on Westerdale and any new development. This buffer zone should be a minimum of 20 metres from the border of these properties. Existing hedgerows at the rear of the properties on Westerdale should be retained as part of the buffer zone. The new dwellings nearest to Westerdale should have their gardens positioned so they back onto the buffer zone to increase the distance between existing homes and the new houses that are being built. Any social housing that is developed on this housing estate should be located well away from current houses on Westerdale. The development should maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment on this estate. It should also retain existing wooded areas and as many hedgerows as possible. Against the development of a road being built to link Blyth Road and Carlton Road through Peaks Hill Farm. If this is built it needs to be located well away from existing homes on Westerdale. Any "green technology" that is developed needs to be located well away from existing homes on Westerdale.</p>	<p>There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. All available sites have been assessed and the Land Availability Assessment states that Peaks Hill Farm is suitable and deliverable to accommodate the homes required. National policy does not prevent the use of agricultural land for development. Instead it requires that if considered necessary lower quality agricultural land is used. Bassetlaw District Council's Environmental Health Team state there are expected to be no pollution concerns associated with the development. In accordance with national Policy (NPPF), the Council has undertaken an assessment of housing and employment need. The Housing and Economic Needs Assessment evidences the housing figures and also evidences the level of job growth that will be supported on employment allocations. 10ha of Peaks Hill Farm will bring jobs to Worksop and other sites are identified close to Worksop on the A57. The Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) state that the Peaks Hill Farm development can be accommodated safely in the area's road network with mitigation, including the new link road. The road line for the link road has yet to be confirmed. Any provision for a new road requires safe cycle access to be designed in. Rail services are a matter for Northern Rail. The use of developer contributions are governed by national legislation; to that where there is a proven link to the impact generated by a development. New homes in Worksop will support the regeneration of the Town Centre. Initial ecology assessment has been undertaken. This did not identify any significant constraints to development of the site. Neither have Natural England and Notts Wildlife Trust. Further ecology assessments will be required through the development management process. 10% biodiversity net gain will be a requirement of the proposal to enhance biodiversity value on site.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
			Good connections to the surrounding residential area are essential to ensure new and existing residents can access services and facilities by walking and cycling. No decision has been made regarding the location of the connecting routes. The policy identifies a green buffer along the site boundary to help protect residential amenity. Improved and enhanced green infrastructure is an important aspect of the Peaks Hill Farm proposal. These are a requirement of the policy. Retention of woodland and tree planting is a requirement of the Local Plan (five trees per dwelling). The employment area is proposed to be located on the northern boundary some distance from existing residents homes.
REF096 Carlton Members	Councillors, Bassetlaw District Council	Note that there have been revisions to the January 20 version of the plan that took into account out earlier feedback and that of others . This focussed on the impact of the development and can be summarised as a concern about Worksop encroaching onto the village of Carlton. Approve of the decision to make the site fronting the A60 publicly accessible green space (7.2.14) and to appoint a Green Gap to the north of the site (7.2.14) and an enhanced green buffer at the sites northern boundary. Thank you for these major revisions. There is still concern locally about the impact the distributor road will have on the landscape quality as it crosses the open land alongside the A60 and its climb through the tree line. Its route should be subject to consultation with Carlton parish council and Carlton Members. At the moment many think the least intrusive route would be to the southern end of the site pursing a direct approach to near the junction with the road through Gateford. Para 7.2.9 recognises that the site is within Carlton Parish. It is covered by the Carlton neighbourhood plan. It still rankles within Carlton that the parish council, Members and the neighbourhood plan group were not consulted . We are pleased that 'evidenced impacts on Carlton' will be addressed in S106 contributions but this will not cover the loss of CIL contributions the Parish Council could have expected to receive. Is there a mechanism for the Parish to be paid some form of compensation by Bassetlaw for the unilateral decision to make this site CIL exempt?	Carlton Parish Council has been consulted on the Local Plan at every stage of public consultation. All matters raised by the Parish Council have been taken into consideration by Bassetlaw District Council as the plan has evolved. The road line has yet to be agreed. As this is a highway issue, the road alignment will need to be agreed with Nottinghamshire County Council (as the Highway Authority). The Parish Council and Members will continue to be consulted on future versions of the Local Plan, the development of the masterplan framework and planning applications for the site. The decision to make the site CIL exempt is based on the financial viability of development as evidenced by the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. National legislation requires CIL be subject to a review, therefore there was never a guarantee that CIL could be secured from the scheme.
REF112	Resident	Totally against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm, within the Bassetlaw Local Plan. The proposal to build a new housing estate consisting of over 1000 houses, plus business premises will mean that residents in the area will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption, and inconvenience for many years to come. For many elderly residents, who cannot afford to move, the devastating impact of developing this estate will last for the rest of their lives. The Draft Plan does not appear to address the adverse impact caused by the massive increase in commuters going in and out of Worksop by road and rail if this huge new housing estate is built. The employment opportunities in Worksop are extremely limited and this will remain the case even if new businesses are developed on Peaks Hill. Most people buying these new properties will therefore need to commute to get to work. There are already huge pressures on Worksop's commuting infrastructure. For example, the connecting roads in and out of Worksop to the A1 and M1 are congested single lane, country roads that are already full of traffic during peak commuter periods. Also, the train service from Worksop to Sheffield is poor, unreliable, and often full to capacity during peak commuting periods.	There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. All available sites have been assessed and the Land Availability Assessment states that Peaks Hill Farm is suitable and deliverable to accommodate the homes required. National policy does not prevent the use of agricultural land for development. Instead it

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
		<p>On many occasions have witnessed people not being allowed on trains during peak times because the train was too full. Building over 1000 new houses on Peaks Hill will result in a massive increase in people commuting in and out of Worksop by road and rail. Building a new road on Peaks Hill and a few new roundabouts in the area will not resolve the significant congestion issues that will be created when the number of commuters using the roads around Worksop substantially increases. Also modernising Worksop train station or eventually building a train station in the new Garden Village will not improve the actual efficiency of the train service to and from Worksop when more commuters start to use it. Worksop Town Centre is very poorly maintained, with no major shops or restaurants to attract people to visit it. If over 1000 new homes are built in Worksop it will just result in a significant increase in people travelling by road and rail to other nearby Towns and Cities to shop and socialise, with only minimal benefit to the economy of Worksop. It is not clear how the housing requirement for Worksop in this plan has been determined. A huge volume of new housing has already been developed in Worksop in recent years e.g. in the Gateford area. The plan should explain in more detail why the Council believes Worksop needs thousands of additional houses on top of what it already has, and why other areas of Bassetlaw (e.g. some of the villages in the area) are not being subjected to such extensive development work. Developing a new housing estate on Peaks Hill Farm and destroying this greenfield area will significantly increase pollution in the area at time when Councils should be doing all they can to improve the environment and mitigate the impact of climate change. Developing a new housing estate on Peaks Hill Farm will have an adverse impact on the established wildlife in the area including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards, frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs, and insect population. The proposal to build a road across Peaks Hill to connect Blyth Road and Carlton Road will increase the pollution from noise and fumes in this area. Councils are supposed to be implementing plans to help to reduce the impact on climate change and pollution (e.g. Clean Air Zones) and this is not in accordance with that approach.</p> <p>If my concerns are over-ruled my feedback is as follows:- totally against the development of a walkway between Westerdale and the new Peaks Hill Housing Estate. The proposal to develop an estate of over 1,000 new houses behind where we live is bad enough. However, building a walkway/cycle path to link Westerdale to this estate will attract anti-social behaviour to the front of where we live. The existing walkways in this area attract fly tipping, dog fouling, rough sleepers, graffiti, and a wide range of other anti-social behaviour. If my feedback re this is ignored and a walkway is developed it needs to be well away from my property and in a position where the public will not have to pass my property when they access it. There should be a green buffer zone between current homes on Westerdale and any new development. This buffer zone should be a minimum of 20 metres from the border of these properties. Existing hedgerows at the rear of the properties on Westerdale should be retained as part of the buffer zone. The new dwellings nearest to Westerdale should have their gardens positioned so they back onto the buffer zone to increase the distance between existing homes and the new houses that are being built. Any social housing that is developed on this housing estate should be located well away from cunent houses on Westerdale. The development should maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment on this estate. It should also retain existing wooded areas and as many hedgerows as possible. Against the development of a road being built to link Blyth Road and Carlton Road through Peaks Hill Farm. If this is built it needs to be located wellaway from existing homes on Westerdale. Any "green technology'that is developed needs to be located well awav from existino homes on Westerdale.</p>	<p>requires that if considered necessary lower quality agricultural land is used. Bassetlaw District Council's Environmental Health Team state there are expected to be no pollution concerns associated with the development. In accordance with national Policy (NPPF), the Council has undertaken an assessment of housing and employment need. The Housing and Economic Needs Assessment evidences the housing figures and also evidences the level of job growth that will be supported on employment allocations. 10ha of Peaks Hill Farm will bring jobs to Worksop and other sites are identified close to Worksop on the A57. The Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) state that the Peaks Hill Farm development can be accommodated safely in the area's road network with mitigation, including the new link road. The road line for the link road has yet to be confirmed. Any provision for a new road requires safe cycle access to be designed in. Rail services are a matter for Northern Rail. The use of developer contributions are governed by national legislation; to that where there is a proven link to the impact generated by a development. New homes in Worksop will support the regeneration of the Town Centre. Initial ecology assessment has been undertaken. This did not identify any significant constraints to development of the site. Neither have Natural England and Notts Wildlife Trust. Further ecology assessments will be required through the development management process. 10% biodiversity net gain will be a requirement of the proposal to enhance biodiversity value on site.</p> <p>Good connections to the surrounding residential area are essential to ensure new and existing residents can access services and facilities by walking and cycling. No decision has been made regarding the location of the connecting routes. The policy identifies a green buffer along the site boundary to help protect residential amenity. Improved and enhanced green infrastructure is an important aspect of the</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
			Peaks Hill Farm proposal. These are a requirement of the policy. Retention of woodland and tree planting is a requirement of the Local Plan (five trees per dwelling). The employment area is proposed to be located on the northern boundary some distance from existing residents homes.
REF114	Resident	<p>Totally against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm, within the Bassetlaw Local Plan. The proposal to build a new housing estate consisting of over 1000 houses, plus business premises will mean that residents in the area will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption, and inconvenience for many years to come. For many elderly residents, who cannot afford to move, the devastating impact of developing this estate will last for the rest of their lives.</p> <p>The Draft Plan does not appear to address the adverse impact caused by the massive increase in commuters going in and out of Worksop by road and rail if this huge new housing estate is built. The employment opportunities in Worksop are extremely limited and this will remain the case even if new businesses are developed on Peaks Hill. Most people buying these new properties will therefore need to commute to get to work. There are already huge pressures on Worksop's commuting infrastructure. For example, the connecting roads in and out of Worksop to the A1 and M1 are congested single lane, country roads that are already full of traffic during peak commuter periods. Also, the train service from Worksop to Sheffield is poor, unreliable, and often full to capacity during peak commuting periods. On many occasions have witnessed people not being allowed on trains during peak times because the train was too full. Building over 1000 new houses on Peaks Hill will result in a massive increase in people commuting in and out of Worksop by road and rail. Building a new road on Peaks Hill and a few new roundabouts in the area will not resolve the significant congestion issues that will be created when the number of commuters using the roads around Worksop substantially increases. Also modernising Worksop train station or eventually building a train station in the new Garden Village will not improve the actual efficiency of the train service to and from Worksop when more commuters start to use it. Worksop Town Centre is very poorly maintained, with no major shops or restaurants to attract people to visit it. If over 1000 new homes are built in Worksop it will just result in a significant increase in people travelling by road and rail to other nearby Towns and Cities to shop and socialise, with only minimal benefit to the economy of Worksop. It is not clear how the housing requirement for Worksop in this plan has been determined. A huge volume of new housing has already been developed in Worksop in recent years e.g., in the Gateford area. The plan should explain in more detail why the Council believes Worksop needs thousands of additional houses on top of what it already has, and why other areas of Bassetlaw (e.g. some of the villages in the area) are not being subjected to such extensive development work. Developing a new housing estate on Peaks Hill Farm and destroying this greenfield area will significantly increase pollution in the area at time when Councils should be doing all they can to improve the environment and mitigate the impact of climate change. Developing a new housing estate on Peaks Hill Farm will have an adverse impact on the established wildlife in the area including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards, frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs, and insect population. The proposal to build a road across Peaks Hill to connect Blyth Road and Carlton Road will increase the pollution from noise and fumes in this area. Councils are supposed to be implementing plans to help to reduce the impact on Climate change and pollution (e.g. Clean Air Zones) and this is not in accordance with that approach. If my concerns are overruled, my feedback is as follows:-totally against the development of a walkway between Westerdale and the new Peaks Hill Housing Estate. The proposal to develop an estate of over 1,000 new houses behind where we live is bad enough. However, building a walkway/cycle path to link Westerdale to this estate will attract anti-social behaviour to the front of where we live. The existing walkways in this area attract fly tipping, dog fouling, rough sleepers, graffiti, and a wide range of other anti-social behaviour. If my feedback re this is ignored and a walkway is developed it needs to be well away from my property and in a position where the public will not have to pass my property when they access it.. There should be a green buffer zone between current homes on Westerdale and any new development. This buffer zone should be a minimum of 20 metres from the border of these properties. Existing hedgerows at the rear of the properties on Westerdale should be retained as part of the buffer zone. The new dwellings nearest to Westerdale should have their gardens positioned so they back onto the buffer zone to increase the distance between existing homes and the new houses that are being built. Any social housing that is developed on this housing estate should be located well away from current houses on Westerdale. The development should maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment on this estate. It should also retain existing wooded areas and as many hedgerows as possible. Against the development of a road being built to link Blyth Road and Carlton Road through Peaks Hill Farm. If this is built it needs to be located well away from existing homes on Westerdale. Any "green technology" that is developed needs to be located well away from existing homes on Westerdale.</p>	<p>There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. All available sites have been assessed and the Land Availability Assessment states that Peaks Hill Farm is suitable and deliverable to accommodate the homes required. National policy does not prevent the use of agricultural land for development. Instead it requires that if considered necessary lower quality agricultural land is used. Bassetlaw District Council's Environmental Health Team state there are expected to be no pollution concerns associated with the development. In accordance with national Policy (NPPF), the Council has undertaken an assessment of housing and employment need. The Housing and Economic Needs Assessment evidences the housing figures and also evidences the level of job growth that will be supported on employment allocations. 10ha of Peaks Hill Farm will bring jobs to Worksop and other sites are identified close to Worksop on the A57. The Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) state that the Peaks Hill Farm development can be accommodated safely in the area's road network with mitigation, including the new link road. The road line for the link road has yet to be confirmed. Any provision for a new road requires safe cycle access to be designed in. Rail services are a matter for Northern Rail. The use of developer contributions are governed by national legislation; to that where there is a proven link to the impact generated by a development. New homes in Worksop will support the regeneration of the Town Centre. Initial ecology assessment has been undertaken. This did not identify any significant constraints to development of</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
			<p>the site. Neither have Natural England and Notts Wildlife Trust. Further ecology assessments will be required through the development management process. 10% biodiversity net gain will be a requirement of the proposal to enhance biodiversity value on site.</p> <p>Good connections to the surrounding residential area are essential to ensure new and existing residents can access services and facilities by walking and cycling. No decision has been made regarding the location of the connecting routes. The policy identifies a green buffer along the site boundary to help protect residential amenity. Improved and enhanced green infrastructure is an important aspect of the Peaks Hill Farm proposal. These are a requirement of the policy. Retention of woodland and tree planting is a requirement of the Local Plan (five trees per dwelling). The employment area is proposed to be located on the northern boundary some distance from existing residents homes.</p>
REF115	Resident	<p>Totally against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm, within the Basselflaw Local Plan. The proposal to build a new housing estate consisting of over 1000 houses, plus business premises will mean that residents in the area will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption, and inconvenience for many years to come. For many elderly residents, who cannot afford to move, the devastating impact of developing this estate will last for the rest of their lives. The Draft Plan does not appear to address the adverse impact caused by the massive increase in commuters going in and out of worksop by road and rail if this huge new housing estate is built. The employment opportunities in Worksop are extremely limited and this will remain the case even if new businesses are developed on Peaks Hill. Most people buying these new properties will therefore need to commute to get to work. There are already huge pressures on Worksop's commuting infrastructure. For example, the connecting roads in and out of Worksop to the A1 and M1 are congested single lane, country roads that are already full of traffic during peak commuter periods. Also, the train service from Worksop to Sheffield is poor, unreliable, and often full to capacity during peak commuting periods. On many occasions have witnessed people not being allowed on trains during peak times because the train was too full. Building over 1000 new houses on Peaks Hillwill result in a massive increase in people commuting in and out of Worksop by road and rail. Building a new road on Peaks Hilland a few new roundabouts in the area will not resolve the significant congestion issues that will be created when the number of commuters using the roads around worksop substantially increases. Also modernising Worksop train station or eventually building a train station in the new Garden Village will not improve the actual efficiency of the train service to and from Worksop when more commuters start to use it. Worksop Town Centre is very poorly maintained, with no major shops or restaurants to attract people to visit it. If over 1000 new homes are built in Worksop it will just result in a significant increase in people travelling by road and railto other nearby Towns and Cities to shop and socialise, with only minimal benefit to the economy of Worksop. It is not clear how the housing requirement for Worksop in this plan has been determined. A huge volume of new housing has already been developed in Worksop in recent years e.g, in the Gateford area. The plan should explain in more detailwhy the Council believes Worksop needs thousands of additional houses on top of what it already has, and why other areas of Bassetlaw (e.g. some of the villages in the area) are not being subjected to such extensive development work.</p> <p>Developing a new housing estate on Peaks Hill Farm and destroying this greenfield area will significantly increase pollution in the area at time when Councils should be doing all they can to improve the environment and mitigate the impact of climate change Developing a new housing estate on Peaks Hill Farm will have an adverse impad on the established wildlife in the area including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards, frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs, and insect population. The proposal to build a road across Peaks Hill to</p>	<p>There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. All available sites have been assessed and the Land Availability Assessment states that Peaks Hill Farm is suitable and deliverable to accommodate the homes required. National policy does not prevent the use of agricultural land for development. Instead it requires that if considered necessary lower quality agricultural land is used. Bassetlaw District Council's Environmental Health Team state there are expected to be no pollution concerns associated with the development. In accordance with national Policy (NPPF), the Council has undertaken an assessment of housing and employment need. The Housing and Economic Needs Assessment evidences the housing figures and also evidences the level of job growth that will be supported on employment allocations. 10ha of Peaks Hill Farm will bring jobs to Worksop and other sites are identified close to Worksop on the A57. The</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
		<p>connect Blyth Road and Carlton Road will increase the pollution from noise and fumes in this area. Councils are supposed to be implementing plans to help to reduce the impact on Climate change and pollution (e.g. Clean Air Zones) and this is not in accordance with that approach. If my concerns are over-ruled, my feedback is as follows:- totally against the development of a walkway between Westerdale and the new Peaks Hill Housing Estate. The proposal to develop an estate of over 1,000 new houses behind where we live is bad enough. However, building a wallway/cycle path to link Westerdale to this estate will attract anti-social behaviour to the front of where we live. The existing walkways in this area attract fly tipping, dog fouling, rough sleepers, graffiti, and a wide range of other anti-social behaviour. If my feedback re this is ignored and a walkway is developed it needs to be well away from my property and in a position where the public will not have to pass my property when they access it. There should be a green buffer zone between current homes on Westerdale and any new development. This buffer zone should be a minimum of 20 metres from the border of these properties. Existing hedgerows at the rear of the properties on Westerdale should be retained as part of the buffer zone. The new dwellings nearest to Westerdale should have their gardens positioned so they back onto the buffer zone to increase the distance between existing homes and the new houses that are being built. Any social housing that is developed on this housing estate should be located well away from current houses on Westerdale. The development should maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment on this estate. It should also retain existing wooded areas and as many hedgerows as possible. Against the development of a road being built to link Blyth Road and Carlton Road through Peaks Hill Farm. If this is built it needs to be located well away from existing homes on Westerdale. Any "green technology" that is developed needs to be located well away from existing homes on Westerdale.</p>	<p>Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) state that the Peaks Hill Farm development can be accommodated safely in the area's road network with mitigation, including the new link road. The road line for the link road has yet to be confirmed. Any provision for a new road requires safe cycle access to be designed in. Rail services are a matter for Northern Rail. The use of developer contributions are governed by national legislation; to that where there is a proven link to the impact generated by a development. New homes in Worksop will support the regeneration of the Town Centre. Initial ecology assessment has been undertaken. This did not identify any significant constraints to development of the site. Neither have Natural England and Notts Wildlife Trust. Further ecology assessments will be required through the development management process. 10% biodiversity net gain will be a requirement of the proposal to enhance biodiversity value on site.</p> <p>Good connections to the surrounding residential area are essential to ensure new and existing residents can access services and facilities by walking and cycling. No decision has been made regarding the location of the connecting routes. The policy identifies a green buffer along the site boundary to help protect residential amenity. Improved and enhanced green infrastructure is an important aspect of the Peaks Hill Farm proposal. These are a requirement of the policy. Retention of woodland and tree planting is a requirement of the Local Plan (five trees per dwelling). The employment area is proposed to be located on the northern boundary some distance from existing residents homes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
REF119	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>In response to the first Draft Local Plan, in January 2020, raised objections to the inclusion of the field adjacent to the A60, at the western end of the proposed Peaks Hill site. I objected (as did many others) to the loss of amenity from loss of beautiful countryside and open views. The wooded ridge, running NE from G4S on the A60 at south of this site to N of Peaks Hill Farm itself, was I felt, a natural topographical boundary between Worksop and the open countryside which slopes downhill towards Carlton in Lindrick. Very pleased that planners and developers have listened to reasoned arguments and have now designated the triangular field, adjacent to the A60, a piece of 'green infrastructure' (hope this will be managed as a flower meadow?) within the development site. Therefore the wooded ridge, referred to above, becomes the effective boundary of the residential development. It is vital, as the plan develops, to ensure that this field and the open views, are protected.</p> <p>Believe consideration should be given to designating the woods within the site as a community woodland, developing access paths, while at the same time enhancing the management of the woods for the benefit of wildlife. Covid lockdowns have shown how much access to nature, and woodland especially, is valued by people for exercise and mental health. Still have concerns and wish to make a number of points that I hope will be incorporated into the design of the site – First, the new access road will still run through the field to join the A60. It remains to be seen what Highways engineers will say on the siting of this road but I have concerns on a number of issues – This is a dangerous stretch of the A60, particularly on the hill/bend nr Peaks Hill farm with a history of fatal accidents. There will also be considerable visual impact of the road on the landscape. The road will create a new link to the A57, by traffic using the new road to bypass the north of Worksop, travel along the A60 towards Carlton, turning into Owday Lane, then Woodsetts rd to travel to the A57 roundabout. Both the A60 and the minor road of Owday lane (with two lots of Z bends) are very busy with frequent accidents. To minimise the impact of the above – the new road should take a line towards the south of the site, nearer to Worksop, so a new roundabout could be built at the new rd/A60 junction just south of Freshfields. Traffic will therefore be more likely to travel on the Eddison Park/Ashes Park road through Gateford estate to join Gateford Rd and then on to the A57. The road through Gateford, with its roundabouts and traffic lights at Gateford Rd junction, is a much safer route for any increased traffic than Owday lane. To minimise the visual impact, the new road will need to be screened by planting large numbers of grown trees along its length, matching the species in the surrounding woods. In the plan, the northern boundary of the site is to be screened by a planted belt of trees and want to emphasise how important that is, in terms of visually screening the houses from Red lane to the north and creating that 'green buffer' between Worksop and Carlton – and also to act as a corridor for wildlife. A welcome aspect of the plan is to provide cycling and walking routes within the site. To realise the full potential for greener/active travel by residents, these cycle/walking routes will have to connect to the wider Worksop and Carlton communities. There should be a wide shared use cycle/pedestrian path alongside the new road and joining the A60. From there, safe cycle/walk crossing of the A60 and safe routes into Worksop/Carlton should be provided in both N/S directions. How that should be achieved is not relevant to this site but is relevant to the plans of both Bassetlaw District and Notts County Councils, so therefore I've set out below in an appendix, some suggestions, but of course, it would need consultation with experts and landowners to achieve the connecting routes. Still have concerns about the large scale of this development in open countryside and the limited provision of affordable housing. Recognise that Worksop will need to grow to prosper and welcome the consideration that has been given to sustainable and landscape issues in this latest version of the plan. If my suggestions above are implemented then they will mitigate some of negative impacts and create positive opportunities in terms of creating a more sustainable and healthier community e.g. connecting cycle routes. Appendix – Cycle/walking routes connecting the site to Worksop and Carlton. The cycle route to Carlton would be simplest to achieve by widening the existing pavement alongside the A60 and re-designating it as shared use. An alternative, which would need the landowner's agreement, would be to establish a safe and durable surfaced route from the northern boundary of the site to Red lane, and then on to Carlton (it needs to be considered by experts on how practical it is to make this connection). A cycle route into Worksop could be achieved by a shared use path from the new roundabout on the A60, south alongside the A60 and along the wide pavements on Eddison Park Ave (re-designated shared use) to join the existing cycle route that goes through the Gateford estate, south to the Toucan crossing on Raymouth Lane and then the 'cycle lane' along Valley Rd to Valley School. The route would then have to be extended to provide safe access to the town centre. Hope the developers, County Council and District Council can cooperate to achieve this vision of safe, sustainable travel, connecting the site to the wider community, schools, shops and employment.</p>	Support for retaining the open field next to the A60 and for the defensible northern boundary are welcome. The policy requires a community woodland on site. The Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) state that the Peaks Hill Farm development can be accommodated safely with mitigation, including the new link road. The road line for the link road has yet to be confirmed. Any provision for a new road requires safe cycle access to be designed in. The use of developer contributions are governed by national legislation; to that where there is a proven link to the impact generated by a development. Requiring the developer to fund a cycle lane into Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick would be unreasonable. But new and improved cycle routes which connect to existing routes are required by the policy.
REF127	Lincolnshire County Council, Archaeological Planning Advice	Each site has been consulted on in relation to archaeology and where potential has been identified, welcome the inclusion of the advice provided.	Comments noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
REF031	Resident	<p>Now see that they are indicating where the proposed playing fields are planned. The question is what security are you planning for the properties which are there now on 2 sides, mine being one. Have now an undesirable element of off road bikes quads and people coming off the A60. Let alone the projected noise element. This will not be conducive for senior citizens to enjoy the use of their gardens. No doubt having read this you will file it with no further action or thoughts. Regret dearly moving to Worksop all those years ago you could drive down Bridge Street. Yes it was a large village but we were proud to be a part of it. Sadly we have people of the caliber of the Council overseeing the place. Very disappointed.</p>	<p>Policy ST37 Design Quality requires development to be designed to address crime and the fear of crime by ensuring there is natural surveillance through the incorporation of active frontages onto the street. Cycle and walking routes are also required to be designed to promote natural surveillance, thereby creating safe spaces. The detailed design of the site will be taken forward through a masterplan framework, and then a planning application. Through that process, which will involve community engagement, residents will be able to see how the amenity of existing properties will be protected.</p>
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Area Plan	<p>Page 80, Para 7.2.9 – Financial Contributions – it is a little unclear where these financial contributions should come from. If they are to be from a developer then that should be clarified and noted.</p>	<p>Policy ST60 Provision and delivery of infrastructure makes it clear that developers will be required to contribute towards the delivery of any necessary infrastructure. The Local Plan should be read as a whole document. As such, no amendments are necessary to Policy 17.</p>
REF153	Natural England	<p>Welcome the requirements set out within the section on Green Infrastructure & Biodiversity which aims to retain the woodland setting, make connections to surrounding natural habitats and to provide climate resilience.</p>	<p>Comments noted and welcomed.</p>
REF186	Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England	<p>Welcome the additional criteria for protecting landscape, views and heritage assets. This should also alleviate some at least of the concerns expressed by residents.</p>	<p>Comments noted and welcomed.</p>
REF048	Resident	<p>Against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm Policy 15 within the Bassetlaw Local plan. The development is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents of Worksop. The number of dwellings proposed and already under construction will cause noise pollution disruption and inconvenience for possibly the rest of my lifetime. Understand that the supporting infrastructure will only commence after the completion of the development which can only cause harm to the existing infrastructure which is struggling to provide services already. Existing transport systems are under pressure now, roads and rail links will be unable to cope with the increase this development will have on them. New rail and road links must be in place prior to and development commencing if the development proceeds. The number of dwellings exceeds local needs. This will only increase the number of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems. Increased commuting will add to pollution. Traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment such as Sheffield and Doncaster. At this time of climate change we should be trying to reduce commuting not increase it. Better to place new development near to the centre of employment hubs thus shortening the commute. Loss of prime local farm land is in the light of climate change is also to be deplored. The loss to the established local wildlife and green environment is also to be deplored. The Council should be the Guardians for the future generations of Worksop residents and should not side step those issues by allowing developers to maximise their profits by over development of the area. Should my concerns be over-ruled I would like to see:- A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. A little like farmers wildlife margins around their fields. Sympathetic development arrangements planning gardens that back onto the buffer zone to increase the distance between existing and new homes. Any communal area to be centrally located in the new development and away from the existing homes. Provision of low level housing near any existing homes such as bungalows not higher-rise town houses.</p>	<p>There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. All available sites have been assessed and the Land Availability Assessment states that Peaks Hill Farm is suitable and deliverable to accommodate the homes required. National policy does not prevent the use of agricultural land for development. Instead it requires that if considered necessary lower quality agricultural land is used. Bassetlaw District Council's Environmental Health Team state there are expected to be no pollution concerns associated with the development. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will identify when infrastructure is to be delivered, it will be phased to support the development. This will be secured via planning conditions and legal agreement.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
			<p>This will include transport provision. In accordance with national Policy (NPPF), the Council has undertaken an assessment of housing and employment need. The Housing and Economic Needs Assessment evidences the housing figures and also evidences the level of job growth that will be supported on employment allocations. 10ha of employment land will be provided on Peaks Hill Farm and further employment land will be provided close to Worksop along the A57. Initial ecology assessment has been undertaken. This did not identify any significant constraints to development of the site. Neither have Natural England and Notts Wildlife Trust. Further ecology assessments will be required through the development management process. 10% biodiversity net gain will be a requirement of the proposal to enhance biodiversity value on site. The Policy requires development to be of a high quality and makes provision for a green buffer around the edge of the site to protect amenity. Communal areas will be required to serve both the existing community and new residents moving onto the site so should be in accessible locations. The Local plan requires the development to provide for a housing mix that meets local needs. This could include low level accommodation.</p>
REF050	Resident	<p>Opposed to the plan to build 1000+ houses on the fields around Peak Hill Farm, feel the size of the development is inappropriate for the housing needs of local people. A development of this scale would have a massive negative effect on the environment in a time when we need to be preserving the natural world, not destroy it. Any suggestion that building 1000+ houses on one site, could be classed as 'green' by planting a few trees, is clearly ludicrous, not to mention the increase in air pollution from the 1000 + cars and home boilers a development of this scale would generate. Worksop is a small town with limited services, that are probably at breaking point, and any substantial increase in population would send these services into crisis. It's impossible to get an appointment at the Larwood Surgery, given another 1000+ houses, then who knows how long it would take to get an appointment. Worksop has two secondary schools both of which are at full capacity. Would a third school be built, or would we expect to cram in the extra pupils, thus lowering the standard of education received by our children. The only thing going for Worksop is the quality of education our children receive, building these extra unnecessary houses, puts that at risk for generations to come. The road and rail network is currently inadequate for the current population; with the addition of 1000+ houses, road and rail will need considerable investment to keep Worksop 'moving'. These are just a few examples of why we are opposed to this development. If the council over-rules our concerns and the development goes ahead, then we would like to see the following. Running along the existing border between the fields and the houses on Westerdale etc. a green buffer of at least 15+ meters and the existing hedgerow be retained . This should contain a mixture of deciduous and ever-green trees to a) reduce the amount of noise pollution, and b) to stop the existing residents from being overlooked by any new development, and c) to give the wild-life some refuge. It should be a permanent fixture with NO public right of way, and should be made into law that no builder can ever infringe up on it. It should also be designed not to encourage any form of criminal or anti-social behaviour. Would expect that no properties be built that exceed 2 stories, preferably 1 along the boundary. Any 'community' developments, i.e. sports fields, community halls etc be built away from the existing border, preferably behind the line of trees in the middle of the fields. Street lighting</p>	<p>In accordance with national Policy (NPPF), the Council has undertaken an assessment of housing and employment need. The Housing and Economic Needs Assessment evidences the housing figures and also evidences the level of job growth that will be supported on employment allocations. 10ha of employment land will be provided on Peaks Hill Farm and further employment land will be provided close to Worksop along the A57. Bassetlaw District Council's Environmental Health Team state there are expected to be no pollution concerns associated with the development. The policy requires developers to provide financial contribution to improve health facilities, including GP surgeries and the policy identifies land for secondary school facilities on site. Nottinghamshire County Council</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
		<p>be kept to a minimum, with anti-light pollution designs. Any builders to be kept in check about what they destroy, for example, bats (a protected species) are found all the way along Westerdale. Make sure that the builders respect the natural inhabitants, and make sure that punitive fines for any breaches are substantial. Strongly object to the top of Westerdale being 'opened up' to adjoining roads from the new estate, including cycle and foot access.</p>	<p>state that there is sufficient capacity in Worksop primary schools to accommodate the growth associated with the site. The Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) state that the Peaks Hill Farm development can be accommodated safely with mitigation, including the new link road. Initial ecology assessment has been undertaken. This did not identify any significant constraints to development of the site. Neither have Natural England and Notts Wildlife Trust. Further ecology assessments will be required through the development management process. 10% biodiversity net gain will be a requirement of the proposal to enhance biodiversity value on site. The Policy requires development to be of a high quality and makes provision for a green buffer around the edge of the site to protect amenity and states the mature hedgerows be retained. The design policy states that development should design out crime and anti social behaviour. Communal areas will be required to serve both the existing community and new residents moving onto the site so should be in accessible locations. It is important that new facilities are accessible to existing residents to discourage car use in the local area. The policy requires pedestrian and cycle access between the site and Thievesdale. The location of the link has not yet been agreed. There will be no vehicular access between the existing and new development.</p>
REF201	Severn Trent	<p>Supportive of the approach to incorporate Multifunctional connected green infrastructure, where this contains SuDS features it could be used to manage surface water sustainably and convey it safely through the development. Recommend that section 3 of the policy also refers to the incorporation of SuDS to manage surface water sustainably delivering against the 4 key principles of SuDS. A statement regarding Water efficiency and the promotion of the 110l/p/d water efficiency target are included as a requirement. Peaks Hill Farm site is located within a within Source Protection Zone (SPZ), please refer to Protection of Groundwater sources section of our response.</p>	<p>Water Efficiency and Water re-use including standards mentioned are outlined in policy ST52 Climate Change, sustainable drainage, including the drainage hierarchy is set out in ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage & ST55 Protecting Water Quality and Management, and groundwater related matters by ST55. These are strategic policies therefore the requirements cover all relevant new development. It is not considered necessary to repeat the requirements for each allocation, unless an additional site specific matter is identified.</p> <p>STW confirmed via email (on 4/3/2021) that this was an acceptable approach.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
REF218	Resident-member of Residents Against Peaks Hill Farm Development	<p>Peaks Hill Farm will have severe and irreparable damage to the environment and wildlife i.e. deer, birds, blue tits, blackbirds, sparrow's, house and hedge, fieldfare's, buzzard's, crows and many more, rabbits, hares and all types of insects. Every morning the crow's leave there roosts and fly from West to East and back again at night times vary with the time of year, the roosts are beyond the Long Plantation in the woods to the West. What are Council planning to do with the crows, send in the bailiffs to evict them or rehouse them or just leave them to find new roosts? When the developers move in to cut the trees down, as they did with the magnificent Silver Birch tree near the entrance to the existing development what a loss to this area a local landmark, and also some of the crow's sat in this tree in the daytime. What is going to happen to the Long Plantation will this also be cut down and lost forever? The Council seem to be hell bent on building houses on Green Belt land mostly farm land surely since Brexit we need the farm land to produce more of our own food and not to rely on other countries. Most of the brownfield sites around the area have been used for building supermarkets and fast food outlets, why not houses instead and leave the green belt area's for future generations to enjoy. With the onset of the Covid-19 pandemic we need more than ever our open space's. As for the link road all we will see instead of the crow's moving from West to East and East to West will be boy racer's and lorries going up and down, with some of the lorries turning into the large warehousing complex at the BLYTH ROAD end, which will no doubt get much bigger when the road is built. The hospital's, doctor's surgeries, school's, transport system's are struggling to cope now what will it be like in the future with this influx to the population? Just one more thought it will truly and literally be a MURDER OF CROWS.</p>	<p>Initial ecology assessment has been undertaken. This did not identify any significant constraints to development of the site. Neither have Natural England and Notts Wildlife Trust. Further ecology assessments will be required through the development management process. 10% biodiversity net gain will be a requirement of the proposal to enhance biodiversity value on site. The policy states that the majority of trees will be protected and any loss should be re-provided on site. Bassetlaw does not have any green belt. There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. All available sites have been assessed and the Land Availability Assessment states that Peaks Hill Farm is suitable and deliverable to accommodate the homes required. National policy does not prevent the use of agricultural land for development. Instead it requires that if considered necessary lower quality agricultural land is used. The Infrastructure Delivery plan identifies the infrastructure needed to support the development at Peaks Hill Farm. This includes a new link road, financial contribution to improve health facilities including the hospital and doctors, a site for new secondary school facilities, bus service and walking and cycling links. All will be required by the Local Plan policy and secured via planning condition and/or legal agreement.</p>
REF219	Resident-member of Residents Against Peaks Hill Farm Development	<p>Peaks Hill Farm will destroy the aspects of the north end of Worksop and do severe damage to the environment. Not forgetting all the wildlife that frequent the woodland adjacent to the Long Plantation. At present we have the pleasure of watching the deer, rabbits, hares, hedgehogs and numerous species of birds and insects. There is a family of jays, hawks, sparrowhawks amongst the more common birds ie robins, jenny wren, dunnock, blue tits, blackbirds, sparrows, chaffinch etc also what will happen to the beautiful skylark that nests on the ground on the long plantation? Never thought for one minute that a housing estate would be built at the rear of my bungalow. My late husband and myself purchased our property for our last forever home as near to the countryside that we could afford. In 1999 when we purchased the property the solicitor told us that there would never be any kind of buildings on the above stated land as it is green belt land! Since Brexit and leaving the EU the farmers lose their subsidies, but the Government has said that they will pay the farmers to plant trees on their farmland as this will help with the Climate Change! Also with Covid 19 pandemic would have thought that the U.K would be better to grow our crops locally and not having to rely on other countries (we are a greener, cleaner country). I believe that all green belt land should be kept in tact for our future generations to enjoy. Don't know how the local infrastructure is going to cope. The Bassetlaw Hospital is at breaking point shipping patients out to Doncaster Royal Infirmary whilst we have got ward closures. Trying to see a Doctor is like trying to see Royalty and it's not just so because of the Covid 19 pandemic. The police are never seen, the police station and courthouse are closed so offenders have to be taken to Mansfield etc. Don't know how the</p>	<p>Initial ecology assessment has been undertaken. This did not identify any significant constraints to development of the site. Neither have Natural England and Notts Wildlife Trust. Further ecology assessments will be required through the development management process. 10% biodiversity net gain will be a requirement of the proposal to enhance biodiversity value on site. The policy states that the majority of trees will be protected and any loss should be re-provided on site. Bassetlaw does not have any green belt. There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
		<p>ambulance and fire services will cope with more influx. The local schools cannot cope, but you do say new ones will be built like the ones that were supposed to be built on other new estates! There will be more roads so that means more traffic, more deadly fumes and more oversized lorries going in and out of the warehousing complex off Blyth Road. Will the warehouse site be extended and also what will happen to the tip that was covered over and has a chimney/pipe stuck in it? (Presumably for the release of gasses!) At the entrance to the outgoing site off Thievesdale Lane, there was a magnificent Silver Birch tree, who gave permission for it to be cut down and thrown behind the hedge? (Probably hoping that no one would ever notice that it had been removed). Area of Thievesdale Lane, Carlton Road and Blyth Road will not be able to cope with a big influx to the population.</p>	<p>number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. All available sites have been assessed and the Land Availability Assessment states that Peaks Hill Farm is suitable and deliverable to accommodate the homes required. National policy does not prevent the use of agricultural land for development. Instead it requires that if considered necessary lower quality agricultural land is used. The Infrastructure Delivery plan and the draft policy identifies the infrastructure needed to support the development at peaks Hill Farm. This includes a financial contribution to improve health facilities including the hospital and doctors, a site for new secondary school facilities, bus service and walking and cycling links. Nottinghamshire Police, Ambulance, and Fire Service have been consulted on the Local Plan. No concerns have been raised regarding capacity of the services. The employment land at Carlton Forest will be expanded to provide space for more businesses. Bassetlaw District Council's Environmental Health Team state there are expected to be no pollution concerns associated with the development.</p>
REF214	Historic England	<p>Historic England has no objections in principle to the potential concept plan. It is not clear whether the HER has been consulted as part of the Plan process and wish to stress that your archaeological advisors should be consulted on the concept plan. The landscape is Iron Age, and there is evidence of a Roman settlement and associated farming as indicated by aerial photo enclosure features on adjacent land. There is potentially an extant earthwork - a boundary is visible in the long plantation area on EA Lidar running NE-SW and legible into arable field to NE within the proposed allocation site. Aware that a geophysical survey has been undertaken in relation to the land west of Blyth Road which may be of assistance. In addition, the (site of) Pen Cottage is shown on 1st edition OS. Note the comments in supporting text paragraph 7.2.12 relating to the aircraft crash site and the 'equivalent status of a scheduled monument'. It would be helpful for any substantiation of that statement within the text. It is recommended that the statement, or the subsequent sentence, be reworded as the text implies that a memorial is required on the basis of the scheduled monument assumption which is misleading since a memorial would relate to the incident that occurred and the life lost rather than heritage designation status.</p>	<p>As confirmed in the updated Historic Environment Assessment (2021), the HER and Lincs Archaeology have both been consulted. No objections have been received from either parties. Lincs Archaeology has indicated that archaeology can be addressed through the development management process.</p> <p>Paragraph 7.2.12 has been amended to remove 'equivalent status of a scheduled monument'.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
REF220	Resident	<p>Concerned about the amount of development proposed for Worksop. In particular Peaks Hill Farm site. Houses are already being built on this site and some appear to be lived in. So the council is conducting a Public Consultation on housing already built. The proposed site is a very large area of farmland which slopes quite steeply down to Blyth Road and Carlton Road. The area of Carlton Road that runs along were the development would be gets a lot of water on it in heavy rain and does flood across the road near Red Lane. Has any consideration been given to how concreting over such a large area of steep farmland could cause more significant flooding along Blyth Road and Carlton Road? Concerned about new access road that is being built running from Blyth Road through to Carlton Road. The area of Carlton Road where the through road would have to exit has had several accidents, some of them fatal, over the years and there is no clear line of sight where traffic would be able to see vehicles pulling out onto Carlton Road. This will be quite dangerous. Concerned about how close this development will come to Carlton, both on the Carlton Road and Blyth Road ends. Already being advanced upon by the rapidly growing Ashes Park/Eddison Park development. The houses there can now be seen from Owday Lane and Carlton Road. How many more houses are going to be built there on farmland and how close to Carlton are they going to come? Is Carlton eventually going to be swallowed up by Worksop and stop being a separate village?</p>	<p>The site under development was granted planning permission in June 2018 (15/01477/OUT). The Council is not consulting on the housing development consented, rather the neighbouring land. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has not identified any significant flood risk issues. However a flood risk assessment will be required to inform the masterplan and planning application. This will include provision of mitigation to address surface water run-off. The Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) state that the Peaks Hill Farm development can be accommodated safely with mitigation, including the new link road. There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. All available sites have been assessed and the Land Availability Assessment states that Peaks Hill Farm is suitable and deliverable to accommodate the homes required. National policy does not prevent the use of agricultural land for development. Instead it requires that if considered necessary lower quality agricultural land is used.</p>
REF221	Resident	<p>As I live on Westerdale am very interested in this, attended the public meeting in early 2020 and I also wrote to BDC at the time. Will repeat my views. Broadly in favour of the development, realise new housing is needed and targets are set by government. See the access road going through the estate as a positive. The speed limit of 30mph on Blyth Road is not adhered to very well and the signage is poor. Hopefully the new junction, a roundabout I think, and Blyth Road will help to filter and slowdown traffic as well as becoming a link road to the by-pass. Reservations:- When I was interested in buying my existing property in 1982 the Ashes Park development was proposed. Went to the town hall to look at the plans. They included a doctor's surgery at what is now known as Monty's Meadow, shops, a public house, a play area and a school. The school was built but it was too small and St John's was extended. So most of this didn't happen and are forty years on. Main concern for Peaks Hill is that the same will happen. An area of this size needs the infrastructure plus public transport to be put in at a very early stage, not forgotten as appears to be the case with Ashes Park. A doctor's surgery is a must, as a patient of Larwood must say appointments are in short supply. Hope that accommodation for mixed age groups is preferable. Interested in Worksop and surrounding area. Have taken a lot of time to write this. Hope it is of some use and would appreciate feedback or new information when available.</p>	<p>Support for the principle of the scheme is welcome. The Infrastructure Delivery plan identifies the infrastructure needed to support the development at Peaks Hill Farm. This includes a new link road, financial contribution to improve health facilities including the hospital and doctors, a site for new secondary school facilities, bus service and walking and cycling links. All will be required by the Local Plan policy and secured via planning condition and/or legal agreement.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
1670232	Resident	<p>Object to any building on farmland and woodland. The biodiversity and food production will most likely never be recovered. Further development within Carlton parish boundaries can only erode its village character and blur the distinction between Carlton and Worksop. Carlton residents voted for the village plan having been led to believe that doing so would limit development within the village to less than we have already seen since. The plans in the first section for Good Quality Design and Local Character, while along the right lines, are not enough. Similar assurances were given over the development east of the A60 at Hawfinch Place and they have not been implemented. The country cannot need any more greenfield developments of three- and four-bedroom detached houses when the countryside is already filling up with them. What is needed to solve the housing crisis is affordable housing, and this should be built on brownfield sites.</p>	<p>There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. All available sites have been assessed and the Land Availability Assessment states that Peaks Hill Farm is suitable and deliverable to accommodate the homes required. National policy does not prevent the use of agricultural land for development. Instead it requires that if considered necessary lower quality agricultural land is used. Policy ST42 Biodiversity and Geodiversity requires development to deliver at least a 10% net gain in biodiversity on the site. The policy identifies a green gap between Carlton and Worksop, which provides a defensible boundary between Worksop built up area (including this site) and Carlton settlement. There is also a strong belt of trees separating the two settlements which will be retained. 20% of new homes on site will be affordable housing.</p>
1670552	Resident	<p>Against Peaks Hill farm and would like to make the following points: The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction. Currently Worksop's secondary schools are almost at capacity and as Valley has been over-subscribed for the past 3 years in year 7 the residents of this development would not have a secondary school and possibly a primary school within walking distance. This will put added pressure on the infrastructure. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems. There is also the issue of the impact of covid 19 and whether people will be able to afford to buy these homes once they are built. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster. Certain parts of Worksop such as the Cannon crossroads and the mini roundabout at the bottom of Kilton Hill will not be sufficient for the extra traffic coming into Worksop and whilst the new road will connect with Eddison Park Avenue, people will not drive through Gateford if they are wanting to go into town or to a supermarket or to get to school with the exception of Gateford Park. The site will mean loss of prime local food growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change. The site will contribute to the loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character. The site will effect and cause the loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs, deer as well as insect population. <u>If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:</u> A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline</p>	<p>The Local Plan states the site will provide for at least 1000 dwellings. The Infrastructure Delivery plan identifies the infrastructure needed to support the development at Peaks Hill Farm. This includes a new link road, financial contribution to improve health facilities including the hospital and doctors, a site for new secondary school facilities, bus service and walking and cycling links. All will be required by the Local Plan policy and secured via planning condition and/or legal agreement. In accordance with national Policy (NPPF), the Council has undertaken an assessment of housing and employment need. The Housing and Economic Needs Assessment evidences the housing figures and also evidences the level of job growth that will be supported on employment allocations. 10ha of employment land will be provided on Peaks Hill Farm and further employment land will be provided close to Worksop along the A57. The Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) state that the Peaks Hill Farm development can be accommodated safely with mitigation,</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
		<p>New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change) Minimal or environmentally friendly street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses. Affordable housing to be sited at the other side of the development away from existing homes and close to the road. Access on to existing estates including the top of Winster Grove to not be facilitated. This is a narrowish and steep hill and my concern would be that people on bikes could come flying down the hill and be hit by a car coming the other way or they hit the children who play in the street when the weather allows. People who bought their homes on Ambleside, Winster and Appleby including elderly residents did so because of it being a small estate with dead end streets and due to the presence of the woodland and farmland behind. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes and walking routes to enable access to public transport Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan) Ensure that the road built is not able to be used as a race track by putting in traffic calming and islands so residents can cross safely. This road is going to generate a lot of traffic cutting through to get to the A1 or the A57 depending on which direction they are travelling in.</p>	<p>including the new link road. Financial contributions will be sought via the policy for improvements to Cannon Crossroads and Kilton mini roundabouts. There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. All available sites have been assessed and the Land Availability Assessment states that Peaks Hill Farm is suitable and deliverable to accommodate the homes required. National policy does not prevent the use of agricultural land for development. Instead it requires that if considered necessary lower quality agricultural land is used. 10% biodiversity net gain will enhance biodiversity value on site. The Policy requires development to be of a high quality and makes provision for a green buffer around the edge of the site to protect amenity. Communal areas will be required to serve both the existing community and new residents moving onto the site so should be in accessible locations. It is important that new facilities are accessible to existing residents to discourage car use in the local area. The design policy requires parking to be provided in accordance with Nottinghamshire Parking Standards. Street lighting and garden size is a detailed matter that will be addressed at planning application stage. The Plan requires a housing mix to meet local needs but this should be delivered across the site to support mixed communities. 20% of the homes will be for older people and 20% will be affordable housing. The Distributor Road will be required to meet the highway standards adopted by Nottinghamshire County Council. The Policy requires: Well-connected street patterns that deliver high quality, safe and direct walking, cycling and public transport routes through the development.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
1670598	Resident	<p>Concerned about the increased urban sprawl that the development proposes, impacting those in Carlton in Lindrick as well as those in the land adjacent to the proposed development. The huge number of houses planned for this development (1000) will not only impact local wildlife and the beautiful views, but the rural gap between Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick as well. The view is irreplaceable. Once built on, it will be lost. Whilst the rural gap between Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick is being proposed to be maintained, the precedent being set is a dangerous one that states that if new homes need to be built, to build them in the north of Worksop on green land. Increasingly, with Gateford being developed, that appears to be the trend. The new proposed road which has the potential to become very busy as it could serve to direct traffic away from the current canon cross roads if you're coming from the Gateford/the north rural villages and instead direct traffic through the site if you wanted to get to the east of Worksop. This will mean potentially more noise pollution and the potential for accidents.</p>	<p>The policy identifies a green gap between Carlton and Worksop, which provides a defensible boundary between Worksop built up area (including this site) and Carlton settlement. There is also a strong belt of trees separating the two settlements which will be retained. The Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) state that the Peaks Hill Farm development can be accommodated safely with mitigation, including the new link road. Financial contributions will be sought via the policy for improvements to Cannon Crossroads and Kilton mini roundabouts. Bassetlaw District Council's Environmental Health Team state there are expected to be no pollution concerns associated with the development.</p>
1671174	Resident	<p>Despite stating that following the consultation in January more details would be shared, this is not the case. On the Peaks Hill Farm Concept Plan there are still no confirmed plans for link roads. This infrastructure could have a devastating impact on existing homes.</p>	<p>The Concept Plan was produced following the January 2020 consultation, and in response to the comments made. The concept plan indicates where different land uses could go, this information was previously not available. The alignment of the new link road will be agreed with the Local Highways Authority, work is underway. The Infrastructure Delivery plan identifies the infrastructure needed to support the development at Peaks Hill Farm. This includes a new link road, financial contribution to improve health facilities including the hospital and doctors, a site for new secondary school facilities, bus service and walking and cycling links. All will be required by the Local Plan policy and secured via planning condition and/or legal agreement.</p>
1671189	Resident	<p>Support the proposals set out in this latest draft Bassetlaw Local Plan. While there has been a clear evolution of proposals from the January 2020 consultation, will reiterate my comments. Acknowledging the relatively constrained nature of Worksop, in terms of deliverable land, notwithstanding the fact that this site falls within the parish of Carlton-in-Lindrick, it represents the most logical option for a sustainable urban extension to Worksop. As such, any potential developer contributions that may be secured towards enhancement of existing community facilities should be allocated to Worksop-based facilities and not Carlton-in-Lindrick. Accepting the need for a comprehensive masterplan for the site, in the form of an SPD, the infrastructure provision highlighted at this stage, including a distributor road to link Carlton Road and Blyth Road is welcomed in an effort to enhance connectivity in the north of Worksop and alleviate the pressure that is already evident upon Cannon Crossroads. In addition would encourage a strong emphasis on connectivity in to and through the neighbouring estates. Current road connectivity within the Hemmingfields/Wensleydale estates is poor, consideration should be given to vehicular linkages for north-south connection. One such example would be at the northern end of Hemmingfield Rise, where the small portion of land originally put forward in the Land Availability Assessment was to be made accessible by the optioned-developer purchasing an existing dwelling that would 'make way' for an access point. This and numerous other points, such as</p>	<p>Support noted and welcome. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan identifies the infrastructure needed to support the development at Peaks Hill Farm. It indicates that the vast majority of infrastructure will be delivered in Worksop. Any improvements in Carlton in Lindrick would need to be based on evidence of need in relation to the impact the development would have on local services. The Local highways Authority do not require vehicular access to the existing development therefore the Policy is seeking</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
		<p>Westerdale, Bransdale and Colsterdale should also be considered as vehicular links as part of the masterplan, in the interests of a truly 'connected' development. The NPPF (para.110) does specify giving priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, within the scheme and within neighbouring areas, Manual for Streets and Notts County Council's Highways Design Guide (NCCHDG) promote creation of networks of streets that provide permeability and connectivity to main destinations with a choice of routes, whilst also highlighting that connected or permeable networks lead to a more even spread of motor traffic throughout the area. In this case, allowing vehicular movements from the existing adjoining residential areas to utilise new access points on to Carlton Road and Blyth road could be expected to further reduce through traffic. Similarly, with ever increasing demand for home delivery services for convenience and comparison goods, vehicular connectivity would be of customer benefit by allowing delivery vehicles to make more direct connections. Although written in the context of planning applications, NCCHDG (para. 2.5) makes clear that developers should aim to provide multiple points of vehicular access onto the wider highway network where land availability and where the external road network permits. These access points should be to adoptable standards and available for general public. Where multiple points of vehicular access are not provided, the reasons for not doing so must be justified within the submission. Many residents are focused upon objecting in principle, of the opinion that this consultation represents a unique opportunity to influence the form of the new development and, to remedy the evident urban design short-comings of yesteryear. Every effort should be made to maximise connectivity and permeability that will benefit old and new residents alike. Again referencing NCCHDG (para. 2.7), 'If there is a likelihood that adjacent land will come forward that can be practically served through the development in the future, suitable ransom free connections should be provided to maintain and enhance the movement framework'.</p>	walking and cycling connections only. Policy ST37 Design Quality is seeking to ensure developments are well connected and permeable.
REF079	Resident	<p>Formally object to the development of Peaks Hill Farm. The ancient woodland, which follows the contours of the ridge, and is an integral part of the land, is a beautiful natural vista visible from many of the local walks and bridleways. This provides a natural boundary between the settlements of Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick, with its historic conservation area of South Carlton. Once it is removed, altered, destroyed it is gone forever along with the deer, hedgerow creatures and birds which frequent this area. The natural beauty and historical division cannot be replaced. The proposed link road will carve another concrete scar through the ever dwindling countryside to facilitate even more speeding vehicles. The increase in vehicular traffic through Carlton in Lindrick over the past decade has increased massively. The introduction of a high speed link road from Blyth Road, which effectively links to the A1 and the Motorway network and the A60 Carlton Road can only add to the over capacity of the local road system with the inevitable noise, pollution and speed. With the capability and willingness of more people to work from home why is another high speed road necessary? What consideration has been given to the brave World War Two pilots whose plane crashed on Peaks Hill, with the loss of their lives. Is it right their sacrifice should be buried under concrete in the name of progress. Peaks Hill is locally known as the Sand Hills. A natural sponge to soak up water. Covering this natural flood management with houses and roads will push the water elsewhere. Carlton in Lindrick is at the bottom of the hill. Given the increase in flooding over recent years this potentially puts, Carlton in Lindrick, areas around Carlton and Worksop at greater risk of flooding. Surely with the development of the old Gateford Quarries, the farmland to the North West of Worksop towards Carlton in Lindrick and the land to the East of Thievsdale Lane for huge housing estates the North of Worksop has surrendered enough green and brown land to satisfy council targets without destroying further green land to fuel this unbalanced expansion of Worksop towards Carlton in Lindrick. The huge local opposition to the proposed development of Peaks Hill should be considered and acted on and the response from officers should show empathy rather than a cut and paste dialogue.</p>	<p>Whilst there are mature trees present, the woodland on the ridge is not designated ancient woodland. The policy requires the majority of the woodland to be retained and lost trees to be replaced on site. The policy identifies a green gap between Carlton and Worksop, which provides a defensible boundary between Worksop built up area (including this site) and Carlton settlement. There is also a strong belt of trees separating the two settlements which will be retained. Initial ecology assessment has been undertaken. This did not identify any significant constraints to development of the site. Neither have Natural England and Notts Wildlife Trust. Further ecology assessments will be required through the development management process. 10% biodiversity net gain will be a requirement of the proposal to enhance biodiversity value on site. The Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) the new link road is necessary to improve the traffic flow in Worksop and improve highways safety at key junctions. The Distributor Road will not be a 'high speed' link road. It will be a connecting route from Gateford and Blyth Road, and beyond to the A1. It will save time by reducing the length of the journey, not by increasing the speed of vehicles. The planning permission will be subject to conditions which address noise and</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
			<p>disruption during the construction stage. Development also is required to ensure residential amenity is protected (Policy 50 Protecting Amenity). This policy requires the crash site to be protected and added. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment identifies that the site is not within a high risk flood area. The Policy requires a Flood Risk Assessment to be undertaken to inform the approach taken to surface water management (SuDS) to manage flood risk on and off site.</p> <p>There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. All available sites have been assessed and the Land Availability Assessment states that Peaks Hill Farm is suitable and deliverable to accommodate the homes required. National policy does not prevent the use of agricultural land for development. Instead it requires that if considered necessary lower quality agricultural land is used.</p>
REF084	Resident	<p>Opposed the development for the following reasons. It is an area of outstanding natural beauty and ancient woodland. Destroying this is contrary to current ideas and policy on environment and global warming. It is a valuable asset to the people aesthetically and recreationally and promotes good mental health and well-being. It provides countless habitat for all manner of flora and fauna some of which are protected species. It is morally reprehensible to build on greenfield sites when there are many brownfield sites in Worksop that could and should be developed. A ton of cement produces almost a ton of the greenhouse gas Carbon Dioxide and a ton of steel even more. Building a thousand houses has a direct and indirect negative effect on global warming. More concrete means more chance of flooding, something the town has already endured. Where are the extra school places for the two thousand extra pupils in our already over-crowded schools. Where are the extra hospital places in our already overstretched hospital. Waiting lists will increase. Where is the extra land fill or recycling plant. More houses means more waste. Where are the extra roads for the commuting and recreation of these residents, Existing residents will face even more traffic congestion with the reduction in quality of life and increased accidents that will inevitably result. The environment takes another hit. Congested traffic produces more pollution. Don't suppose any thought has been given to upgrading electrical capacity and charging points?</p>	<p>The site is not designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or ancient woodland. However, the policy requires trees and woodland to be protected and any lost to be replaced. Initial ecology assessment has been undertaken. This did not identify any significant constraints to development of the site. Neither have Natural England and Notts Wildlife Trust. Further ecology assessments will be required through the development management process. 10% biodiversity net gain will be a requirement of the proposal to enhance biodiversity value on site. With regard to its recreational use, the site is privately owned and does not contain any public rights of way. There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. All available sites have been assessed and the Land Availability Assessment states that Peaks Hill Farm is suitable and deliverable to accommodate the homes required. The Local Plan contains policies which seek to</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
			<p>address the effects of climate change. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment identifies that the site is not within a high risk flood area. The Policy requires a Flood Risk Assessment to be undertaken to inform the approach taken to surface water management (SuDS) to manage flood risk on and off site. The Infrastructure Delivery plan identifies the infrastructure needed to support the development at Peaks Hill Farm. This includes a new link road, financial contribution to improve health facilities including the hospital and doctors, a site for new secondary school facilities, bus service and walking and cycling links. All will be required by the Local Plan policy and secured via planning condition and/or legal agreement. Nottinghamshire County Council is the Waste Authority. The Waste Local Plan has taken into consideration growth in the District. As such, it is not necessary to include policies relating to waste in the Local Plan. The Local Highway Authority has agreed the transport provision and any necessary financial contributions towards highway improvements. National Grid, Western Power, and Northern Powergrid have all been consulted on the Local Plan and they have not raised any concern about the capacity of the electricity network. A connection for a charging point is required for new dwellings.</p>
REF080	Resident	<p>Would like to re-confirm our objections we previously submitted. Very concerned that the green buffer will be in place prior to the building work starting, to minimise disruption and noise given that multiple builders will be building on the land but to also create a safe place for the wildlife during the building works. If you're planting trees they will take years to create the sort of boundary that would hope to be in place. If the plan does go ahead I would like the following points to be considered: A green buffer zone between current homes on Westerdale and any new development. Preferably building behind 'Long Plantation' (Figure 14 in the Draft Plan) or a minimum 15 metres from the existing housing on Westerdale, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook. Build enough housing that local people can actually afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by creating a 'concrete city' environment.</p>	<p>The policy identifies a green buffer to separate existing and new. The timing will be considered when a planning application is submitted. Communal areas will be required to serve both the existing community and new residents moving onto the site so should be in accessible locations. It is important that new facilities are accessible to existing residents to discourage car use in the local area. Street lighting and garden size is a detailed matter that will be addressed at planning application stage. Green tree lined corridors are identified by the policy. The Plan requires a housing mix to meet local needs but this should be delivered across the site to support mixed communities. The Plan requires a contribution of 5 trees per</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
			dwelling which will be provided on site. 20% of the homes will be for older people and 20% will be affordable housing.
REF081	Resident	<p>Re-confirm our objections we previously submitted. Concerned that the green buffer will be in place prior to the building work starting, to limit disruption and noise given that multiple builders will be building on the land but to also create a safe place for the wildlife during the building works. If you're planting trees they will take years to create the sort of boundary that we would hope to be in place. If the plan does go ahead would like the following points to be considered: A green buffer zone between current homes on Westerdale and any new development. Preferably building behind 'Long Plantation' (Figure 14 in the Draft Plan) or a minimum 15 metres from the existing housing on Westerdale, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change). Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport . Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook. Cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by creating a 'concrete city' environment.</p>	<p>The policy identifies a green buffer to separate existing and new. The timing will be considered when a planning application is submitted. Communal areas will be required to serve both the existing community and new residents moving onto the site so should be in accessible locations. It is important that new facilities are accessible to existing residents to discourage car use in the local area. The Plan requires all development to have appropriate car parking in line with the Nottinghamshire Parking Standards. Street lighting and garden size is a detailed matter that will be addressed at planning application stage. Green tree lined corridors are identified by the policy. The Plan requires a housing mix to meet local needs but this should be delivered across the site to support mixed communities. The Plan requires a contribution of 5 trees per dwelling which will be provided on site. 20% of the homes will be for older people and 20% will be affordable housing.</p>
REF083	Resident	<p>Strongly object to Peaks Hill Farm. Visual / Aesthetics This area is an unusually beautiful and unique rolling sandhills terrain, offering a wonderful approach into Worksop (just before the sign showing "Worksop" is reached so does Worksop Council really have any business planning housing outside the town boundary?). The view to the East, just South of Peaks Hill Farm is so beautiful, it adds such great value to Worksop. The abomination of constructing a sprawling housing estate and road junction upon this astoundingly beautiful vista would reflect the brutality of you planners, apparently/evidently simply striving to meet the so called "Government Targets" of throwing up houses everywhere, no matter what! If you have interests and concerns about your town and the people you serve, you should eschew the Government's demands as Worksop is already full of unsustainable housing. Planners should say "No. We've had enough housing put upon us and we reject your bribes, Government!". The Sandhills and surrounding woodland have delighted my eyes for over 60 years</p>	<p>There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. All available sites have been assessed and the Land Availability Assessment states that Peaks Hill Farm is suitable and deliverable to accommodate the homes required. The</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
		<p>now, whenever travelling to and from Worksop to Carlton in Lindrick. It would greatly sadden me and thousands of other residents in this region, to lose this area of natural beauty in your dash for a botched housing estate, evidently being rushed through to reach Government cash incentive targets now that Bassetlaw has apparently recently lost the Gamston Garden Village. You have a duty to serve us, not simply serve yourselves and you have a duty to not to follow your misguided leaders instructions. Urge you to retain your professional integrity as once these poor leaders are swept away in the next elections you will still be holding the can in your conscience (They will be swept away the same way as our town was swept away in November 2019 due to those poor leaders' dithering and inaction when begged to open the sluice gates but didn't until it was too late . . . and indeed we had been earlier swept away in 2007 after which these poor leaders have since failed to learn any lessons nor form any sensible flood prevention strategies). Road Safety Am a motorist, a motorcyclist, a cyclist and a pedestrian. One of my motorcyclist colleagues was recently killed at the very spot along the A60 where you are considering to construct houses and create a junction for a link road joining Blyth Road to the A60. The junction would be in the blind hollow / blind bend which is where my fellow motorcyclist was caught-out by a turning vehicle at the very spot you are considering creating a junction. Another one of my friends was killed on a motorcycle in an accident close to the Red Lane junction at the end of the 1970's. At this point along the A60, noticed that you now constantly have difficulty controlling water run-off from the Sandhills, and the road at this point is always constantly flooded when it rains. If you construct housing on this side of the Sandhills uphill of the A60 and build climbing roads to access these houses and construct a link road to the Blyth Road, the water run-off back down onto the A60 would become greatly exacerbated as is indeed proven by urbanisation / concreting / tarmac over previously natural land, limiting natural drainage, causing rapid surface run-off. If you can't presently even control simple field run-off, little confidence that you could control the increased water run-off from this ill-considered estate onto the A60 in the future. Sadly, another young man was recently killed in a car crash, in between the Red Lane and the proposed housing estate and link road. This is another tragedy which reinforces the need to ensure that "A" roads are kept as safe as possible and be designed to have the least possible distractions / hazards and must be maintained correctly including road surfaces, drainage and you must not consider constructing junctions in hazardous blind spots and must not increase the risk of the flooding of this A road (A roads are designed to provide rapid safe links between major towns, not to be beset with hazards and restrictions - need progress not regression or restriction). Regarding the proposed link road and the construction of almost 1,000 of houses at the proposed Peaks Hill Farm, it is obvious that many more than 1,000 households would use this road. Since the construction of the sprawling Gateford Estate and the main access road off the A60 called Eddison Park Avenue, noticed so many more people seem to be using the small roads linking Wigthorpe with Blyth road as a rat-run to reach the A1, particularly during the rush hours. If you built this link road, then thousands of Gateford rat-runners would then use this road. Imagine that you would surround this road with Peaks Hill Farm housing and then suddenly be surprised regarding the huge increase in traffic and then would adopt your somewhat counter intelligent strategy of constructing hundreds of speed humps to slow the traffic down that you didn't really want! These counterintuitive practices would not be sensible engineering. It would reek of botched planning and the adoption of the usual hassle speed hump strategy adopted by thoughtless councils. Believe me, as a motorcyclist, these speed humps are potentially deadly, particularly when allowed to fall into disrepair which is frequently observed - and they are often not signed/painted correctly - and so can potentially catch out motorcyclists and unseat them, potentially leading to injury or death. So do you want a link road? Do you want a rat-run? Think this through carefully and sensibly. Do the Eddison Park Avenue people want the 1,000 homes' Peaks Hill Farm people rat-running through their estate to access the M1? Have you considered this too? Speed humps there too in the future? Ludicrous. Peaks Hill Farm is ill considered regarding transport. Already overloaded with traffic. More houses make more traffic, more pollution and more risk of accidents along rat-runs. Include a sap in your document regarding provision for cyclists and buses, but Peaks Hill Farm is very far away and uphill from the town centre (and far away from our pathetically small local industrial sites), so where are you imagining the cyclists would be going? Evidently not to their workplaces . . . as there seem to be no new local job opportunities associated with this unsustainable plan. Natural Habitats and Ancient Woodland On observance of the awful pink blot in the Bassetlaw plan, which illustrates Peaks Hill Farm, it is apparent that it involves the planned cutting down of some 15 acres of particularly beautiful ancient woodland immediately adjacent to the A60. This ancient woodland provides natural habitats for many species of trees, plants, animals, birds and bats and according to my father who is now 88, it was already a fully established habitat and looks exactly the same as when he was a boy, living in Langold and travelling to Worksop frequently to court my mother who is also 88. Another 15 or so acres of woodland in a half a kilometer strip right in the centre of the pink blot is also destined for the chop according to your plans. This would be shamefully hypocritical, as on the one hand you talk about "managing growth in a responsible way" and are then estolling "carbon offsetting and promoting green initiatives" in the Bassetlaw Plan, whilst on the other hand you are planning to cut down 30 acres of Natural Habitat, Ancient Woodland, Carbon Dioxide absorbing woodland in an area of particularly natural beauty of rolling sandhills where natural woodlands frame the view and the woods house Birds of Prey, English Wild Birds, Owls and Bats. This makes you</p>	<p>Local plan is delivering a Garden Village, just not at Gamston. The Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) state that the Peaks Hill Farm development can be accommodated safely with mitigation, including the new link road. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment identifies that the site is not within a high risk flood area. The Policy requires a Flood Risk Assessment to be undertaken to inform the approach taken to surface water management (SuDS) to manage flood risk on and off site. Initial ecology assessment has been undertaken. This did not identify any significant constraints to development of the site. Neither have Natural England and Notts Wildlife Trust. Further ecology assessments will be required through the development management process. 10% biodiversity net gain will be a requirement of the proposal to enhance biodiversity value on site. There is no designated ancient woodland on the site. The policy protects the majority of trees on site and requires lost trees to be replaced on site. Bassetlaw District Council's Environmental Health Team and the Environment Agency have not identified any concerns with the landfill site and state there are expected to be no pollution concerns associated with the development. Peaks Hill Farm includes new job opportunities associated with the 10.6 Hectares of employment land. It also include new services (local centre, primary school, etc) all which would generate jobs opportunities. There are also a number of other employment sites near to Worksop along the A57 supporting local opportunities for jobs. These include in offices, industry and logistics. The number of people commuting out for work is comparable with that in-commuting. The way people work is changing, working from home is becoming more prevalent due to advances in technology. This is likely to increase due to recent events relating to the pandemic. As such, commuting is likely to decline in the future.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
		<p>hypocrites. Suggest the words of platitude you print are merely a diversion to hide your intentions. Every tonne of cement produces around 700kg of CO2. How much cement would be used to construct all of these 1,000 houses at Peaks Hill Farm? How much gas/electricity would their heating systems produce all of the time thereafter following construction? Local Landfill and Local Industries Towards the North of the planned abomination, Peaks Hill Farm borders a VERY toxic (Carlton Forest - an abandoned site) landfill which still emits bad odours, emits methane and oozes deadly leachates. This landfill is built in a redundant quarry sitting in the Sandstone Aquifer / catchment, which according to the local topography may well be allowing toxic leachate flows towards the land that this proposed estate is planned to sit upon. . . And of course when the prevailing wind doesn't prevail, the opposing winds could also blow the toxic landfill stench across the houses frequently. Towards the North East of the planned estate, there is a bone rendering / tallow / animal feed factory which is also odorous and could alarm the new residents when the prevailing wind ever changed direction.</p> <p>Sustainability Noticed that in an earlier version of the Bassetlaw Plan, you printed that 17,000 people travel out of Bassetlaw per day for work. Noticed that you have since removed this in the latest version, i.e. redacted this information. Imagine you have removed this out of shame, trying to disguise what I have to say now regarding sustainability . . . Once a proud production and manufacturing hub, powering the Nation with our coal (6 mines within Bassetlaw borders and 9 mines within just a mile of our border) and our power stations West Burton, Cottam and High Marnham. In addition, Worksop had Textile Manufacturing, Footwear, Glass, Chemicals, Refractories and many mining support industries including e.g. Dosco at Tuxford. It is estimated that these jobs would have equated to around 17,000 production and manufacturing jobs . . . that have evidently been replaced with NOTHING (except a few sandwich jobs and warehouse/distribution jobs importing cheap Chinese goods to put even more of us out of useful work). The recent advent of the pandemic showed how inept and inadequate we were to even produce simple masks and gloves and other personal protective equipment. Cannot be left so vulnerable in the future and just as a sensible example, we MUST produce all of our own drugs, PPE and machinery and equipment for the NHS within the Nation i.e. all used in the UK and made in the UK. Have had our pride and employment and sustainability stolen from us over the last 30 years by political spite, by Globalism and by political elites based in London who view us up North as inconvenient pet rabbits who just need feeding and mucking out now and then (but what gets the chop first whenever times get tough?). The Council is falling into the Government's hands by turning Worksop simply into a Garden City, tempted by handouts. Must reject this situation and fight back for our pride and productivity and local and National resilience. If we have jobs on our doorstep, do not need to travel out of Bassetlaw and hence would not congest and pollute the atmosphere with our vehicles as we could indeed walk, cycle or catch a bus to local jobs. The businesses would contribute to rates and rent and taxes (see every morning how congested the Worksop by-pass is during the rush hour as thousands of people rush out of Worksop to go to work!). Boris Johnson appeared on television saying "Buy British" so . . . give us back the opportunity to manufacture for Britain and the UK Boris! Given the unfolding situation around the globe, we must start to build National Resilience now! See that the Peaks Hill Farm plan mentions no industrial accommodation but does give the sap saying "business space". In Worksop town centre, there are hundreds of empty offices and shut down shops, so there is plenty of business space empty so how could you fill the proposed ones at Peaks Hill Farm? The town has become unsustainable (notice in the Bassetlaw plan a "Former Knitwear Factory". Why isn't it becoming a New Knitwear Factory?). Notice that there is 60,000 tonnes of stinking plastic waste still in the (former) industrial heart of the town at the bottom of Sandy Lane, which has been there for over 10 years since the collapse of a recycling firm (As I recall, associated with the Council at that time). It is suggested that before sprawling the town any further, the Council should clean up their act and clear this rubbish away and open new useful production industries on the site and on other brownfield land, where people could sustainably walk to, cycle to, or catch a bus. Suggest that before you build another house, that every new house MUST have a useful production job assigned for it and the job be proven to have been created within Worksop/Bassetlaw before that house is ever built. This is what sustainability means! Strain on Local Services Every single house built in Worksop may accommodate 2.5 people, so the 1,000 houses planned at Peaks Hill Farm would acquire another 2,500 people within the folds of Worksop. The services in Worksop are stretched to breaking point, particularly so far away from the town centre. Schools, Surgeries, Hospital, Electricity, Gas, Water, Sewage, Communications, Roads, Transport, Tips/recycling and Town centre parking would all be hit by this additional 2,500 people, which are all services stretched to breaking point. Because there are no jobs within Bassetlaw, around 1,000 of these people may also have to travel out of Bassetlaw every day for work, congesting all of the roads in the area and polluting the air around the town.</p> <p>Need local sustainability, need to preserve our natural beauty and natural habitats, need to create local/National resilience, need to plan our town carefully to achieve this.</p>	<p>The Local Plan is also proposing to deliver new jobs in Worksop. Over 11,000 new jobs are proposed at Apleyhead adjacent to the A1 and A57. The proposed regeneration of Worksop in the Local Plan should also deliver new employment. The Bassetlaw Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment 2020 indicates that the number of new homes proposed is required to support the level of growth/new jobs proposed in the district. The Worksop DPD sets out the regeneration strategy for Worksop town centre to introduce new uses into the vacant units. The Infrastructure Delivery plan identifies the infrastructure needed to support the development at Peaks Hill Farm. This includes a new link road, financial contribution to improve health facilities including the hospital and doctors, a site for new secondary school facilities, bus service and walking and cycling links. All will be required by the Local Plan policy and secured via planning condition and/or legal agreement.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
REF103	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>The discussions about Peaks Hill Farm have been mainly about the traffic on the A60 Carlton Rd but concern is about the Blyth Rd A6045. The amount of traffic already on that road towards Blyth is constant with lorries from Carlton Forest. My ward includes Thievesdale Lane up to the junction of Blyth Road. The junction of Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road is very dangerous at the fork junction. Although the speed of the traffic on the main stretch from the BDH and the junction has been decreased to 30mph, when turning right from the fork up to the Hospital it is virtually impossible to see what is coming down the hill, even with the speed reduction. The new housing development at the junction does not cause traffic issues but feel infrastructure is an important issue for the safety of residents crossing to use the field plus cyclists and car owners. All this is waiting for an accident to happen and one has already all but not a serious one. Have residents concerned about the volume of traffic already so my concern is the junction and not in disagreement with any future developments. The Local Plan is an essential part of the progress we require but hopefully the infrastructure will be part of the Outline Planning application when it comes forward.</p>	<p>The Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) state that the Peaks Hill Farm development can be accommodated safely with mitigation, including the new link road. A transport assessment will also be required to support future planning applications for the site, the results of which will be taken into consideration in the decision making process. The Policy requires developer contributions for all necessary highway improvements, including Cannon Crossroads for example.</p>
REF105	Resident	<p>Against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm because: The development is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents of Worksop. 1000 dwellings (plus 120 after 2037) and business/ employment land in addition to the houses already being built at the end of Thievesdale Lane, will mean that local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 17 years building site. For many elderly residents, that is the rest of their lives. There is already a vast amount of housing being built in Worksop. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists, and schools. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the long wait to see a GP. Schools in Worksop are already busy and most full. The School on Gateford cannot accommodate the children already living on that development. As there are no plans to build a Primary school until after 2037 any children on this proposed new development will not be within walking distance of a school so will more than likely be taken to school by car adding to the already congested roads at this time of day. All our connecting roads to the A1 and the M1 are single lane, country-style roads. These pass through small villages which already get very congested. The train car park is often full and the train services poor and unreliable. Increased commuting will add to the pollution, traffic and poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield, Rotherham and Doncaster. Say Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement but there is no mention of how the infrastructure will be improved between now and 2037. To build the connecting road from the B6045 to the A60 will mean cutting down mature trees on the A60 side of the development. Should be protecting them not destroying them! Know you say more trees will be planted, which should be happening anyway, but how long will it be before these are mature as trees grow slowly.</p> <p>The land is a natural soakaway but if vast numbers of dwellings and roads are built there is the potential for flooding. Living at a time when extreme weather conditions are going to be expected so heavy rain is something we will have to accept. The drains don't always cope at the moment so more buildings and roads will only add to the problem. Loss of prime food growing land is wrong when the council should be helping to mitigate climate change. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character. Effect and loss of the established wildlife which will surely disappear if any building work begins. If my concerns are overruled I would like to see the green buffer zone along the southern boundary to provide appropriate separation with existing residential properties to be a minimum of 15 metres, which should be established before the development with shrubs and trees to encourage birds and wildlife to become established, and not left until 2037! New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the buffer zone to increase the distance between existing homes and to extend the green corridor. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution. Low level dwellings built near existing homes. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space. The employment land to be behind existing Carlton Industrial site.</p>	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery plan identifies the infrastructure needed to support the development at Peaks Hill Farm. This includes a new link road, financial contribution to improve health facilities including the hospital and doctors, a site for new secondary school facilities, bus service and walking and cycling links. All will be required by the Local Plan policy and secured via planning condition and/or legal agreement. Infrastructure will be phased so that it is delivered in parallel to the development. The policy protects trees and woodland on site, any lost will be replaced on site. New trees will also be planted as a result of the development. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment identifies that the site is not within a high risk flood area. The Policy requires a Flood Risk Assessment to be undertaken to inform the approach taken to surface water management (SuDS) to manage flood risk on and off site. The Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) state that the Peaks Hill Farm development can be accommodated safely with mitigation, including the new link road. A transport assessment will also be required to support future planning applications for the site, the results of which will be taken into consideration in the decision making process. The Policy requires developer contributions for all necessary highway improvements, including Cannon Crossroads for example. The policy identifies a green buffer to separate existing and new. The timing will be considered when a</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
			<p>planning application is submitted. Communal areas will be required to serve both the existing community and new residents moving onto the site so should be in accessible locations. It is important that new facilities are accessible to existing residents to discourage car use in the local area. There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. All available sites have been assessed and the Land Availability Assessment states that Peaks Hill Farm is suitable and deliverable to accommodate the homes required. National policy does not prevent the use of agricultural land for development. Instead it requires that if considered necessary lower quality agricultural land is used. The Plan requires all development to have appropriate car parking in line with the Nottinghamshire Parking Standards. Street lighting and garden size is a detailed matter that will be addressed at planning application stage. Green tree lined corridors are identified by the policy. The Plan requires a housing mix to meet local needs but this should be delivered across the site to support mixed communities. The Plan requires a contribution of 5 trees per dwelling which will be provided on site. 20% of the homes will be for older people and 20% will be affordable housing. The Concept plan identifies the land to the rear of Carlton Forest as new employment land.</p>
REF108	Resident	<p>Against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm because: The development is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents of Worksop. 1000 dwellings (plus another 120 after 2037) and business/ employment land in addition to the houses already being built at the end of Thievesdale Lane, will mean that local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 17 years building site. For many elderly residents, that is the rest of their lives. There is already a vast amount of housing being built in Worksop. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the long wait to see a GP. Schools in Worksop are already busy and most full. The school on Gateford cannot accommodate the children already living on that development. As there are no plans to build a Primary school until after 2037 any children on this proposed new development will not be within walking distance of a school so will more than likely be taken to school by car, adding to the already congested roads at this time of day. All our connecting roads to the A1 and the M1 are single lane, country-style roads. these pass through small villages which already get very congested. The train car park is often full and the train services poor and unreliable. Increased commuting will add to the pollution, traffic and poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield, Rotherham and Doncaster. You say Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement but there is no mention of how the infrastructure will be improved between now and 2037. To build the</p>	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery plan identifies the infrastructure needed to support the development at Peaks Hill Farm. This includes a new link road, financial contribution to improve health facilities including the hospital and doctors, a site for new secondary school facilities, bus service and walking and cycling links. All will be required by the Local Plan policy and secured via planning condition and/or legal agreement. Infrastructure will be phased so that it is delivered in parallel to the development. The policy protects trees and woodland on site, any lost will be replaced</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
		<p>connecting road from the B6045 to the A60 will mean cutting down mature trees on the A60 side of the development. We should be protecting not destroying them! I know you say more trees will be planted, which should be happening any way, but how long will it be before these are mature as trees grow slowly. The land is a natural soakaway but if vast numbers of dwellings and roads are built there is the potential for flooding. We are living at a time when extreme weather conditions are going to be expected so heavy rain is something we will have to accept. The drains don't always cope at the moment so more buildings and roads will only add to the problem.</p> <p>Loss of prime food growing land is wrong when the council should be helping to mitigate climate change. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's character. Effect and loss of the established wildlife which will surely disappear if any building work begins. If my concerns are overruled I would like to see The green buffer zone along the southern boundary to provide separation with existing residential properties to be at least 15 metres, which should be established before the development with shrubs and trees to encourage birds and wildlife, and not left until 2037! New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the buffer zone to increase the distance between existing homes and to extend the green corridor. New dwellings to have minimum car- parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution. Low level dwellings near existing homes. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space. The employment land to be behind existing Carlton Industrial site.</p>	<p>on site. New trees will also be planted as a result of the development. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment identifies that the site is not within a high risk flood area. The Policy requires a Flood Risk Assessment to be undertaken to inform the approach taken to surface water management (SuDS) to manage flood risk on and off site. The Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) state that the Peaks Hill Farm development can be accommodated safely with mitigation, including the new link road. A transport assessment will also be required to support future planning applications for the site, the results of which will be taken into consideration in the decision making process. The Policy requires developer contributions for all necessary highway improvements, including Cannon Crossroads for example. The policy identifies a green buffer to separate existing and new. The timing will be considered when a planning application is submitted.</p> <p>Communal areas will be required to serve both the existing community and new residents moving onto the site so should be in accessible locations. It is important that new facilities are accessible to existing residents to discourage car use in the local area. There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. All available sites have been assessed and the Land Availability Assessment states that Peaks Hill Farm is suitable and deliverable to accommodate the homes required. National policy does not prevent the use of agricultural land for development. Instead it requires that if considered necessary lower quality agricultural land is used. The Plan requires all development to have appropriate car parking in line with the Nottinghamshire Parking Standards. Street lighting and garden size is a detailed matter that will be addressed at planning application stage. Green tree lined corridors are identified by the policy. The Plan requires a housing mix to meet local needs</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
			but this should be delivered across the site to support mixed communities. The Plan requires a contribution of 5 trees per dwelling which will be provided on site. 20% of the homes will be for older people and 20% will be affordable housing. The Concept plan identifies the land to the rear of Carlton Forest as new employment land.
REF189	NHS Bassetlaw CCG	With regard to Peaks Hill Development, acknowledging that earliest housing development may be 2026, the plan states at 7.2.15 'On that basis, the new Local Centre, health and education facilities, community hub/sports facilities, and open space should be appropriately located to encourage sustainable access, to reduce car use for local journeys'. It is not clear what the new health facilities would be, but recognise and thank the council for the financial contribution identified for health care infrastructure. Welcome working with BDC to further define in due course.	Comments noted and welcomed. The Council will continue to work with the CCG to confirm the approach to be taken to health care facilities required.
REF212	Councillor, County Councillor	Concur with all the comments made by Carlton parish Council in respect of the Local Plan notwithstanding my previously objection to the proposals to build on green field land at Peaks Hill Farm, which continue to be strongly opposed to.	Comments noted.
REF195 PHF	Freeths on behalf of Hallam Land Management	Note the reference in para. 7.2.5 in recognition of the complex nature of delivering a large urban extension, however, it is considered that the expectation for delivery not to proceed 2026 is unduly pessimistic. Work is already underway in preparing a masterplan for the site and the promoters of the site remain committed to working and engaging with the Council in the preparation of supporting studies and surveys for a planning application during the Local Plan process. This will enable end users and developers to be secured to ensure early delivery from the site. It is considered that the site could deliver dwellings as early as 2024/5 which would support the potential for more dwellings than 1,000 coming forward within the plan period. Support Policy 17 but would make the following observations and recommendations regarding some of the specific requirements for this site. In relation to sub-paragraph: 1. (a) (iv). note the reference to use of level access accommodation and bungalows along the urban-rural interface. Noting that this falls under the heading relating to "Design and Character" it would seem the objective of this requirement is to enable a visual transition along the new urban-rural boundaries of the site that will be created by the development. This objective is supported in principle but the reference to bungalows is considered overly prescriptive and should be omitted. 4.(d). support the principle of providing local services to serve this urban extension but consider the reference to "a local centre in a central location on site" is prescriptive suggest this should be amended to "in a location within safe, easy walking and cycling distance on the site". This would provide appropriate flexibility for master planning of the site. 4.(g). recognise the development may involve the need for provision for community infrastructure, but consider that reference to improvements at Carlton in Lindrick Civic Centre through appropriate financial contribution is prescriptive. Note that para. 7.2.9 of the Local Plan refers to residents of the urban extension potentially using nearby strategic community facilities in Carlton in Lindrick but this acknowledges that the financial contribution should be assessed on the basis of any evidenced potential impacts. This should be reflected in the reference in sub para.4 (g). 5.(a)(iii). The requirement for a planning application to be supported by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan is acknowledged. This will include assessment of impact of the development on the surrounding highway network. The requirement of sub para.5 (a) (iii) is to identify this impact and relevant mitigation measures, where necessary is acknowledged. The reference to specific mitigation by financial contribution towards improvements at Kilton Road/East Gate and Cannon Crossroads and the A57/Claylands Avenue/Shireoaks Common roundabout is not as yet established as necessary. Suggest that sub para.5.(a)(iii) be amended by removing the reference to these junctions and require that relevant mitigation measures are provided where necessary.	The Council has taken a prudent approach to the commencement and build out rates of sites proposed for allocation in Bassetlaw Local Plan. This does not restrict sites coming forward earlier. Once the Local Plan is adopted, sites could come forward sooner than anticipated. A strategic urban extension should provide a mix of house types to support sustainable communities. Therefore with a growing older population lower level housing on the periphery of the site is not unreasonable and would contribute to good design, particularly along the rural interface. Proposed to change the policy from 'bungalows' to 'such as bungalows'. The requirement for financial contributions towards improvements at Carlton Civic Centre has been removed because there is no evidence to demonstrate that the development will impact on the centre. The Bassetlaw Transport Study justifies the approach taken to the requirement for highway improvements associated with the development. Highway improvements identified by the Transport Study will be required to be delivered to make the development acceptable. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan provides details of required infrastructure improvements associated with the development and these will be reflected in policy.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
REF185	iba Planning on behalf of Carlton Forest Partnership	<p>The Council is aware that our client, alongside Hallam Land (promoting the balance of the Peaks Hill Farm allocation on behalf of the adjoining landowners), has confirmed their willingness and ability to deliver Peaks Hill Farm at the very earliest opportunity – working with the Council every step of the way to ensure that the project is a viable one and the level of development can be delivered during the Plan period as anticipated and required. Whilst the overall allocation straddles two ownerships, both landowners have confirmed the principle of collaborating together to meet the above objectives – and there is already a commitment between the parties to invest significantly in the various investigatory surveys to be able to demonstrate the lack of any technical constraints with regard to the delivery of the development and to be in a position to submit a planning application so as to provide comfort to the Council and the Examination Inspector regarding the timing and delivery of the development. Our client has a strong track record for delivering housing in Worksop promptly following the grant of planning permission and intends to carry this forward should land at Peaks Hill Farm be allocated. Has already been approached by several regional and national housebuilders expressing an interest in purchasing their land with the benefit of the allocation – further confirming the location of the site for housing to be a good one, and the appetite for developing on this side of the town. The level of development identified will be critical to the delivery of the new distributor road which is essential i) to ease town centre congestion; ii) to mitigate for existing junctions which are already at capacity; and iii) to help unlock other town centre/regeneration sites which could otherwise not be delivered. For all these reasons, the inclusion of the Peaks Hill Farm allocation is supported - and it is hoped the same will be carried forward into the Submission Version. Remain committed to assisting the Council and Hallam Land in any way that it can to demonstrate the viability and delivery of the site as part of the draft of the Plan and the Examination in Public.</p>	Comments noted and welcomed. The approach taken in terms of collaborative working with the adjoining landowner both in terms of supporting the preparation of the plan and its subsequent delivery is welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 18 Site HS2: FORMER PUPIL REFERRAL CENTRE WORKSOP			
REF127	Lincolnshire County Council, Archaeological Planning Advice	Each site has been consulted on in relation to archaeology and where potential has been identified, welcome the inclusion of the advice provided.	Comments noted and welcomed.
REF201	Severn Trent	<p>The site is a proposed redevelopment site it is important that the drainage and sewerage systems are designed in accordance with current industry best practice, looking to identify separate systems for surface water and foul water, so that the drainage Hierarchy and SuDS, can be used to provide a sustainable development and improve resilience to flooding and climate change. New developments should also be designed with water efficiency in mind. Development should also consider the need to incorporate Water efficiency and Water re-use within the development to ensure that it is delivered in a sustainable way. Recommend that Policy 16 incorporates specific statements to require the development to consider design principles outline above, some example wording that we feel would assist with this is provided under the Bassetlaw Garden village comments above. The Former Pupil Referral Centre site is located within a within Source Protection Zone (SPZ), please refer to Protection of Groundwater sources section of our response.</p>	Comments noted and welcomed. Water Efficiency and Water re-use including standards mentioned are outlined in policy ST52 Climate Change, sustainable drainage, including the drainage hierarchy is set out in ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage & ST55 Protecting Water Quality and Management, and groundwater related matters by ST55. These are strategic policies therefore the requirements cover all relevant new development. It is not considered necessary to repeat the requirements for each allocation, unless an additional site specific matter is identified. STW confirmed via email (on 4/3/2021) that this was an acceptable approach.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 20 - Site HS4 FORMER MANTON PRIMARY SCHOOL			
REF127	Lincolnshire County Council, Archaeological Planning Advice	Each site has been consulted on in relation to archaeology and where potential has been identified, welcome the inclusion of the advice provided.	Thank you for your comment.
REF201	Severn Trent	<p>There are surface water sewers indicated within the vicinity of the site therefore no connection of surface water to Foul Sewers shall be permitted. Recommend that Water Efficiency design and Water re-use is outlined within policy 20 to ensure that development is carried out in a sustainable way, making the most of the resources available. Recommend that the 110 l/h/d water efficiency standard is incorporated to ensure that developers understand that what is expected from them from the outset.</p> <p>Whilst Policy 20 makes a reference to multifunctional open spaces there is no reference to the use of SuDS or the Drainage Hierarchy, recommend that there is a reference to both SuDS or and the drainage hierarchy is included. The Former Manton Primary School Site is located within a within Source Protection Zone (SPZ), please refer to Protection of Groundwater sources section of our response.</p>	Comments noted and welcomed. Water Efficiency and Water re-use including standards mentioned are outlined in policy ST52 Climate Change, sustainable drainage, including the drainage hierarchy is set out in ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage & ST55 Protecting Water Quality and Management, and groundwater related matters by ST55. These are strategic policies therefore the requirements cover all relevant new development. It is not considered necessary to repeat the requirements for each allocation, unless an additional site specific matter is identified. STW confirmed via email (on 4/3/2021) that this was an acceptable approach.
REF058	Sport England	Site HS4 and Policy 20 - Object – in 2012 Sport England commented following a pre-application consultation on the development of the former school site with the retention of the school playing fields for sports use. Para 9.4.3 and 9.4.4 advises shortfalls is evidenced from the Playing Pitch Strategy. Has the evidence shown that in this area the whole playing field should be retained for youth and mini-football to meet those shortfalls.	Thank you for your comment. Please see policy amended to include financial contribution towards play pitch improvement/provision in the area, as per the recommendations in the 2019 Play Pitch Strategy.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 19 - Site HS3: RADFORD STREET			
REF127	Lincolnshire County Council, Archaeological Planning Advice	<p>2. Policies 17 to 30 (Site Allocations)</p> <p>Each site has been consulted on in relation to archaeology and where potential has been identified, I welcome the inclusion of the advice provided.</p>	Comments noted and welcomed.
REF201	Severn Trent	<p>Severn Trent would recommend that Policy 19 also includes a reference to the use of SuDS and water efficiency to ensure that development is carried out sustainably utilising resource in the most effective way.</p> <p>We would also recommend that the 110 l/h/d water efficiency standard is incorporated to ensure that developers understand that what is expected from them from the outset.</p> <p>The Former Pupil Referral Centre site is located within a within Source Protection Zone (SPZ), please refer to Protection of Groundwater sources section of our response.</p>	Comments noted and welcomed. SuDS and Water Efficiency are covered by separate DM policies. STW confirmed via email (on 4/3/2021) that this was an acceptable approach.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 21 - Site HS5 TALBOT ROAD			
REF127	Lincolnshire County Council, Archaeological Planning Advice	Each site has been consulted on in relation to archaeology and where potential has been identified, welcome the inclusion of the advice provided.	Thank you for your comment.
REF201	Severn Trent	Surface water sewers indicated within the vicinity of the site therefore no connection of surface water to Foul Sewers shall be permitted. Recommend that Water Efficiency design and Water re-use is outlined within policy 21 to ensure that development is carried out in a sustainable way, making the most of the resources available. Recommend that the 110 l/h/d water efficiency standard is incorporated to ensure that developers understand that what is expected from them from the outset. Whilst we appreciate that due to the scale of the development there is limited space available for green features, it is still important that any surface water leaving the site is discharged in a sustainable way, and is of suitable quality that it would not cause harm to the water environment to water resources within the underlying Principle Aquifer. Recommend that a specific statement is made regarding SuDS and the Drainage Hierarchy within Policy 21. Talbot Street Site is within a within Source Protection Zone (SPZ), please refer to Protection of Groundwater sources section of response.	Comments noted and welcomed. Water Efficiency and Water re-use including standards mentioned are outlined in policy ST52 Climate Change, sustainable drainage, including the drainage hierarchy is set out in ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage & ST55 Protecting Water Quality and Management, and groundwater related matters by ST55. These are strategic policies therefore the requirements cover all relevant new development. It is not considered necessary to repeat the requirements for each allocation, unless an additional site specific matter is identified. STW confirmed via email (on 4/3/2021) that this was an acceptable approach.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 23 - Site HS7 TRINITY FARM			
REF071	Minerals and Waste, NCC	As per our previous responses, Part A, point 1, e) of the policy states that any non-mineral development proposal in a Mineral Safeguarding Areas will need to meet the requirements set out in the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan. This is in line with the Publication Version of the Minerals Local Plan and is welcomed by the County Council.	Comments noted and welcomed.
REF089	Resident	Could the footway along North Road be widened to include a shared cycleway? There is no mention of a contribution to Education in this Plan or the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	The Policy requires well-connected street patterns that deliver high quality, safe and direct walking, cycling and public transport routes through the development and to neighbouring areas. Highway improvements, including cycling infrastructure will be informed by a transport assessment undertaken by the developer, to be agreed with Nottinghamshire County Council as the Highway Authority. Nottinghamshire County Council as the education Authority states that there is sufficient capacity within the schools in the Retford catchment area. As such, there is no requirement for education contributions from this site.
REF094	Network Rail	This allocation may have an impact on traffic flows over the nearby Botany Bay level Crossing, and this needs to be assessed in any transport assessment for the site. We request an addition to criterion 5 (iii) of policy 23: Add "...where necessary, including Botany Bay Level Crossing (Sutton Lane)."	Comments noted. This has been added to the Policy as requested.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 23 - Site HS7 TRINITY FARM			
REF106	Water Management Consortium	<p>The Boards are primarily concerned with the rate of flow and volume of water to our network of maintained watercourses, therefore the Boards support the preference for sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) and recommends that SUDS are incorporated into all developments where feasible. SUDS should be designed to mimic the pre development 'greenfield' surface water regime and must be agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority. The Boards recommend including in this section that drainage design needs to take into account climate change by allowing for an expected increase in the volume of rainfall, when assessing the storage and conveyance requirements for potential development sites.</p> <p>HS7 Trinity Farm The site lies just outside the Board's district but within the catchment. The Board's consent will be required prior to any increases in surface water discharge from the site being made to any watercourse, other than a designated main river.</p>	<p>Drainage requirements are included in Policy ST54 Flood Risk and Drainage & ST55 Protecting Water Quality and Management. A criterion has been added to the water quality policy to cover climate change allowance. As the Plan should be read as a whole document, it is not considered necessary to repeat the policy requirements within this policy.</p>
REF127	Lincolnshire County Council, Archaeological Planning Advice	Each site has been consulted on in relation to archaeology and where potential has been identified, welcome the inclusion of the advice provided.	Comments noted.
REF126 - intro of response includes surveys	Retford Cycling Campaign	<p>We refer you to the Bassetlaw infrastructure plan (as of 12th Jan 2021), which should be read in conjunction with our views below as it refers to the Retford maps and details from page 42 onwards (at the time of writing). Acknowledge that these are draft plans, and share our compliments, in principle, on the good work done by all councillors, officers, and third parties that put this together. Don't claim these pros and cons to be our ideas alone - are influenced by the local community, our surveys, and conversations with a wide range of people and organisations. Grateful for those who share their ideas with the public, and ourselves, and where practical and possible we reference these individuals and organisations below.</p> <p>HS7: Trinity Farm, Retford Pros - provision of cycle and walking routes, which have been missed on many of the newer estates - some connectivity planning for the proposed development on the North Road development, note from the developers submission they intend to link to the HS7 plot, but this at the time of writing didn't align to good practices for segregation of people on cycles, foot, and cars (as per LTN 1/20) - integration with the wider cycle network - that in our view, require improvements and maintenance to modern standards, however encourages cycling (e.g. catchment area for the train station, schools and employers) - has potential to encourage and assist people to use alternative healthy, sustainable transport, and for those that wish to choose or do not have a choice of the car (e.g. carers, parents, children, people with disabilities)</p> <p>Cons 1. suggest the path on the North Road is taken into account and enhanced for pedestrians, and if possible cyclists (residents or not, users of or access to the Idle Valley Nature reserve need safer access) as an contingency route to the main estate thoroughfare (e.g. blockage due to a broken down bus, accident etc) 2. removal of regular walking route for people of the present neighbourhood area (people visit the fields to walk themselves and their pets) - support objections from the Wildlife Trust should there be any 3. lack of detail in the design to provide comfort that proposed walking and cycling routes and how infrastructure will work with modern design standards (e.g. direct, safe, attractive, convenient, cohesive) for all abilities 4. lack of information on safety and educational awareness, e.g. contributions to support education for adults and children for school and work cycling (e.g. Bikeability for adults contributions) – by increasing and encouraging use of sustainable transport, urge that Nottinghamshire County Council and Bassetlaw District Council and central government consider this seriously - existing/past efforts are not sufficient in our view to enhance safety and encourage take up of sustainable transport 5. public transport access should be considerate of design principles for people on cycles and foot - not detailed e.g. routing of cycle and walking infrastructure designs 6. cycle parking / mobility scooter, all abilities storage not detailed</p>	<p>Comments relating to the benefits of development of the site are welcomed. Comments relating to the 'Cons' are addressed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The policy refers to the provision of a new footway along the North Road frontage and refers to the requirement for well-connected streets that deliver high quality cycling routes through the development and to neighbouring area. The details will be agreed through the developer's Transport Assessment and Travel Plan, agreed with Nottinghamshire County Council as the Highway Authority. 2. The site is privately owned and there are no adopted public rights of way. The policy makes provision for a public right of way through the site to connect to the existing network to the north-east, thus formalising the current informal use. Notts Wildlife Trust has not objected to the proposal. 3. The policy refers to quality, safe and direct cycling routes. The sustainable travel policy ensures all walking/cycling routes consider the needs of all abilities. 4. Education is not a Local Plan matter. 5. This is covered by Notts County Council's Highway Design Guide, which is taken into consideration when determining planning applications. 6. The Council continue work with Nottinghamshire County Council to ensure highway safety is a major factor in the design of the development and the decision making process. 7. Policy ST37 Quality Design requires the use of the Nottinghamshire Parking Standards for all new development. This includes cycling, mobility scooters as well as cars. That is a strategic policy so applies to all relevant new development. It is not necessary to repeat the requirements in each site allocation policy. The Local Plan should be read as a whole document.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 23 - Site HS7 TRINITY FARM			
REF153	Natural England	7.86 note that this policy references the Idle Valley SSSI. Whilst it is the Idle Valley Nature Reserve, managed by the Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust, the SSSI designation is known as the Sutton & Lounds Gravel Pits SSSI. The impact of this housing allocation on the SSSI should be fully considered.	Not an issue for the HRA as its not a European designation. impact on the Sutton & Lounds Gravel Pits SSSI was considered in the SA. The site is within 500m of a SSSI. As such, a minor negative effect is likely. The draft Policies ST39: Landscape Character and ST37: Design Quality promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to mitigate any potential negative effects.
REF172	Elkesley Parish Council	If any additions are to be made in Retford and Ordsall, the Trinity Farm development looks far the best solution for a number of reasons; 1 - the road network on the north of Retford is far more substantial. 2 - North Road is well lit, and has already had traffic calming / speed reduction implementation. 3 - there are existing services, ie: schools, Dr's surgery's, shops etc all within a short distance of this area.	Comments noted.
REF182	Anglian Water	SUPPORT Anglian Water is the water undertaker for Retford and has no objection to the principle of residential development on this site. Development proposals should demonstrate: Dwellings meet the Building Regulations optional higher water efficiency standard of 110 litres per person per day, as set out in Building Regulations part G2.	Policy ST52 Reducing Carbon Emissions, Climate Change Mitigation and Adaption requires the Building Regulations optional higher water efficiency standard of 110 litres per person per day, as set out in Building Regulations part G2. This is a strategic policy so applies to all development. It is not considered necessary to repeat the provisions in the site allocations policies.
REF201	Severn Trent	There are surface water sewers detailed within the vicinity of the site, it is therefore not anticipated that any surface water connection to the foul sewer will be permitted. It is noted that Section 1 bullet point c references the use of SuDS, also recommend that this policy references the drainage hierarchy to ensure that developer utilise the most sustainable outfall. The policy should also look to highlight the need to design SuDS to delivery against all 4 objectives as highlighted by the SuDS best practice (The SuDS Manual Ciria C753). The Trinity Farm Site is located within a within Source Protection Zone (SPZ), please refer to the Protection of Groundwater sources section of our response.	sustainable drainage, including the drainage hierarchy is set out in ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage & ST55 Protecting Water Quality and Management, and groundwater related matters by ST55. These are strategic policies therefore the requirements cover all relevant new development. It is not considered necessary to repeat the requirements for each allocation, unless an additional site specific matter is identified. STW confirmed via email (on 4/3/2021) that this was an acceptable approach.
1666086	Resident	This is well placed for additional houses, unlike other places in Retford. Access to North Road would be easy though it would cause additional congestion to the North Road/Babworth roundabout. Why would extra health facilities be needed in this part of Retford when there are already 2 surgeries within the Primary Care Centre less than 1/2 mile away????????? Has the person who suggested it ever visited Retford or studied where the current health, sports and community facilities are located?	The Policy requires contributions towards necessary health facility improvements. It is likely that this will be improvements to existing facilities to accommodate new patients. It is important that all new development address adverse impacts on existing infrastructure so that existing residents are still able to use the facilities appropriately. NHS CCG has identified the need for improvements to the current facilities to accommodate growth identified by the Local Plan.
REF220	Resident	object to the housing development proposed for Trinity Farm next to the Idle Valley Nature reserve. To build that amount of housing next to a nature reserve would be damaging to the reserve and would, I believe, spoil the reserve.	The Habitat Regulation Assessment informed the sites selected for allocation. No significant constraints have been identified in terms of adverse impact on the Idle Valley.
REF109	Resident	7.8.5. No bungalows or care home have been included in the revised phase 1 plans. Phase 2 plans not available at current time. 7.8.6 & 7.8.9 Habitats and hedges will be lost and the wildlife who utilise this area i.e. birds (including swallows and hawks), hedgehogs, butterflies, bees, foxes and deer will lose their homes / hunting grounds. The proposed area is larger than the existing North Road housing	The Council has worked with a range of partners to assess the suitability of the site for housing, including Natural England, the Environment Agency, and Notts Wildlife Trust. No objections have been raised. The site provides for 6.5ha

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 23 - Site HS7 TRINITY FARM			
		<p>estate and this must surely have a big impact on wildlife. There are other areas around Retford which could be utilised without the environmental impact such a large development would make. There is no mention of buffers (i.e. green spaces) between existing housing and new housing and visual impact on existing residents due to density and mass of buildings. The existing green areas are already used by locals and visitors alike and the proposed plans do not offer substantial green areas. 7.8.7 There is only a narrow footpath between the existing estate and the proposed building plot and currently the rain water drains into the fields with no other drainage. Concerns about the risk of flooding to both the new estate and existing properties despite the few run off areas proposed. 7.8.10 Additional provision for improved cycle routes and footpaths is welcome although in practical terms, the majority of new residents will not utilise these whilst travelling to and from work or the local amenities.</p>	<p>of open space which will include space for wildlife and flood management. The site will provide 10% biodiversity net gain which will add biodiversity value to the site. The policy requires the amenity of existing residents to be maintained. The approach taken which could include a green buffer will be a matter for the planning application. The Policy requires development to be of a high quality design with green infrastructure forming an important element. The site is privately owned and there are no adopted public rights of way. The policy makes provision for a public right of way through the site to connect to the existing network to the north-east, thus formalising the current informal use. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment of the site requires the Policy to secure a flood risk assessment to inform the proposal. This will confirm mitigation to address flood risk. The Council will continue to liaise with the Environment Agency, Severn Trent Water and Anglian Water, to ensure flood risk is fully considered and appropriately addressed by the development.</p>
REF176	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>A community woodland is an attractive prospect for this development. With the Beck nearby, and increasing risk of flooding, all mitigation measures to prevent flooding must be carried out if this development is to go ahead. It is encouraging that green travel routes such as cycling are being considered and a public transport provision should be provided. Could the North Road path be improved for pedestrians and cyclists? Storage for all forms of transport, including storage for mobility scooters as well as cycles should be considered.</p>	<p>The Council has undertaken a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment of the site. The policy requires a flood risk assessment as part of the planning application process. This will confirm the mitigation required to manage flood risk. The Council will continue to liaise with the Environment Agency, Severn Trent Water and Anglian Water, to ensure flood risk is fully considered and appropriately addressed by the development. Highway improvements will be informed by a transport assessment under taken by the developer. The policy requires a new footway along the North Road frontage. Improvements for cycling will be assessed through the Transport Assessment for the scheme. The design policy requires that all development make provision for parking in accordance with the Nottinghamshire Parking Standards. This includes cycles and mobility scooters.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 23 - Site HS7 TRINITY FARM			
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	<p>This extension to the already approved housing scheme would appear to be a logical move. Unconvinced of the effectiveness of a planting belt along the railway to reduce noise to an acceptable level. Generally noise reduction due to tree and shrub planting would be in the order of 5-10dBA for every 30 metres of intensive planting and this would need to be coniferous if this reduction was to be provided all year round. The noise level typically produced on a rail line is dependent of course on speeds, the higher the speed the louder the noise. At 50kph (31mph) the noise level at 25 metres is about 60 dBA, at 100kph (68mph) it is 68 dBA. The normally acceptable noise levels that would not cause a nuisance is around 40 dBA but of course this is dependent upon the current background noise levels. In this location there will be noise from the A638 as the background but this is sited to the east of the site and with prevailing westerly winds it will fluctuate and reduce dependent upon wind strength. The rail line is on the west of the site and although general noise itself is not a major planning issue, development adjacent to high noise levels should be avoided. Noise reduction due to planting will require a buffer width in excess of 50 metres if a level of 40-50 is to be achieved. It should not be forgotten that for this wooded belt to become effective it will require some considerable time so if this allocation is to be adopted then planting should start now and development not commenced until a noise survey has substantiated the effectiveness of the planting. It is a shame that the northern entrance into Retford could not have had better commercial development along the lines of a technology park or similar offices to those that exist at The Enterprise Centre and the old Retford copy shop, both of which are examples of good modern design, visually attractive and would suggest a vibrant, confident and successful town and present a different visually attractive entrance to Retford. Give it some more thought, once we have a housing estate that is it. These dwellings will be speculative built and as such will more than likely be traditional in design and layout with dwellings interspersed with roadways and planting. Commercial on the other hand brings a vibrancy throughout the day with comings and goings, it shows the town is alive.</p>	BDC Environmental Health are confident any noise impact can be addressed through appropriate mitigation at the development management stage. The Council will also work with partner organisations, such as Network Rail, Notts Wildlife Trust to identify the most suitable methods for noise reduction where necessary. The site identified for employment has planning permission. The details of the design has not yet been agreed. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment does not identify any need for additional employment land in this location. The Policy is considered to be sufficiently detailed enough to deliver a development of a high quality design.
REF180 Trinity Farm - assessments attached	Fisher German on behalf of Avant Homes	<p>The allocation of land at Trinity Farm, Retford for residential use is supported. This land is sustainably located adjacent to Retford and will form part of a wider mixed-use development to the north of the town, inclusive of employment and community facilities. The site is within close proximity to a number of existing bus stops, which provided easy and regular access to Retford's town centre, Doncaster and other locations. The site also enjoys a good synergy with existing and proposed employment development, which will enable people to live close to their place of work. This is particularly important given the key linkages within the Plan generally between housing and employment. This allocation is sound and will make a vital contribution to meeting future housing needs within the town. The masterplan and these representations have been prepared having regard to a number of site-specific assessments which have been undertaken. These include Ecology, Flood Risk and Drainage, Highways and Landscape Impact. A summary is detailed below. Copies of the technical reports will be provided in due course. Ecology A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report (PEAR) has been undertaken on the site. This sets out the site is predominantly formed of arable land, surrounded by poor quality semi-improved grassland field margins, tall ruderal vegetation and hedgerow. The site also contained a field compartment of short mown poor semi-improved grassland and broadleaved scattered trees. A small brick-utility building is present within the site to the north-east. Just beyond the sites northern boundary is a small easterly flowing brook. The site does not contain or adjoin any designated sites, however it is within the SSSI Impact Risk Zone for the Sutton and Lound Gravel Pits, as such Natural England may make comments, albeit it is considered unlikely this will preclude the uses proposed on site. The PEAR sets out that habitats onsite are generally of low botanical diversity and species found are common, widespread and typical of such habitat. There is higher biodiversity value in the hedgerows and the brook to the north, albeit still not of great local significance. Hedges will be retained where possible throughout the site, and any loss needed to facilitate the scheme (such as to deliver an access onto North Road), will be mitigated by compensatory planting. With regards to the brook, the illustrative masterplan demonstrates how the site can be delivered inclusive of a substantial</p>	Support for the allocation is noted and welcomed. The Council welcomes the proactive approach taken by Avant Homes. Evidence undertaken at an early stage in the Local Plan process demonstrates the developer's commitment to bringing forward development of the site in a sustainable and timely manner. Ecology findings are noted and the early assessment approach is welcomed. Further ecology assessments will be required as part of the development management process. Work undertaken in relation to flood risk and drainage is welcomed. As acknowledged, further flood risk and drainage assessment work will be required through the development management process. Work on the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment is welcomed. The propose retention and enhancement of the site's key existing green infrastructure assets (in order to retain and enhance the site's character and distinctiveness) is welcomed. Confirmation that the site can accommodate the number of dwellings proposed whilst also retaining existing habitats is welcomed. The integrated approach to highway design is welcomed. A Transport Assessment and Travel Plan will be required at the development management stage. As the 244 dwellings is a minimum figure, and the policy does not restrict a higher yield, it is not considered necessary to increase the requirement. Confirmation that the housing mix policy and supporting evidence will be

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 23 - Site HS7 TRINITY FARM			
		<p>landscape buffer to the north, in line with the PEAR. There are no ponds present onsite, or within 250m of the site. Whilst there are ponds within 500m, this is beyond the intermediate zone for Great Crested Newts and beyond barriers which would likely prevent dispersal onto the site. The site is considered to be of moderate value to roosting bats, due to the presence of hedgerows, scattered trees onsite, and adjacent railway, woodland and brook. As much of the hedgerow is to be maintained, combined with new landscape features, the PEAR concludes that the value of the site will not be significantly impacted post development. Hedgerows and trees could provide habitat for nesting birds, as such an additional Nesting Bird check will be carried out by a suitably qualified ecologist prior to any works on site if commencing between March-September. The site is considered to be of relatively low value to reptiles, water voles, otters, Terrestrial Invertebrates or white-clawed crayfish. Some mitigation measures suggested, but no significant residual impacts. There is no setts or signs of badgers recorded within the site survey. Mitigation is recommended in new open space features. Similarly for principal species, again hedgerow which is likely to be of greatest value to such animals will be largely retained and new landscape features can provide habitat. Flood Risk and Drainage The indicative masterplan illustrates how the site can be brought forward accommodating the area of flood Risk to the north of the site. A comprehensive drainage strategy which has regard to the current Reserved Matters site is currently being prepared, however initial works have not suggested any issues in delivery of the site. Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been undertaken which concludes that the proposed development promotes a sensitive and considered development which relates to the existing and emerging urban edge and character of Retford. The LVIA confirms that consideration has been given to the scale and layout of the proposals, to the proposed landscape structure, and provision of open space seeking to promote a strong green infrastructure. The proposals seek to retain and enhance the site's key existing green infrastructure assets in order to retain and enhance the site's character and distinctiveness. The considered development layout ensures that the proposals can be integrated into the site and its immediate setting within the market town of Retford. The Assessment confirms that the application site and receiving environment have the capacity to accommodate the proposals. The proposals will not result in significant harm to the landscape character or visual environment and that the proposed development can be successfully integrated in this location, is supportable from a landscape and visual perspective, and therefore meets the landscape requirements of both national and local planning policy. Highways In preparing the movement strategy for the land to the south of the proposed allocation (planning references 15/00493/OUT & 20/01477/RES) consideration was given to a future second phase on the proposed allocation site. As such the land to the south was designed with a spine road to its northern boundary. The spine road has been designed so that it is capable of accommodating a bus route which can extend further through the proposed allocation site in the future. A roundabout is proposed on North Road. Updated modelling is being undertaken on this, but work undertaken has indicated that it has capacity to accommodate any future traffic flows arising from the proposed allocation. The work Avant Homes have undertaken on the site confirms it can deliver in excess of the 244 dwellings proposed within the emerging Plan. A comprehensive masterplan for the site, having regard for the consented land to the south, it is clear that the allocation could deliver in excess of 297 dwellings and accommodate the additional requirements of Policy 23. It is recognised the dwelling numbers are a "minimum" in Policy ST16 and "at least" in Policy 23: Site HS7 for transparency, and to support the delivery of the Plan, the true quantum of housing should be expressed in the policy. Any eventual housing mix will have due regard for adopted policy, evidence of local need at that time as well as local market signals to ensure any proposed scheme is both meets need and is viable. The need for self-build units is discussed at 2.21-2.25. Policy HS7 seeks the provision of 6.5 ha of open space and at least 0.5 ha for a community woodland on the proposed allocation (Phase 2 land). The provision of 6.5 ha of open space is in excess of what would be sought through the Council's open space requirements for a scheme of even 297 dwellings and is not justified. Such a requirement seems to reflect the entirety of the North Road site, incorporating the consented land to</p>	<p>taken into consideration at the development management stage is welcomed. In error, the November 2020 draft Policy was seeking 6.5Ha of open space. This has now been revisited to at least 3.4 Ha of high quality, multifunctional open space. The policy now requires a Surface Water Management Masterplan and Strategy to be produced to inform the approach taken to SuDS. The results of the SWMMS will be used to determine the amount of additional green infrastructure required for flood management. The requirement to deliver 0.5ha of community woodland is sufficiently justified in relation to the vision and spatial strategy of the Local Plan, both of which seek to address the effects of climate change. This approach accords with national policy and planning legislation:</p> <p>Section 19(1A) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires local planning authorities to include in their Local Plans "policies designed to secure that the development and use of land in the local planning authority's area contribute to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change". This will be a consideration when a Local Plan is examined. Public consultation on the Masterplan is considered necessary due to the nature and size of the site, and its potential impact on neighbouring residential areas. The site has the potential to adversely impact upon the environment (flood risk and lying in the SSSI impact zone) and infrastructure and therefore the masterplan should provide a response. Such a consultation at an early stage will enable all the public to become better aware of the approach taken by the development to address these potential issues which may have a positive impact at planning application stage. The Statement of Community Involvement also requires that developers of strategic developments undertake public consultation at pre-application stage. This would be part of that process. It is acknowledged that the provision of open space is that sought for the committed and allocated part of the site. The figure will be amended to reflect the requirement for the allocation.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 23 - Site HS7 TRINITY FARM			
		<p>the south, not the phase 2 land the subject of the proposed allocation. A comprehensive scheme will be brought forward which works with the consented land to the south, this does not justify a need for a far greater quantum of open space to be delivered on the proposed allocation. Concern raised in relation to deliver 0.5ha of community woodland. This requirement does not appear to be sufficiently justified in relation to the delivery of the site. Reference to it should therefore be deleted. Trinity Farm will provide for extensive open space which will include a robust landscaping scheme inclusive of new tree planting. The quantum proposed through the policy is not provided. The policy wording, and supporting text, should be amended: "Provision of 3.9ha of high quality, multifunctional publicly accessible open space, which could include an area for community woodland. The future management and maintenance shall be agreed through a planning application" A landscape buffer will be provided between the site and the railway, to protect residential amenity and to separate the site from this infrastructure and has been demonstrated as an acceptable approach through the consented site to the south. Criteria B of Policy 23 suggests the need for a masterplan to be prepared, consulted on and agreed with the Planning Authority ahead of the submission of a planning application. Avant Homes are committed to the delivery of a comprehensive scheme across the consented site to the south and the proposed allocation at Site HS7. An indicative masterplan has been provided to Officers (submitted) to demonstrate how a comprehensive scheme can be brought forward. It is agreed that a masterplan is beneficial to inform the coherent delivery of the wider site, do not agree that it is necessary for a masterplan to go through public consultation, nor are we clear through what mechanisms Council approval will be derived. Given the work undertaken to date and recognising that the submission of any outline/reserved matters application offers further scope for conversations relating to the masterplan it is considered that Criteria B of Policy 23: Site HS7 should be deleted.</p>	
REF180 Trinity Farm	Fisher German on behalf of Avant Homes	<p>Relationship with this Local Plan and CIL It is understood that the Council intend to review the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in parallel with the preparation of the Local Plan. Paragraph 7.1.11 of the Plan advises that large number of allocated sites, including Trinity Farm, can only reasonably deliver infrastructure, affordable housing and other developer contributions on site if the site is exempt from CIL as it stands. As such, the delivery of this Plan is intrinsically linked to the review of CIL. Clearly without such a review, a number of the Council's employment allocations may also not be able to come forward immediately, which could have an impact on housing delivery and also the ability for the Council to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply. Given the importance of this issue to housing delivery, and the delivery of the Plan's wider aims, the Council should commit in policy to undertake the review to commit to timescales for the review, should the intention and timetabling of undertaking the review in parallel with the Plan slip.</p>	<p>Paragraph 1.8 of the Local Plan identifies the approach to CIL review. The Council have also set out the CIL timetable in the Local Development Scheme. This will be considered at Examination, at which point the CIL Charging Schedule will have been submitted alongside the Local plan for Examination. It is not considered necessary to commit to this in policy.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 24 Site HS8 MILNERCROFT			
REF006	Resident	<p>Re: HS8 Milnercroft.</p> <p>I am interested in the reasons why this site was deemed suitable for development. Reading the Draft plan it seems that because the allotments are under used at this location and thought of as poor quality makes the site suitable for building on? My view, in case I don't get the chance in the consultation to air it is as follows. If these are the reasons then the decision seems short sighted. It would mean the permanent loss of a piece of green in our urban jungles and the opportunity and convenience lost to future families to garden on their doorstep. Even if the allotments aren't utilised as standard allotments the loss of wildlife habitat is something that has been highlighted as beneficial to avoid in towns. I know that a pledge has been made to replace any active allotments with one in the local area before development begins. However this doesn't really reiterate other parts of the Draft Local plan i.e. making the future better. If you were following the essence of making the future better you would allocate land available for all the allotments that would be lost, whether they were active or not. Then there is the knowledge that something you can access that is right outside your front door so to speak is a lot better than an alternative provision made in the locality. What may benefit the area even more is encouragement to use the allotments as they exist, by local families. I did not know that these allotments were under utilised or even available. Maybe if they were advertised more then the uptake might be higher.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The site is currently identified as allotments, however the Open Space Assessment Update 2020 identified that it has limited quality with only one plot currently being used. To ensure no loss of provision all active plots will be re-provided within the locality. Details of this will be determined at a future stage.</p>
REF106	Water Management Consortium	<p>The Boards are primarily concerned with the rate of flow and volume of water to our network of maintained watercourses, therefore the Boards support the preference for sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) and recommends that SUDS are incorporated into all developments where feasible. SUDS should be designed to mimic the pre development 'greenfield' surface water regime and must be agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority.</p> <p>The Boards recommend including in this section that drainage design needs to take into account climate change by allowing for an expected increase in the volume of rainfall, when assessing the storage and conveyance requirements for potential development sites.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">HS8 Milnercroft</p> <p>The site lies just outside the Board's district but within the catchment. The Board's consent will be required prior to any increases in surface water discharge from the site being made to any watercourse, other than a designated main river.</p>	<p>Within the Local Plan there is a strategic policy which deals with SUDS and can be applied to all development in the District.</p>
REF127	Lincolnshire County Council, Archaeological Planning Advice	<p>2. Policies 17 to 30 (Site Allocations)</p> <p>Each site has been consulted on in relation to archaeology and where potential has been identified, I welcome the inclusion of the advice provided.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 24 Site HS8 MILNERCROFT		<p>We refer you to the Bassetlaw infrastructure plan: https://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/media/6065/idp-part-2-nov-2020.pdf (as of 12th Jan 2021), which should be read in conjunction with our views below as it refers to the Retford maps and details from page 42 onwards (at the time of writing). We acknowledge that these are draft plans, and share our compliments, in principle, on the good work done by all councillors, officers, and third parties that put this together. We don't claim these pros and cons to be our ideas alone - we are influenced by the local community, our surveys, and conversations with a wide range of people and organisations. We are also grateful for those who share their ideas with the public, and ourselves, and where practical and possible we reference these individuals and organisations below.</p> <p>HS8: Milnercroft, Retford</p> <p>Pro's</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - provision of cycle and walking routes, which have been missed on many of the newer estates, and more so to as this is for affordable housing, where more families and key workers will be in greater need of infrastructure for sustainable mobility - some connectivity planning for the proposed development north of the North Road development - integration with the wider cycle network - that in our view, require improvements and maintenance to modern standards (and engagement and commitment from NCC/Highways et al) - has potential to encourage and assist people to use alternative healthy, sustainable transport, and for those that do not have a choice (e.g. children, people with disabilities) <p>Con's</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - lack of detail in the design to provide comfort that proposed walking and cycling routes and infrastructure e.g. will it be fit for purpose and work with modern design standards - lack of information on safety and educational awareness, e.g. contributions to support safer, direct, cohesive, attractive, infrastructure, and education for adults and children - NCC are reportedly looking at bike aid to provide support to those who cannot afford a cycle e.g. key workers and others - we would encourage that this could become something that is formally adopted across BDC, NCC and other organisations - e.g. a compliment to the cycle to work scheme (for those that cannot afford it) - this potentially promotes health sustainable travel for all - lack of detail on improving cycle infrastructure for connectivity, directness for school, employees et al - density of population and motor vehicle needs, may cause conflict and resentment with people who drive, leading to downturn or lack of appetite in taking to alternative transport - necessitating priority for sustainable health transport - public transport access should be considerate of design principles for people on cycles and foot - not detailed e.g. routing of cycle and walking infrastructure designs - cycle parking / storage, mobility scooter access, all abilities storage not detailed 	
REF126 response includes surveys	Retford Cycling Campaign		Thank you for your comments. Due to the size of the proposed development we are unable to ask for developer contributions. As a result, no infrastructure improvements are specified within the Policy. However, safe access via cycling will be required for access and will therefore be provided.
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Area Plan	The figure 22: is titled incorrectly.	Thank you for your comment. Figure 22 displays the red line boundary for the proposed Milnercroft site.
REF175	Resident	<p>Policy 24, HS8 Milnercroft – It is not a site I am familiar with but it seems wrong to dispose of/build on a green space used as allotments especially when the Draft Plan promotes growing your own food. Are people of the area aware of the allotments? Do they need advertising? Can the soil be improved?</p> <p>Many people of all ages and abilities feel isolated even more so over the last year. A community garden would bring people together to experience social interaction, the sharing of life skills as well as promoting a healthy, active lifestyle. Perhaps this is something that BDC could initiate with a view to it become a charitable/self-funding group.</p>	Thank you for your comments. The site is currently identified as allotments, however the Open Space Assessment Update 2020 identified that it has limited quality with only one plot currently being used. To ensure no loss of provision all active plots will be re-provided within the locality. Details of this will be determined at a future stage.
REF182	Anglian Water	<p>See Anglian Water general response in PDF in folder. Milnercroft, Retford (page 95) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Anglian Water is the water undertaker for Retford and has no objection to the principle of residential development on this site.</p>	POLICY 24: Site HS8: Thank you for your comment, your support is noted.
REF201	Severn Trent	Severn Trent acknowledge that this development is small in scale at that the legal requirement to implement SuDS is not applicable, however we would still encourage the use of SuDS principles and the implementation of the Drainage Hierarchy to	Text has been added to the supporting text for the Policy which recommends that developers consider

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 24 Site HS8 MILNERCROFT			
		<p>manage surface water sustainably.</p> <p>We would recommend that Water Efficiency design and Water re-use is outlined within policy 24 to ensure that development is carried out in a sustainable way, making the most of the resources available. We would also recommend that the 110 l/h/d water efficiency standard is incorporated to ensure that developers understand that what is expected from them from the outset.</p> <p>The Milnercroft Site is located within a Source Protection Zone (SPZ), please refer to the Protection of Groundwater sources section of our response.</p>	<p>the use of sustainable water management techniques, such as SuDS.</p> <p>The Council acknowledges that the site is within a SPZ. Policy ST54 Flood Risk and Drainage sufficiently sets out the requirements in relation to this. It is therefore not considered necessary to amend this policy.</p>
REF030	Resident	<p>A case in point is Milnercroft and the existing allotments. Five houses are planned and a community garden, with the one allotment still in use being relocated.</p> <p>Even if the existing residents of Milnercroft have not made extensive use of the allotments available what about future generations? The appreciation of allotments local to people if not obvious enough has been shown by the Leafield allotments and the feelings about developing that site.</p> <p>Another reason or excuse has been that the allotments are of poor quality. Are there no resources available from the Council to help improve the quality? Think of the benefits to the residents and the Council if the allotments were put to use?</p> <p>Further, does the Council not think that allotments are a resource that we should think long and hard before losing? How much they benefit the people who use them and thus go toward making living in Retford a better experience. The fact that they are so easily accessible increases their chance of people using them (a relocated allotment will not so readily be taken up and used).</p> <p>I have not ascertained how many allotments were originally at Milnercroft but an indication of the short sightedness or narrow-mindedness of the Local plan is that it was prepared to relocate the one remaining allotment still in use. Why just this one, why not promise to relocate and make available all the previously existing allotments or better still not to move them at all and encourage people to make use of them.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The site is currently identified as allotments, however the Open Space Assessment Update 2020 identified that it has limited quality with only one plot currently being used. To ensure no loss of provision all active plots will be re-provided within the locality. Details of this will be determined at a future stage.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 25 Site HS9 FORMER ELIZABETHAN HIGH SCHOOL			
REF106	Water Management Consortium	<p>The Boards are primarily concerned with the rate of flow and volume of water to our network of maintained watercourses, therefore the Boards support the preference for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) and recommends that SuDS are incorporated into all developments where feasible. SuDS should be designed to mimic the pre development 'greenfield' surface water regime and must be agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority. The Boards recommend including in this section that drainage design needs to take into account climate change by allowing for an expected increase in the volume of rainfall, when assessing the storage and conveyance requirements for potential development sites. The site lies just outside the Board's district but within the catchment. The Board's consent will be required prior to any increases in surface water discharge from the site being made to any watercourse, other than a designated main river.</p>	<p>Drainage requirements are included in Policy ST54 Flood Risk and Drainage & ST55 Protecting Water Quality and Management. A criterion has been added to the water quality policy to cover climate change allowance. As the Plan should be read as a whole document, it is not considered necessary to repeat the policy requirements within this policy.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 25 Site HS9 FORMER ELIZABETHAN HIGH SCHOOL			
REF021	Resident	<p>During the consultation Site HS9 was mentioned, the former Elizabethan School and that access to the development would be via West Furlong. Queries were raised during the online consultation by more than one person regarding the location of this access. The Planning department's response was that this was the preferred access identified by the Highways dept and that they would be asked to review it if there were a number of queries raised. However, no reference to the decision of access by vehicles via West Furlong can I see in the Draft consultation paper? So unless a person attended one of the online consultations they would not necessarily know of this proposal. Further, because previous development plans have concluded that the best access would be via Leafield road, residents in the area may have assumed that as no access was detailed, that this is still the case. I certainly did. So whether you will get a true reflection of peoples' views regarding this, is debatable. Further, the number of queries you might receive re the mentioned access via West Furlong may be significantly less than if the proposal was publicised more clearly. Viewing the area and reflecting on the Highways decision re the access via West Furlong does make me wonder the parameters for such a decision, or the fact that it had not already been asked to be reviewed by the Planning staff at the council. In terms of impact on the number of residents I cannot think of a worse proposal. West Furlong has houses down both sides of the road; Leafield road for the most part has houses down just one side of the road. The entry into the proposed site via Leafield road could be at a slight angle thus reducing the effect of car lights at night and it would not run along any existing houses rear gardens whereas access via West Furlong would have to be at 90 degrees to the existing road and run along existing houses' rear gardens. If the access were at the western corner of the proposed site on Leafield road the impact of the new development on existing residents would be at a minimum and far, far less than if the access were to be via West Furlong. During the consultation of the Local plan the Council officers mentioned 'maintaining the existing quality of living'. This statement to me does not tie in with the briefly mentioned proposed access to the future development on site HS9, I repeat again, the current proposal seems to affect the most number of residents any access could.</p>	<p>The Council has been in discussion with the Highway Authority in response to this query. It is likely that vehicular access will be from Leafield and access via West Furlong will be by walking and cycling. But this will be confirmed at planning application stage once the detailed design and mix of properties is known and will reflect the outcome of the Transport Assessment for the site. The Council will be guided by the Highway Authority at planning application stage regarding access. The Policy indicates that development should be supported by a transport assessment detailing quality, safe and direct footpath and cycle links to integrate with existing neighbouring development at West Furlong. The consultation was well publicised locally including via site notices, and a range of public consultation events were held on line which were free for residents to attend. Access information available to the Council was shared in the Plan and through the consultation.</p>
REF127	Lincolnshire County Council, Archaeological Planning Advice	Each site has been consulted on in relation to archaeology and where potential has been identified, welcome the inclusion of the advice provided.	Comments noted and welcomed.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 25 Site HS9 FORMER ELIZABETHAN HIGH SCHOOL			
REF126 response includes surveys	Retford cycling Campaign	<p>We refer you to the Bassetlaw infrastructure plan: which should be read in conjunction with our views below as it refers to the Retford maps and details from page 42 onwards (at the time of writing). Acknowledge that these are draft plans, and share our compliments, in principle, on the good work done by all councillors, officers, and third parties that put this together. Don't claim these pros and cons to be our ideas alone - we are influenced by the local community, our surveys, and conversations with a wide range of people and organisations. Grateful for those who share their ideas with the public, and ourselves, and where practical and possible we reference these individuals and organisations below.</p> <p>HS9: Former Elizabethan High School Pro's - provision of cycle and walking routes, which have been missed on many of the newer estates - some connectivity planning for the proposed development north of the North Road development - integration with the wider cycle network - that in our view, require improvements and maintenance to modern standards - has potential to encourage and assist people to use alternative healthy, sustainable transport, and for those that do not have a choice (e.g. children, people with disabilities)</p> <p>Con's</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. lack of detail in the design to provide comfort that proposed walking and cycling routes and infrastructure will be fit for purpose and work with modern design standards 2. lack of information on safety and educational awareness, e.g. contributions to support education for adults and children, signage, behavioural changes e.g. active signage, road markings etc 3. NCC are reportedly looking at bike aid to provide support to those who cannot afford a cycle e.g. key workers and others - perhaps this could become something that is formally adopted across BDC, NCC and other organisations - e.g. a compliment to the cycle to work scheme (for those that cannot afford it) - this potentially promotes health sustainable travel for all 4. lack of detail on improving cycle infrastructure for connectivity, directness for school, employees et al 5. density of population and motor vehicle needs, may cause conflict and resentment with people who drive, leading to downturn or lack of appetite in taking to alternative transport 6. public transport access should be considerate of design principles for people on cycles and foot - not detailed e.g. routing of cycle and walking infrastructure designs 7. cycle parking / mobility scooter, all abilities storage not detailed - this encourages use of cycles et al, and sets a message that this is not fringe transport 	<p>The identification of positive benefits is welcome. With regard to the 'Cons':</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is not possible to provide the level of detail sought at the Local Plan stage. The policy requires proposals to be designed to a high standard, ensuring walking and cycling routes connect to neighbouring areas. In terms of policy requirements, this is sufficient detail to ensure the development will connect to existing routes. 2. Signage would be dealt with at the development management stage. This would be informed by the Highway Authority and transport assessment. It is not the role of the Local Plan to educate people on cycling matters. 3. This is not a planning policy matter. 4. and 5. The site allocations policies can only identify infrastructure needed to deliver that development. New infrastructure provided by development cannot address existing deficiencies/issues. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan identifies all necessary infrastructure, including cycling provision required to deliver the Local Plan. 6. This is covered by Notts County Council's Highway Design Guide, which is taken into consideration when determining planning applications. The Council continue work with Nottinghamshire County Council to ensure highway safety is a major factor in the design of the development and the decision making process. 7. Policy ST37 Quality Design requires the use of the Nottinghamshire Parking Standards for all new development. This includes cycling, mobility scooters as well as cars. That is a strategic policy so applies to all relevant new development. It is not necessary to repeat the requirements in each site allocation policy. The Local Plan should be read as a whole document.
REF182	Anglian Water	SUPPORT Anglian Water is the water undertaker for Retford and has no objection to the principle of residential development on this site.	Comments note and welcomed.
REF201	Severn Trent	<p>There are surface water sewers detailed within the vicinity of the site, it is therefore not anticipated that any surface water connection to the foul sewer will be permitted. Note that there is no reference to the incorporation of SuDS or the drainage hierarchy within policy 25, and would advise that development of this scale looks to incorporate these design principles to ensure the sustainable management of surface water. Recommend that Water Efficiency design and Water re-use is outlined within policy 25 to ensure that development is carried out in a sustainable way, making the most of the resources available. Recommend that the 110 l/h/d water efficiency standard is incorporated to ensure that developers understand that what is expected from them from the outset. The Former Elizabethan High School Site is located within a within Source Protection Zone (SPZ), please refer to the Protection of Groundwater sources section of our response</p>	<p>Comments noted and welcomed. Water Efficiency and Water re-use including standards mentioned are outlined in policy ST52 Climate Change, sustainable drainage, including the drainage hierarchy is set out in ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage & ST55 Protecting Water Quality and Management, and groundwater related matters by ST55. These are strategic policies therefore the requirements cover all relevant new development. It is not considered necessary to repeat the requirements for each allocation, unless an additional site specific matter is identified.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 25 Site HS9 FORMER ELIZABETHAN HIGH SCHOOL			
			STW confirmed via email (on 4/3/2021) that this was an acceptable approach.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 26 - Site HS10 ST MICHAEL'S VIEWS			
REF106	Water Management Consortium	The Boards are primarily concerned with the rate of flow and volume of water to our network of maintained watercourses, therefore the Boards support the preference for sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) and recommends that SUDS are incorporated into all developments where feasible. SUDS should be designed to mimic the pre development 'greenfield' surface water regime and must be agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority. Recommend including that drainage design needs to take into account climate change by allowing for an expected increase in the volume of rainfall, when assessing the storage and conveyance requirements for potential development sites. The site lies just outside the Board's district but within the catchment. The Board's consent will be required prior to any increases in surface water discharge from the site being made to any watercourse, other than a designated main river.	Drainage requirements are included in Policy ST54 Flood Risk and Drainage. Drainage requirements are included in Policy ST54 Flood Risk and Drainage & ST55 Protecting Water Quality and Management. A criterion has been added to the water quality policy to cover climate change allowance. As the Plan should be read as a whole document, it is not considered necessary to repeat the policy requirements within this policy.
REF127	Lincolnshire County Council, Archaeological Planning Advice	Each site has been consulted on in relation to archaeology and where potential has been identified, welcome the inclusion of the advice provided.	Comments noted and welcomed.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 26 - Site HS10 ST MICHAEL'S VIEWS			
REF126 response includes surveys	Retford Cycling Campaign	<p>Refer you to the Bassetlaw infrastructure plan which should be read in conjunction with our views below as it refers to the Retford maps and details from p42 onwards (at the time of writing). Acknowledge that these are draft plans, and share our compliments, in principle, on the good work done by all councillors, officers, and third parties that put this together. Don't claim these pros and cons to be our ideas alone - we are influenced by the local community, our surveys, and conversations with a wide range of people and organisations. Grateful for those who share their ideas with the public, and ourselves, and where practical and possible we reference these individuals and organisations below.</p> <p>Pro's - options for people at different life stages, encourages use of healthy personal transport - provision of cycle and walking routes, which have been missed on many of the newer estates - some connectivity planning for the proposed development north of the North Road development - integration/creation of new route on Hallcroft Road (also for the benefit of children and staff at the Elizabethan School), with the wider cycle network - that in our view, require improvements and maintenance to modern standards - has potential to encourage and assist people to use alternative healthy, sustainable transport, and for those that do not have a choice (e.g. children, people with disabilities)</p> <p>Con's 1. concerns on lack of segregate cycle and walking infrastructure on Hallcroft Road, more could be done for the school, cadet hall, and those who chose to cycle 2. lack of detail in the design to provide comfort that proposed walking and cycling routes and infrastructure will be fit for purpose and work with modern design standards 3. lack of information on safety and educational awareness, e.g. contributions to support education for adults and children - with the schools being so close 4. cycle parking / storage / mobility scooter access, all abilities storage not detailed 5. encourage the use of the inclusivity design guide from Wheels for Wellbeing and DfT Cycle Infrastructure Design Note 1/20 - improvements for cyclists and walkers of the Hallcroft Roundabout, urge serious consideration of a Manchester CYCLOPS junction (https://www.cyclingweekly.com/news/latest-news/could-this-be-a-game-changer-britains-first-cycling-safe-junction-is-officially-open-459511) or dutch style approach such as the one in Cambridge (https://www.camcycle.org.uk/blog/2020/07/cambridge-celebrates-arrival-of-uks-first-dutch-styleroundabout/)</p>	<p>The identification of positive benefits is welcome. With regard to the suggested 'Cons':</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is not possible to provide the level of detail sought at the Local Plan stage. The policy requires proposals to be designed to a high standard, ensuring walking and cycling routes connect to neighbouring areas. The Local Highways Authority have not requested that segregated cycling/walking infrastructure be a requirement for 20 dwellings. So the emphasis will be to ensure that safe walking/cycling access can be made to existing routes. 2. Policy ST37 Quality Design seeks to ensure all development is of a high quality design and requires the prioritisation of safe and easy access for pedestrians and cyclists. The Local Plan should be read as a whole document so this policy will apply to the design of St Michaels View. 3. This is not a planning policy matter. 4. The Design Quality policy provides the parking standards for new development. This applies to St Michael's View and covers all types of parking. 5. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan identifies all necessary infrastructure evidenced as being required to make development acceptable in planning terms. It is not within the remit of the Local Plan to address highway matters not relating to proposed site allocations. These matters should be raised with the Highway Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council).
REF182	Anglian Water	SUPPORT Anglian Water is the water undertaker for Retford and has no objection to the principle of residential development on this site.	Comments noted and welcomed.
REF201	Severn Trent	<p>Acknowledged that the development is a brownfield site would encourage that surface water is managed sustainably, utilising the principles of the Drainage Hierarchy. There is a surface water sewer indicated in close proximity to the site therefore a discharge of surface water to the foul system should be avoided. Recommend that Policy 26 incorporates a statement to highlight the application of the drainage hierarchy and the implementation of SuDS techniques to sustainably manage surface water.</p> <p>Recommend that Water Efficiency design and Water re-use is outlined within policy 26 to ensure that development is carried out in a sustainable way, making the most of the resources available. Recommend that the 110 l/h/d water efficiency standard is incorporated to ensure that developers understand that what is expected from them from the outset. St Michael's View is located within a within Source Protection Zone (SPZ), please refer to Protection of Groundwater sources section of our response.</p>	Comments noted and welcomed. Water Efficiency and Water re-use including standards mentioned are outlined in policy ST52 Climate Change, sustainable drainage, including the drainage hierarchy is set out in ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage & ST55 Protecting Water Quality and Management, and groundwater related matters by ST55. These are strategic policies therefore the requirements cover all relevant new development. It is not considered necessary to repeat the requirements for each allocation, unless an additional site specific matter is identified. STW confirmed via email (on 4/3/2021) that this was an acceptable approach.
1666086	Resident	Apartments for whom?	The site can provide for 20 dwellings. This means that it will need to provide for affordable housing as well as market housing.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 26 - Site HS10 ST MICHAEL'S VIEWS			
REF176	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	The reusing of this brownfield site seems a positive way to contribute dwellings. Will appropriate parking be available onsite? Trees on site should be retained.	The Design Quality policy requires all new development provide for parking in accordance with the Nottinghamshire Parking Standards. Policy 26 requires an arboriculture assessment to ensure the proposal would not result in the loss of quality mature trees, and that all appropriate trees are retained and integrated positively into the design.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 27 Site HS11 FAIRYGROVE			
1655416	Resident	<p>Am extremely worried about the environmental and aesthetic impact on the protected conservation area of South Retford and have 2 specific areas for which would like you to consider as you look to finalise the plan. 1. Fairy Grove, South Retford, 60 properties As a resident of Blossom Grove, to the north side of this site. I have a number of concerns including... Access would like a clear explanation on the access to this planned site. The site plan has no access directly parallel to London Road, however the plan states 'one safe point of access from London Road for vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians. How can this be possible when the site boundary is not onto London Road? Properties between the Whitehouse Roundabout and the Grove Road Roundabout often have difficulty entering onto London Road by car safely, with even more cars coming off the proposed Fairy Grove site it poses even more traffic congestion and accident potential. The plan states 'existing right of way to SE and West from the site' where is this? Traffic congestion and safety extremely concerned about the additional burden on London Road South end (and the impact of 800 additional houses in South Ordsall see point 2) Improvements to Goosemoor roundabout at Whitehouses is not enough, traffic and pedestrian safety needs to be further considered. Grove Road Roundabout is a busy spot, with many accidents occurring. Visibility is poor and the traffic speed is a significant issue. When the A1 is closed and traffic is diverted through Retford this is particularly concerning and unsafe. This is a regular occurrence. Has this been considered? On Grove Road queues of traffic at the level crossing, sometimes for 15 minutes plus causes an additional burden on the traffic in this area, has this been considered with the addition of 60 properties worth of cars. Why Fairy Grove? Why are 60 properties required at this location? The plan includes 800 properties in South Ordsall, less than 1 mile away from Fairy Grove, why not plan 860 properties in this site? The infrastructure at this end of Retford is already swamped with planning for 70+ houses on Bracken Lane, 100+ on Norman's Nursery, with a further 100+ awaiting a decision.</p> <p>Environmental Impact On the Fairy Grove site the notes include a statement 'mature trees and hedgerows along site boundaries will be retained' don't believe this is enough. No trees should be removed and want to see provision for significantly more trees to be planted along the boundary. In particular I would like to see a full 'green corridor' along the whole of the north side of this site, to provide space for birds and wildlife, both sustaining existing and encouraging new. This will also provide natural privacy for existing properties and new adjacent properties in the plan. A 'green corridor' will be welcomed, and small compensation for those on Blossom Grove, who purchased a property with a view, which they will be robbed of should this Plan be approved. Trees will also add character in keeping with the surrounding area and reduce noise and also help to reduce pollution and release oxygen, something we'll need with 1000 extra homes in south Retford.</p>	<p>Access should be from Grove Road not London Road. The Policy text will be amended accordingly. The Council has worked closely with the Highway Authority (Notts County Council) on the assessment of sites. Notts County Council has confirmed that, subject to necessary highway improvements, the site is suitable for residential development. The Council has undertaken a Transport Study to assess the impact on the public highway. This has been agreed with the Highways Authority. The County Council confirm that with mitigation agreed in the Local Plan, evidenced by the Transport Study development would be acceptable.</p> <p>There is a public right of way to the south east of the site on the opposite side of Grove Road. There is also a public right of way to the west of the site on the opposite side of London Road. Footpaths from the site are required to connect to these existing rights of way.</p> <p>All sites proposed for allocation for housing are required to enable the district to meet Bassetlaw's housing requirement (as evidenced by the Bassetlaw HEDNA 2020). This is a requirement of national planning policy (NPPF, 2019).</p> <p>The site will be required to deliver a minimum 10% net gain in biodiversity on site (see Policy ST42 Biodiversity and Geodiversity) which will strengthen the green infrastructure that exists. The site will also make provision for 5 trees per dwelling helping to reduce pollution and promote carbon offsetting.</p>
1655416	Resident	DO NOT support the proposals and would like further explanation in particular on why Fairy Grove is a pinpointed site. Have no doubt that its a matter of 'when not if' so would request the addition of a 'green corridor' to the full north side of this site plan to be included in the Bassetlaw Plan currently under review for Fairy Grove.	The Land Availability Assessment 2021 identifies that the site is located in an area which is well served by services and facilities, including a bus service directly adjacent to the site (also evidenced by the Bassetlaw Sustainability Appraisal). It is well

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 27 Site HS11 FAIRYGROVE			
			contained by residential development and forms a logical extension to Retford. The site allocation is also supported by statutory partners and infrastructure providers so is considered to be deliverable with current infrastructure in the area subject to mitigation. The site will be required to deliver a minimum 10% net gain in biodiversity on site (see Policy ST42 Biodiversity and Geodiversity) which will strengthen the green infrastructure that exists. The site will also make provision for 5 trees per dwelling helping to reduce pollution and promote carbon offsetting.
REF060	Notts County Council	5a)i. NCC consider that there should be vehicular access from Grove Road and have no issues with two points of access which may be preferable but not essential.	Comments noted and welcomed. The Policy will be amended to reflect this.
REF106	Water Management Consortium	The Boards are primarily concerned with the rate of flow and volume of water to our network of maintained watercourses, therefore the Boards support the preference for sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) and recommends that SUDS are incorporated into all developments where feasible. SUDS should be designed to mimic the pre development 'greenfield' surface water regime and must be agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority. The Boards recommend including in this section that drainage design needs to take into account climate change by allowing for an expected increase in the volume of rainfall, when assessing the storage and conveyance requirements for potential development sites. The site lies just outside the Board's district but within the catchment. The Board's consent will be required prior to any increases in surface water discharge from the site being made to any watercourse, other than a designated main river.	Drainage requirements are included in Policy ST54 Flood Risk and Drainage & ST55 Protecting Water Quality and Management. A criterion has been added to the water quality policy to cover climate change allowance. As the Plan should be read as a whole document, it is not considered necessary to repeat the policy requirements within this policy.
REF127	Lincolnshire County Council, Archaeological Planning Advice	Each site has been consulted on in relation to archaeology and where potential has been identified, welcome the inclusion of the advice provided.	Comments noted and welcomed.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 27 Site HS11 FAIRYGROVE			
REF126	Retford Cycling Campaign	<p>We refer you to the Bassetlaw infrastructure plan: which should be read in conjunction with our views below as it refers to the Retford maps and details from page 42 onwards (at the time of writing).</p> <p>Acknowledge that these are draft plans, and share our compliments, in principle, on the good work done by all councillors, officers, and third parties that put this together. Don't claim these pros and cons to be our ideas alone - we are influenced by the local community, our surveys, and conversations with a wide range of people and organisations. Grateful for those who share their ideas with the public, and ourselves, and where practical and possible we reference these individuals and organisations below.</p> <p>HS11: Fairy Grove, Retford Pro's - provision of cycle and walking routes, which have been missed on many of the newer estates - some connectivity planning for the proposed development north of the North Road development - integration with the wider cycle network - that in our view, require improvements and maintenance to modern standards - has potential to encourage and assist people to use alternative healthy, sustainable transport, and for those that do not have a choice (e.g. children, people with disabilities) - opportunities to improve footway alongside Grove Road, from developer contributions Con's 1. only one point of cycling and walking access 2. lack of detail in the design to provide comfort that proposed walking and cycling routes and infrastructure will be fit for purpose and work with modern design standards 3. lack of information on safety and educational awareness, e.g. contributions to support education for adults and children of all abilities 4. would encourage a dutch or CYCLOPS style roundabout/junction (or as good practices in LTN 1/20) - public transport access should be considerate of design principles for people on cycles and foot 5. not detailed e.g. routing of cycle and walking infrastructure designs 6. lack of and therefore suggest access for walking and cycling (scooters etc) to promote safer route for primary school children e.g. for Thrumpton and Bracken Lane academies</p>	<p>The identification of positive benefits is welcome. With regard to the suggested 'Cons':</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is not possible to provide the level of detail sought at the Local Plan stage. The policy requires proposals to be designed to a high standard, ensuring walking and cycling routes connect to neighbouring areas. The Local Highways Authority have not requested that segregated cycling/walking infrastructure be a requirement for 20 dwellings. So the emphasis will be to ensure that safe walking/cycling access can be made to existing routes. 2. Policy ST37 Quality Design seeks to ensure all development is of a high quality design and requires the prioritisation of safe and easy access for pedestrians and cyclists. The Local Plan should be read as a whole document so this policy will apply to the design of Fairygrove. 3. This is not a planning policy matter. 4. The Design Quality policy provides the parking standards for new development. This applies to Fairygrove and covers all types of parking. 5. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan identifies all necessary infrastructure evidenced as being required to make development acceptable in planning terms. It is not within the remit of the Local Plan to address highway matters not relating to proposed site allocations. These matters should be raised with the Highway Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council).
REF169	Resident	page 100, para 7.12.4 HS11 Fairygrove, Retford: plans for this site must have regard to the proposals by Network Rail to close Grove Road level crossing and replace it by a bridge. Following public consultation in 2014, the preferred option was an overbridge on the northern side of Grove Road, with its western approach ramp occupying some of the eastern section of this site. It would be prudent to consider adding this area to the list of safeguarded land in ST58, page 173, as anticipated in paragraph 11.1.13, page 168. Linked to this site allocation should be a developer requirement in ST27 A.5a to contribute to the upgrade of the northern footway along Grove Road to shared-use (walking and cycling) standard between the London Road and Allison Avenue junctions [project 11 in the Cycling Plan for Retford].	The Council has liaised with Network Rail regarding the proposed site allocation. They have indicated that safety improvements to the level crossing will be required. This is likely to include road markings, signal lighting, and speed restrictions. However, the suggestion of a bridge did not form part of the measures required by Network Rail. The Council will continue to liaise with Network Rail throughout the plan making and development management processes to ensure any necessary improvements are delivered.
REF182	Anglian Water	SUPPORT Anglian Water is the water undertaker for Retford and has no objection to the principle of residential development on this site.	Comments noted and welcomed.
REF201	Severn Trent	Recommend that Water Efficiency design and Water re-use is outlined within policy 27 to ensure that development is carried out in a sustainable way, making the most of the resources available. Recommend that the 110 l/h/d water efficiency standard is incorporated to ensure that developers understand that what is expected from them from the outset. Recommend that the policy incorporates references to the Drainage Hierarchy and SuDS to ensure that development is undertaken in a sustainable way. There are known constraints on the downstream sewer network, therefore there is an increased likelihood that development could increase downstream flood risk, by implementing the Drainage Hierarchy and SuDS design this risk could be reduced. Fairygrove is partially located within a within Source Protection Zone (SPZ), please refer to Protection of Groundwater sources section of our response.	Comments noted and welcomed. Water Efficiency and Water re-use including standards mentioned are outlined in policy ST52 Climate Change, sustainable drainage, including the drainage hierarchy is set out in ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage & ST55 Protecting Water Quality and Management, and groundwater related matters by ST55. These are strategic policies therefore the requirements cover all relevant new development. It is not considered necessary to repeat the requirements for each allocation, unless an additional site specific matter is identified.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 27 Site HS11 FAIRYGROVE			
			STW confirmed via email (on 4/3/2021) that this was an acceptable approach.
1666086	Resident	Why would anybody want to build houses for the elderly in this isolated part of Retford with no shops and a most inadequate bus service. Your leaflet suggests 'improved' open space and health facilities. Currently there are NONE!!!!!!	The Land Availability Assessment 2021 identifies that the site is located in an area which is well served by services and facilities, including a bus service directly adjacent to the site (also evidenced by the Bassetlaw Sustainability Appraisal). It is well contained by residential development and forms a logical extension to Retford. The site allocation is also supported by statutory partners and infrastructure providers so is considered to be deliverable with current infrastructure in the area subject to mitigation. The policy is seeking financial contributions to improve open space and health facilities in the locality. The Open Space Needs Assessment 2020 identifies the location, quality and accessibility of open space in each part of the district. This can be viewed on the Council's website: https://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/planning-and-building/the-draft-bassetlaw-local-plan/draft-bassetlaw-local-plan-evidence-base/healthy-communities/
REF148	Resident	A few questions POLICY 27: 5a) I One point of safe access from London Road for vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians; The site does not appear to reach London Road. The site is situated at the narrowest section of London Road with little chance of widening the road and cycling into town is dangerous because cars are allowed to park on the cycle lanes, so how is safe access possible. London Road has already had two housing estates added to it in recent years and it is getting increasingly difficult to access the town with a long queue at peak times. POLICY 27: 7.12.1 Situated off London Road, Retford, land at Fairy Grove is located within a primarily residential area, accessed from Grove Road. The site (2.7ha) is well located for local services, health facilities and employment. Where is this employment in this area. Most of the young people I know have left Retford because there are no suitable jobs, not because of the lack of housing. To reduce our carbon footprint employment should be within easy reach of housing. A few years ago this field at Fairy Grove was considered to be a valuable open space, let's keep it that way.	Access should be from Grove Road not London Road. The Policy text will be amended accordingly. The Land Availability Assessment 2021 identifies that the site is located in an area which is well served by services and facilities, including a bus service directly adjacent to the site with employment in the town centre and at five employment sites, as well as through a new employment area at Trinity Farm (also evidenced by the Bassetlaw Sustainability Appraisal). It is well contained by residential development and forms a logical extension to Retford. The site allocation is also supported by statutory partners and infrastructure providers so is considered to be deliverable with current infrastructure in the area subject to mitigation. This is a privately owned site so is not considered to be publicly accessible open space. Development provides an opportunity to improve footpath links to existing rights of way.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 28 Site HS12 STATION ROAD			
REF060	Notts County Council	3a)i. NCC think consideration should be given to vehicular access being taken from Victoria Road as the site does not really have a Station Road frontage. In addition, it should be noted that where the road faces the Station forecourt, the land is not adopted highway.	Thank you for your comments, the Policy has been amended to provide access through Victoria Road.
REF094	Network Rail	Page 101 – Housing Site HS12, Station Cottages Retford This allocation is noted, along with the proposed access direct onto Station Road. It should be noted that Station Road, from its junction with Victoria Road towards the station, is unadopted and is owned by Network Rail. Future access arrangements will have to take this into account.	Thank you for your comments, the Policy has been amended to provide access through Victoria Road.
REF106	Water Management Consortium	The Boards are primarily concerned with the rate of flow and volume of water to our network of maintained watercourses, therefore the Boards support the preference for sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) and recommends that SUDS are incorporated into all developments where feasible. SUDS should be designed to mimic the pre development 'greenfield' surface water regime and must be agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority. The Boards recommend including in this section that drainage design needs to take into account climate change by allowing for an expected increase in the volume of rainfall, when assessing the storage and conveyance requirements for potential development sites. HS12 Station Road The site lies just outside the Board's district but within the catchment. The Board's consent will be required prior to any increases in surface water discharge from the site being made to any watercourse, other than a designated main river.	Within the Local Plan there is a strategic policy which deals with SUDS and can be applied to all development in the District.
REF127	Lincolnshire County Council, Archaeological Planning Advice	2. Policies 17 to 30 (Site Allocations) Each site has been consulted on in relation to archaeology and where potential has been identified, I welcome the inclusion of the advice provided.	Thank you for your comments, your support is noted.
REF126	Retford Cycling Campaign	We refer you to the Bassetlaw infrastructure plan: https://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/media/6065/idp-part-2-nov-2020.pdf (as of 12th Jan 2021), which should be read in conjunction with our views below as it refers to the Retford maps and details from page 42 onwards (at the time of writing). We acknowledge that these are draft plans, and share our compliments, in principle, on the good work done by all councillors, officers, and third parties that put this together. We don't claim these pros and cons to be our ideas alone - we are influenced by the local community, our surveys, and conversations with a wide range of people and organisations. We are also grateful for those who share their ideas with the public, and ourselves, and where practical and possible we reference these individuals and organisations below HS12: Station Road, Retford Pro's - provision of cycle and walking routes, which have been missed on many of the newer estates - some connectivity planning for the proposed development north of the North Road development - integration with the wider cycle network - that in our view, require improvements and maintenance to modern standards - has potential to encourage and assist people to use alternative healthy, sustainable transport, and for those that do not have a choice (e.g. children, people with disabilities) Con's - no mention of improvements to the awful potholed state of Westfield Road, Coal Drops, there are so many benefits for all of the town and station, if this was made usable for walkers, cyclists, mobility scooters, and residents (500,000 people come into and out of the station every year), we would encourage NCC/BDC/Network Rail and LNER/North Notts Lincs Community Rail Partnership, match funding/ideas or solutions to this (Sustrans/Cycling UK too?) - lack of detail in the design to provide comfort that proposed walking and cycling routes and infrastructure will be fit for purpose and work with modern design standards	Due to the size of the proposed development we are unable to ask for developer contributions. As a result, no infrastructure improvements are specified within the Policy. However, safe access via cycling will be required for access and will therefore be provided.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 28 Site HS12 STATION ROAD			
		- lack of information on safety and educational awareness, e.g. contributions to support education for adults and children	
REF175	Resident	Policy 28, HS12 Station Road – No objection to this. However, on the opposite corner and the first building visitors exiting by the train station will see is a dilapidated disused blue and white building (former garage). We have an excellent train station, a lovely town with a great deal of history. We need to promote ourselves more as a destination. First impressions count. The street scene would be greatly improved if this blue and white building was either renovated or demolished and sympathetically rebuilt on.	Thank you for your comments, your support is noted. The site referred to in your comment currently has planning permission for redevelopment. Further, information regarding this can be viewed through Public Access on the Council's website.
REF182	Anglian Water	See Anglian Water general response in PDF in folder. POLICY 28: Site HS12: Station Road, Retford (page 102) - SUPPORT Anglian Water is the water undertaker for Retford and has no objection to the principle of residential development on this site.	Thank you for your comment, your support is noted.
REF197	Resident	Retford – there are two properties that appear to be vacant opposite the railway station – one is referred to in Policy 28 – HS12 – there is the opportunity to take a strategic view of the first thing travellers will see of Retford when leaving the station and possibly enhance the practical aspects of traffic approaching the station and turning around and possibly additional car (for electric)/bike parking spaces etc.	Thank you for your comments.
REF201	Severn Trent	As a brownfield development Severn Trent would recommend that the proposed surface water discharge from the site is as close as possible to the predeveloped greenfield rate. Whilst The development is not large enough to require SuDS as part of the Written ministerial Statement we would still recommend that SuDS principles are considered to ensure sustainable management of surface water. We would recommend that Water Efficiency design and Water re-use is outlined within policy 28 to ensure that development is carried out in a sustainable way, making the most of the resources available. We would also recommend that the 110 l/h/d water efficiency standard is incorporated to ensure that developers understand that what is expected from them from the outset. The Station Road Site is located within a within Source Protection Zone (SPZ), please refer to the Protection of Groundwater sources section of our response.	Text has been added to the supporting text for the Policy which recommends that developers consider the use of sustainable water management techniques, such as SuDS.
REF176	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	This is a conveniently placed location for station access, and would be particularly attractive for those using the station on a regular basis. Parking is difficult along Station Road and the surrounding area, so it is encouraging that off-road parking is planned. However, this corner is busy with station traffic, people using it as a turnaround point, and as a taxi rank. Cars exiting the site will be feeding into a busy corner. Further clarity on the type of dwellings envisioned would be helpful. For example, would these be apartments or houses? The site is small and if apartments were proposed, would the height really be in keeping with the local area? It is very positive that pedestrian and cycle access to Station Road and Victoria Road is being considered, and this site is able to encourage sustainable transport options. Further information on how it would link into other walking/cycling routes as part of a sustainable transport network would be helpful, and improvements to the road surface of Westfield Road (with NCC) and the condition of The Coal Drops are badly needed as part of this.	As this is a site allocation proposal, the design and layout will come through and be formalised at the planning application stage. During this time there will be a consultation in which you will be able to submit your comments.
REF053	Land Owner	I would just like to let you know that I am so pleased to see 45a Victoria Road/ Station Road Retford Notts put forward and it is "available and deliverable" as a site for redevelopment.	Thank you for your comments, your support is noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 29: Site HS13: ORDSALL SOUTH			
REF002	Resident	<p>I see the formal notification of the consultation of the above development have been sited on the lamp posts around Ordsall. 1) not against new housing in Ordsall 2) We have an Industrial estate sited on West Carr Road where if the HGV's follow the stated route they go past the infants school twice therefore twice the risk An accident occurring. 3) Could you not consider moving the industrial estate say onto part of the airfield at Gamston therefore taking all HGV's out of Ordsall and significantly reducing the risk to members of the public. 4) If this were done there would be a large brownfield site that could then be used for housing instead of using greenfield areas. 5) a lot of talk about affordable housing but it does not appear to be what would call affordable, if the proposed development were to go ahead make it affordable with more emphasis put on smaller single storey (bungalows) where those who are trapped in 3-4 bedroom detached or semi detached houses could afford to move into releasing those houses onto the market.</p>	<p>The Local Plan seeks to provide a balance between the need for employment and housing. Within Retford there are several areas of employment that have been protected for that use. In addition, there are employment areas that are expanding such as Randall Way off North Road.</p> <p>In terms of housing, the Council is required to find land within more sustainable parts of the District. Retford is the District second largest town and therefore should take additional growth over the plan period.</p> <p>However, it is also important that the Local Plan identifies local issues in terms of infrastructure, flooding and drainage or the environment.</p> <p>Following feedback from the community, the Council is reconsulting on revised proposals for Ordsall South. This will provide more detail in terms of design, layout and associated evidence base such as transport and flooding. This consultation will be in Summer 2021.</p>
1638182	Resident	<p>This site is proposed for residential development and is also identified as a 'green gap'. 1. The land on the east side of Ollerton Road (adjacent to Lansdown Drive) is extremely visible on the approach into Retford from London Road as it is elevated. This is acknowledged by BDC. The existing properties on Lansdown Drive are obtrusive in the landscape from the A638 (London Road) between Eaton and the entrance into Retford. Any new development on here (even single storey) will be very visible. Surely it would make more sense to use this land for the country park rather than built development? The land is already enjoyed by a significant number of walkers etc. and it would be great to make a feature of the site frontage onto the river. All new built development could then be located on the west side of Ollerton Road where the land is flatter and less prominent. 2. Do not understand why the policy fails to mention traffic mitigation measures for the village of Eaton. 800 new dwellings in this location will have a huge impact on the village as anyone living on the new site who travels to Markham Moor in order to get to Newark or Lincoln will drive through Eaton in order to reach the A638. Eaton village has no pedestrian facilities and has a single width hump back bridge. The village REALLY isn't suitable for high volumes of additional traffic. This should be addressed before any new properties are proposed on site HS13.</p>	<p>It is important that landscape quality is preserved where appropriate. The Council recognises the importance of the Idle Valley and views from the area towards Eaton and the wider Countryside. The development at Ordsall South is partly located within a Green Gap and this means that the development will be subject to more detailed design codes. This particularly relates to layout, density and the position of the associated Green Infrastructure.</p> <p>Traffic and transport impacts are included within the revised Policy for the site and are linked to a set of evidence base prepared alongside this plan. The Retford Transport Assessment identifies the relevant transport mitigation measures needed to accommodate the level of development on the site.</p>
1644872	Resident	Highly supportive of this development. In desperate need of housing for the elderly it's nice to see this includes in this plan.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF007	Resident	<p>Regarding the proposal itself, biggest objection is a potential increase in vehicular activity. No doubt that any planners will do all they can to cater for this on the development itself, however, introducing 1000 - 2000 cars onto the road infrastructure of Ordsall will not be without consequence. Live adjacent to the proposed site and can say, with confidence, that the majority of traffic from this area heads into Ordsall in the direction of Babworth every morning then returns in the evening on their daily commute. There is frequently congestion at the following sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shops on Welbeck Road where there is insufficient parking • The mini-roundabout at the junction of West Hill Road and Worksop Road, where there have been a number of vehicle collisions. • Outside both entrances to Ordsall Primary School • The Nursery on Welbeck Road. Also a number of other vehicle "pinch points" in Ordsall: • Ordsall High Street - it is never two way because of parked cars. • The narrow Bridge at the intersection of Ordsall High St and Goosemoor Lane • The single lane priority railway bridge on West Carr Road. Increased traffic, will without doubt, negatively impact all of these sites, also the single lane bridge in Eaton Village, for traffic heading toward Markham Moor. What are the plans 	<p>As part of the preparation work for the Local Plan, the Council has produced a Transport Assessment for Retford. This includes investigating the existing traffic issues, flow and capacity of the road network. It then looks at the impact of the proposed growth and determine the scale of the impact and what parts of the network will need improvement. Any improvement proposed will be in the form of physical improvement or a financial contribution. Mitigation is proposed as part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for Retford.</p>

		<p>for improving these sites and easing congestion that will inevitably occur? The increased traffic generated by 800 households doing at least the weekly shop in Retford will also be felt throughout the town, especially as there are only two main routes to the supermarkets, both of which pass through some of the pinch points above. Has BDC conducted a traffic survey and does it have a plan to ease congestion on these roads before it happens? Lived alongside the Wilcon estate (adjacent to Ollerton Road), whilst it was being built in the 1990s, have no wish to repeat several years of noise, mess, dust, roads works and construction traffic again. The residents of Ordsall have had to endure at least six significant housing developments in recent years, each one causing anxiety and disruption for protracted periods, sometimes a number of years. Why should the same residents tolerate a huge and invasive building project that looks to vastly increase the size of Ordsall and disrupt village life for many years? The last proposal for building upon part of the land designated for this current proposal was rejected because of local opposition, what has changed such that this land can now be included within an even larger housing development? The boundary line abuts approximately 100 homes and affects the outlook of at least as many more, how does BDC intend to address the concerns of the residents in these homes? One of the joys of living in this area is the diversity of wildlife. There is presently a community of bats present on Brecks Lane (adjacent to the proposed building boundary), also a large number of songbirds resident in the mature hedgerow to the East of Retford Golf Club practice field. Additionally, there are many birds and mammals present in the woodland area alongside the proposed development. These include owls, foxes, badgers, two types of woodpecker and many others that will be disturbed by building work. Has BDC completed a full ecological survey yet, if so, what is the plan to protect these declining species? At a loss to understand why BDC is considering imposing 800 new homes upon the residents of Ordsall, when there is a new garden village proposed only a few miles away, could this not be increased to accommodate a controversial project such as this? In total opposition to this proposal in its present form, especially with regard to the large number of proposed dwellings. This will without doubt irreversibly change the character of our community which I have enjoyed for the last 34 years, the "village feel" and identity of Ordsall will be altered considerably, if not lost permanently.</p>	<p>Development can only pay for the impact it will cause and not solve wider traffic or road capacity issues.</p> <p>In addition, major new developments must provide a net-gain in biodiversity, so the proposals include a significant level of green infrastructure, such as a country park, which will help create new habitats for local wildlife as well as a recreation space for the community.</p> <p>The proposed allocation at Ordsall South and the Bassetlaw Garden Village are being planned strategically so any impacts are investigated at an early stage which is involving all the relevant statutory stakeholders.</p>
REF012	Resident	<p>Secondly your presentation contains some very specious points: to address Retford housing needs; Retford doesn't need further housing, above all the district of Ordsall where there have been some 1000 plus houses built in recent years. Nature Reserve?that really is a sop to modern thinking and somewhat ironic when you consider the amount of environment and wild life which will be destroyed by this development in a very rural area edged by several copses.....and one assumes that all the public footpaths in the proposed area will be honoured and preserved. Acknowledge comments that if this plan goes ahead attention will be given to the mini-roundabouts in the area and traffic calming measures in Ordsall High Street.....but, and this is a huge 'but', these measures would be totally inadequate. All roads are already saturated especially at peak times. The main access road to the site is only a country lane and needs complete revision including road widening. Any infrastructure improvement MUST be done prior to the commencement of any building. If not, as have seen with recent promises and housing projects in the area, it will not get done or only in a very superficial and inadequate way. In connection with that, when much, if not the majority, of the traffic resulting from this development would pass through the already congested Ordsall roads and narrow bridge to go to Retford or Worksop the proposal is laughable. Unless the shops in the plan include all those in Welbeck Road, Ordsall.....i.e. a Coop, Post Office, Pharmacy, Men's and Ladies hairdressers and Fish shop, that already overwhelmed and dangerous community area, the existing shopping area would become untenable and certainly a public safety hazard. Whereas a cursory survey would suggest this an ideal spot for development, a thorough examination and first hand knowledge of the district shows this is not so. It would destroy a rural environment, destroy habitats, create a serious public hazard in Ordsall and ruin a community. Think again BDC, think again. Footnote: as an 86 year old non native to Ordsall I am NOT a NIMBY!!!</p>	<p>The Local Plan is looking at housing need for the next 15-20 years. As part of its calculation, it does include previous developments across the town. Retford is the second largest settlement in Bassetlaw so therefore it does need to take its fair share of future housing growth.</p> <p>The proposed allocation at Ordsall South is a long-term site due to its scale. The type of housing on site will include a good mix of housing types, including accommodation for older people, specialist housing for those with disabilities and affordable housing for younger people.</p> <p>The Council has produced a Transport Assessment for Retford. This includes investigating the existing traffic issues, flow and capacity of the road network. It then looks at the impact of the proposed growth and determine the scale of the impact and what parts of the network will need improvement. Any improvement proposed will be in the form of physical improvement or a financial contribution. Mitigation is proposed as part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for Retford.</p> <p>Development can only pay for the impact it will cause and not solve wider traffic or road capacity issues.</p> <p>In addition, major new developments must provide a net-gain in biodiversity, so the proposals include a significant level of green infrastructure, such as a country park, which will help create new</p>

			habitats for local wildlife as well as a recreation space for the community.
REF017	Resident	<p>As a resident of Ordsall am concerned about the plans to develop land behind my property on River View, Ordsall is in danger of becoming a giant housing development with little or no thought for the people who live in the area, the infrastructure can barely cope with the amount of traffic in the village at the present time and the construction of further housing will cause constant problems. Suffer total grid lock whenever there is a problem on the A1. There is very little parking near the few shops we have on Welbeck road, and this will become reduced even further when the proposed construction of flats adjacent to the Coop goes ahead (this is another planning master piece instead of creating parking for the local shops you have reduced the on street parking and will make the road junction with Ollerton road more dangerous). The proposed access to the new development is via Bankside/Farm View, who came up with this plan has never tried turning right onto the High Street from the Farm view junction it is only by good fortune that there has not been a serious accident, adding further traffic will only make the situation worse. West Hill road comes to a virtual standstill outside of the Primary school twice a day with people parking on pathways and double parking this will only get worse with a further influx of young families. No plans of the planned construction site are available but at the top of River View is all bungalows and the preference of house builders is to construct three storey properties not only will we be overlooked but there will be a loss of light into our properties. The hedge row behind us is a haven for wildlife and we even get the occasional Bat flying over our garden, will, this be destroyed to fill every available piece of land with housing. Bassetlaw Council have planned to build two Villages at Gamston and Bevercotes the amount of housing planed for south of Ordsall will result in all three development joining together and creating a giant housing estate and destroying a small market town. Seen two large development recently in the village and one developer was supposed to improve the road junction/ roundabout at the end of Ordsall road but they reapplied and the Council planners let them get away with carrying out the road improvements creating traffic problems with traffic coming From Worksop and Retford</p>	<p>Impacts to neighbouring properties is an important part of the considerations for new development. Land at Ordsall South will include a good mix of property types and the layout of these will be planned to have the least impact to adjoining properties in terms of impacts to private amenity.</p> <p>Any traffic impacts will be mitigated through improved access and contributions towards improving the wider network within the area. Traffic calming measures and infrastructure will form part of the proposals for High Street area of Ordsall. New walking and cycling infrastructure is also planned as well as a new and improved bus service.</p> <p>Land at the proposed Garden Village is being planned alongside Ordsall South so that the infrastructure impacts can be assessed strategically. A separation between both developments will be maintained.</p>

REF020	Resident	<p>Attached a letter that have sent to all our local councillors who feel need to have an input into the plans you have for development of South Ordsall. Not entirely opposed to some development of the land, but definitely not to increase the whole population of Retford by over 7% in that one development and definitely not, when the same policies and consideration that are being applied to the Bassetlaw Garden Village are not being applied to the development at Ordsall. There are a few areas of importance Bassetlaw Council are failing to mitigate for or even consider and these should be at the forefront:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The world as a whole is working hard to mitigate the effects of climate change by sourcing new forms of renewable energy and new ways to feed our over-populated planet. Currently the UK import 46% of our food and this is rising. Given also that we are leaving Europe and are entering uncertain times with regard to imports/exports - surely the agricultural land we have should be protected, enhanced and used to feed us. • Why are Bassetlaw Council not fighting for the residents already here by making our area sustainable, both in power and food. Take away the farms and you are not only removing jobs from local farmers and residents, but also taking away the potential business from our local area by removing the possibility of business diversification - food processing, local produce. After all, Retford is a famous Market Town and that is where our heritage lays. If managed and nurtured correctly, this could be where our future lays too. It seems a shame that our own Council, who we vote in to represent us, protect us and help us to be sustainable, is removing one of our greatest assets! Utter madness and extremely short sighted. Removing our greatest asset will create an area where residents are having to commute out of the area to work. Should be working on making what we already have the best it can be - people will then want to come into the area to invest in sustainable business - bring wealth. The current proposals are based on Government predictions to provide for people not already resident here. By following these plans, are taking away the very assets needed for our future generations to enable them to sustain their own local population. • Why are Bassetlaw Council removing areas of beauty and habitats for a diverse range of wildlife. The area you are looking to develop has unobstructed views right the way to Eaton and on a good day, Clumber. Have hawks, owls, birds of prey, rabbits, deer, partridge, pigeons, frogs, toads, newts, geese, ducks, snakes, bats, buzzards, hares, herons, swifts, crows, magpies, hedgehogs, foxes to name but a few and countless insects and grubs. Have areas of wetland and natural springs (Marsh lane) and the land adjacent, areas of sandy land, loamy land and clay, have areas of forest, hedgerows and shrub, marshy land and dry areas; all alongside our agricultural land - once this is built on, it is gone! • How can you justify increasing the population of people, that are already unable to feed and removing areas of natural diversity such as these? This is the polar opposite of what you should be encouraging! An increase in housing and people doesn't generate jobs. Why are you altering our area into a built-up urban sprawl! would be better investing in what we already have? If you create an outstanding area of natural beauty with a rich and diverse agriculture, can create jobs through encouraging leisure visitors, recreational business that enhance the nature and area that already have, nature reserves, woodland walks, cafes, processing and sale of local produce. With this comes wealth and sustainability for our already resident population and encourages others to invest. Once have these, can naturally increase the population and housing to accommodate need in line and beside our rich and diverse local area. Currently your proposals mean the local community become poorer through the mismanagement, development and lack of diverse thought before making unsustainable, environmentally, economically, thoughtless and damaging plans. 	<p>The Local Plan is proposing growth for the next 15-20 years. As part of its proposals for Retford, there are other developments allocated on brownfield sites across the town. However, there isn't enough brownfield land to accommodate the projected level of growth for Retford and therefore greenfield land is needed. As Ordsall South is located directly adjoining the existing built form, it is considered a logical and sustainable area to accommodate future development.</p> <p>Due to its size and scale, there will be significant investment in infrastructure so that impacts are appropriately mitigated.</p> <p>The development should be low-carbon using sustainable construction methods and materials. The inclusion of new landscaping, trees and a country park will provide a net gain in biodiversity and help maintain some of the key views towards the Idle Valley, Eaton and the wider countryside. Access to the countryside and other parts of Ordsall will be improved through improvements to the walking and cycling infrastructure in the area.</p>
--------	----------	--	---

REF020	Resident	<p>Personally, feel like am preparing myself for a bereavement. To my neighbours and others within the Ordsall community, feels like the proposals are stripping us of the benefits we already have and have grown accustomed to within a rural community and offering nothing in return. Almost like someone stealing a valued asset. The current residents are losing something they hold very dear. There are no benefits to the current, local resident community through these proposals as already have everything the new proposals offer. The proposals take away our local assets with nothing in return - other than negatives. Further congestion on already congested roads making the area less desirable, commuting more difficult, further danger to pedestrians, poorer air quality and noise pollution. More strain on an already strained infrastructure - traffic jams, sitting vehicles, pollution. On rush hours, school times and work times, it can take over 45 minutes travelling from Ordsall, into Retford and longer if commuting from one side of Ordsall to the other - it is okay saying you are going to encourage public transport, this is not convenient, not used and expensive - you can only encourage but not enforce - creatures of habit, busy lives, convenience is key! The documents accessible through the Planning Website are dated 2014. Is there an up to date Infrastructure Capacity Study? Biodiversity, Geodiversity report? Has there been a detailed investigation and consideration taken to road capacity? There are so many questions and so little time - it is such a shame that this period of consultation is happening now, when the communication methods for the region's largest aging population has been removed - preventing them from having a voice! Discrimination at its worse! We are losing our area's rural character and one of its greatest assets (other than the people already within it). Our local councils should be looking to protect what we have and enhance this and should be listening to what current local residents have to say, rather than supplying the predicted needs of people not yet here!!</p>	<p>The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment for Retford which looks at the existing traffic issues and the capacity of the road network. This assessment also identifies what impacts new development will have on the network and what mitigation is required.</p> <p>The assessment also includes improvements to public transport include new bus routes through the site and an increase in frequency of other services.</p> <p>A development of this scale must provide a net-gain in biodiversity with the creation of new habitats. These include a country park which will see significant level of planting, trees as well as recreational benefits for the community.</p> <p>Further consultation on this site and its proposals is planned for Summer 2021.</p>
REF020	Resident	<p>Grade 2 Very good quality agricultural land - This land has minor limitations which affect crop yield, cultivations or harvesting. It can support a wide range of agricultural and horticultural crops but there can be some reduced flexibility on land within the grade, which causes difficulty in the production of more demanding crops e.g. winter harvested vegetables and arable root crops. This land is high yielding but may be lower or more variable than Grade 1. (http://www.lra.co.uk/services/soil-survey-soil-mapping/agricultural-land-grades) Having been resident in this area for nearly 20 years and having benefited from wandering the farm tracks have seen the crops and yield from this land. A good percentage of this land is now turned to grazing for cattle and sheep, however the land is a mix of both arable and cattle. According to: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/847722/fbs-businessincome-statsnotice-21nov19.pdf This is one of the few areas within UK farming where there has been an increase in profit. It seems coincidental that over the last 5 years, this land has been turned to grazing for cattle, which unlike its previous use, grazing profit per ha has dropped -23%. The land lends itself to diversification to the latest upcoming and profitable crops. https://www.fwi.co.uk/arable/crop-selection/market-opportunities/the-new-crops-that-could-soon-profit-uk-farmers</p>	<p>The Council prioritises the use of brownfield land where possible and has allocated several brownfield sites within Retford. However, there isn't enough brownfield land within the town to accommodate the required development. Therefore, the use of greenfield land is necessary. However, the revised Policy for Ordsall South includes substantial and detailed development requirements for the site to deliver a sustainable scheme.</p>
REF020	Resident	<p>The vision will be achieved by meeting the following objectives: 1. To locate new development in sustainable locations and through new settlements that respect the environmental capacity of the District, support a balanced pattern of growth across urban and rural areas, makes best use of previously developed land and buildings and minimises the loss of the District's highest quality agricultural land. New settlements: development on land South of Ordsall is not a new settlement - it is urban sprawl on an already over developed village. The development will take a village on the outskirts of a 'currently' small market town to a substantial sized development. Retford currently has around 22000 residents, the proposed development of 800 houses will increase the population of Ordsall by roughly 1600 (based on 2 persons per household average), this is an increase of 7% of the overall population of Retford within this one development. Makes best use of previously developed land and buildings: The proposed land is active agricultural land. There is a very small area of land that is not actively and currently agricultural - this is likely accounting to poor land management and blocked drainage where on occasion there is sitting water. Currently lends itself perfectly to an area enhanced for wetland and wildlife, conservation and nature. It is thought that historically, this land was used to water horses and that a hand water pump was removed by farmers within the last 15 years. It is questionable that, when the land was recently bored, that this was done on the dryer peripheries of the plot and not where locals suspect an underground spring.</p>	<p>Land at Ordsall South is directly adjacent to the existing built form of Retford. Therefore when assessing the potential for development on the edge of settlements it is considered more appropriate to identify land that has the potential to connect to existing infrastructure and make improvements where necessary.</p> <p>In addition, the Council prioritises the use of brownfield land where possible and has allocated several brownfield sites within Retford. However, there isn't enough brownfield land within the town to accommodate the required development. Therefore, the use of greenfield land is necessary. However, the revised Policy for Ordsall South includes substantial and detailed development requirements for the site to deliver a sustainable scheme.</p>

1656296	Resident	<p>Concerns about the proposal which is considerably larger than the previous 2013 consultation. After the 2013 consultation the preferred site was for a development off Lansdown Drive which is still part of the current plans. The Lansdown sight is a continuation of the relatively new housing site. The site is in line with the boundary of Retford and will not exceed the current building line, it would also insure that Eaton remains separate from Ordsall. 800 new homes will obviously increase traffic through the old village of Ordsall including navigating a narrow bridge. 800 new homes will see a substantial increase in vehicles, maybe 1600 as most homes have 2 cars Ordsall has only on street parking for the local post office, chemist and convenience stores. Likewise Retford is lacking in parking for shoppers, which will need to be improved for the town to prosper. 20% of the housing will be for the 65+and 20% for people with disabilities. The development will be out of town away from the shops, public transport, medical services and the social activities that these groups attended during the day and in the evening.</p> <p>The proposal suggests that public transport will be within a 20 minute walk the above groups will be 40% of the inhabitants and would possibly find it difficult to carry shopping etc that distance. Will public transport be available into the late evening and on Sundays which isn't at the present time. The development will increase the local workforce, where will the employment opportunities be created. The local school has limited availability at present, will the new school be built prior to the completion of the development. Will the medical hub be up and running during construction of the development. Retford medical centre is on a small site and again with limited parking which will need improvement. The limited width of the roads proposed for access onto the development. The cycle lanes again the width of the roads and the current on road parking being used for the properties in and around Ordsall. The proposal includes a country park, sport amenities, allotments, community spaces who will be financially responsible for maintaining them and the running cost involved. Will this development merge with the new garden village ST4, has the proposer a legal right to all the land required.</p>	<p>The Core Strategy Site Allocations Document identified part of Ordsall South as a proposed development allocation back in 2010. This was subject to public consultation and it was considered a suitable area at that stage. However, the Site Allocations document was never formally approved and therefore didn't form part of the adopted Core Strategy in 2011.</p> <p>Since then, the majority of development in Retford has been on brownfield land such as Thrumpton Lane, London Road or to the north of the town around Tiln Lane.</p> <p>The emerging Local Plan is looking to 2037 and seeking to plan for the future needs of the town. The Local Plan is supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and other infrastructure related documents that provide the necessary evidence to support the proposed sites, their infrastructure and the proposed policies.</p>
1655416	Resident	<p>Traffic Ordsall is a village, with narrow roads and a narrow bridge, Betty's Bridge, onto Goosemoor Road. Ordsall Road and West Carr Road currently have significant levels of 'on road' parking which brings problems with car and pedestrian safety. The burden of 800 properties worth of additional cars through Ordsall and South Retford, and potentially through Eaton is a nightmare for local residents. The consideration given to green space in the plan is welcomed. Where are all the people coming from to warrant the need for 800 properties? Where will the children go to school? What about the facilities for doctors, dentists and healthcare professionals?</p>	<p>The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment for Retford, This looks at the existing issues and the impact of future development on the road network. It also identifies mitigation in Ordsall and Eaton to reduce traffic flow and speeds in those areas.</p> <p>At present existing health and education establishments can take additional capacity. However, land has been safeguarded on site for future social infrastructure use in case there is a need for new health or education services.</p>
REF038	Resident	<p>In principal my views remain the same about High Street, Goosemoor Bridge, Ollerton Road/Welbeck Road, West Hill Road, flooding of the River Idle, a reminder of my previous contact with you is detailed further below. Are you proposing creating 800 dwellings alongside and to the rear of the Gleneagles estate or are the 800 dwellings including using the site on the opposite side of Jockey Lane which sides on to Southgate, River View, Hill View and Bankside? If not, how many dwellings are proposed for the smaller site, running alongside Southgate, River View, Hill View and Bankside? Surprised that you haven't given the two proposed development sites different reference numbers. Where would access be gained to the new dwellings to the field at the side of Southgate and the Bankside estate? Should the fields be used at the side of the Bankside estate, then strongly propose that the boundary hedgerow is retained in its current format as it's a haven for a large variety of birds and wildlife, including Bats? Should the smaller site gain planning permission then propose that bungalows be built in the field where there are already existing bungalows on the Bankside estate? As the bungalows have very small rear gardens on River View & Hill View, should houses be built in the small field it would block light entering the bungalows, unless they were built far enough away from the existing boundary. This has been proven by the owners of the bungalows at the bottom of River View that are now overshadowed by the houses on Southgate. Would also like to propose that a footpath is incorporated at the side of this existing hedgerow. With regard to the development to the side/rear of Gleneagles estate, is it possible to put the exit roads to come out on the main Retford to Worksop road, the A620? If the access/ exit roads come out on to Jockey Lane then the automatic choice of getting into Retford would be via High Street/Goosemoor bridge or possibly via Eaton village, both of which would be unable to cope with the additional volume of traffic that is generated by the development. Please find below my previous comments submitted to you and they continue to remain the</p>	<p>The Council has undertaken a detailed Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. This looks at existing flooding and drainage issues within the area and identifies appropriate mitigation as part of the development.</p> <p>For Ordsall, the issue is surface water flooding where water runs off the fields into the area and can lead to large areas of standing water.</p> <p>The Flood Risk Assessment identifies the need for onsite water storage capacity Which could be incorporated into the country park and other green infrastructure provision.</p> <p>The development area covers land both sides of ollerton Road. The amount of development will vary and will be phased over the plan period to enable it to be developed alongside the infrastructure and in a sustainable way.</p>

		<p>same: High Street Vehicles park on High Street at all times of day making this a single lane road over most of the length of the road making it difficult driving conditions in both directions. This is a busy road and not suitable for increased volumes of traffic that the development will generate. This was confirmed when a planning request for a chemist shop on High Street was refused in 2014 due to concerns about increased traffic levels.</p> <p>Goosemoor Bridge The bridge which links Ordsall to Goosemoor Lane & on to London Road is inadequate for today's traffic, it's bad enough with the current volume of cars that are using it but also buses & heavy commercial vehicles. On a positive note the new pedestrian footbridge is a big improvement. Not sure how old this bridge is but certain it was built many years ago before the significant development of Ordsall.</p> <p>Ollerton Road/Welbeck Road The area around the Post Office/Co-op and the other small shops is congested every single day with very limited off-road parking. Further housing development in or around Ordsall will make this situation significantly worse. There are numerous children using this area both to and from school and using local facilities. Please don't wait for a bad accident to happen before action is taken here.</p> <p>West Hill Road</p> <p>During morning and afternoon school times the main road in and out of Ordsall along West Hill Road is reduced to single line traffic due to parked cars either dropping off or collecting pupils at Ordsall Infant & Junior School. This is a difficult road to negotiate at these times of day and problems will obviously become more acute when traffic volumes increase.</p> <p>Increased Potential for Flooding of the River Idle The fields at the bottom of Bankside frequently flood. High Street regularly floods when we have persistent rain as the drains cannot cope. As understand it, the main sewer runs down High Street and even though there have already been several completed housing developments, no changes to the main sewer have been undertaken. Surely building yet more houses on the fields will only lead to more flooding problems on High Street and further into Retford and the surrounding villages further down the Idle Valley. The more fields that are built on, surely the more drainage problems we will have.</p>	<p>The development must provide a net-gain in biodiversity and the creation of the country park will provide new habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council has also produced a transport assessment for Retford which looks at the existing traffic issues and provides recommendations for improvements for development and their impacts.</p>
REF043	Resident	<p>The first objection that come to mind is the huge increase in traffic, onto an already busy road. Ordsall only has 3 main 'outward' roads, namely, West Hill Road, which already has a school, plus large Newland and Rosedale developments feeding onto it, making this an exceptionally busy road already-leading up to a mini roundabout, which also has to deal with heavy traffic from the main Retford to Worksop Road- A20. The next 'outward' road is West Carr Road, which now also has a large housing development feeding on to it, and that already busy road leads to an already very awkward roundabout, which has a large comprehensive school, plus a Special Needs school joining it. The other main 'outward' road, leading up to the busy London Road, is Ordsall High Street- a narrow road which is already almost single line traffic, due to parked cars, and which encompasses an historic old narrow bridge, which was never built to accommodate modern traffic. Ordsall has seen a huge amount of redevelopment over recent years, with over 1,000 houses being built in recent years so has had more than its share for its size, and this very large development would be far too much for the infrastructure it has. Indeed, its rural situation will be almost destroyed, and the ethos of the place taken away. The proposed large development is also going to be situated on land that is already liable to flood- we see the flooded fields in the winter months. My plea for Ordsall is that it has not the infrastructure for this huge development, and will be 'swamped' by it, bringing chaos to its existing roads, and the residents living here.</p>	<p>The Local Plan seeks to allocated land for future development over the next 15-20 years. Existing development has been factored into the evidence base and the distribution of growth across the District.</p> <p>The evidence base includes a Transport assessment which looks at existing traffic issues and provides recommendations for mitigation for future development and their impacts.</p> <p>A similar assessment has been done for flooding which looks at existing issues and provides recommendations for mitigation for future development and their impacts.</p>
REF046	Resident	<p>Para 7 14.1 Does Retford NEED more houses. Ordsall definitely does NOT- after 1000 plus extra homes in about the last 10 years.</p> <p>14.6 Western boundary country park would be excellent if it ever happens!</p> <p>14.9 Yes- a vital aim but I question 10% biodiversity net gain when so much habitat etc. is to be destroyed. Are you even aware of the deer in the copses owls, foxes, bats and badgers?</p> <p>14.11 Active travel and transport will depend hugely on 7.14. 12 and 13. An immense amount of road and access work would be vital for public safety BEFORE building starts.</p>	<p>The Local Plan seeks to allocated land for future development over the next 15-20 years. Existing development has been factored into the evidence base and the distribution of growth across the District.</p> <p>The net-gain in biodiversity will be significant. The creation of a country park will provide new habitats for local wildlife as well as a recreational benefit for local people.</p>

REF047	Resident	<p>The Local Plan aims to achieve a pattern of development which minimises the amount of travel by car and supports the vitality and viability of town centres. Concentrating so much development in Ordsall would disproportionately increase the amount of travel by car and do little to benefit Retford town centre. The proposed site is as far from the town centre as it is possible to get within Retford and it is unlikely that anyone would cycle or walk to the town centre from there. There are sites closer to the centre where new housing would generate less travel by car and would be of more benefit to the town centre.</p> <p>The Draft Plan suggests that an extensive range of community facilities would accompany the Ordsall development. Not all of these are likely to materialise. 800 new houses may be insufficient for even one small shop to be viable within the development and the enhancements proposed for the existing shopping centre seem to be confined to improved paving. The long term financing and viability of the proposed country park is questionable. Bassetlaw District Council is unlikely to adopt and run it, and it is hard to see this as a realistic prospect. The improved cycling facilities suggested include a cycle lane down Brecks Road where parked cars already restrict the width of the carriageway and it is hard to see how meaningful cycle lanes could be created here and on other road in the area without displacing from the kerbside the cars of residents who have nowhere else to park. The additional traffic generated by 800 new houses would put a lot of strain on local roads. It may be possible to expand the capacity of the roundabouts on Babworth and London Roads, but there is little, if any, scope to improve roads within Ordsall itself. Bottlenecks at the river bridge on Goosemoor Lane and the railway bridge on West Carr Road would become more congested and dangerous and even the river bridge at Eton would be affected. If additional housing is to be provided in Retford on the scale envisaged it should be distributed more evenly around the town and more should be provided on sites within walking and cycling distance of the town centre. However, if the scale of house building proposed is reduced, the proposed Ordsall extension could be removed from the Plan without wider implications for the Plan as a whole</p>	<p>The Local Plan allocates growth to Retford which has been distributed across several sites. Brownfield land is seen as a priority and a number of sites have been allocated. However, there isn't enough suitable brownfield land to accommodate the requirement for Retford and therefore some greenfield land is needed.</p> <p>The land at Ordsall South provides an opportunity to create a comprehensive and sustainable development where new homes, infrastructure, services and green spaces can be planned together over the plan period. The development will be phased and will form part of a masterplan for the site including the delivery of infrastructure.</p> <p>As part of the evidence base for the Local Plan, a Transport Assessment for Retford has been prepared. This looks at existing traffic issues and provides recommendations for developments and their impacts.</p>
REF060	Notts County	The Policy should include measures to successfully limit through traffic via Eaton as the route is historic in nature and would not be considered suitable for a significant increase in traffic.	Traffic calming and preventative measures have been included within the Policy as a result of the recommendations within the Retford Transport Assessment.
1664654	Resident	In the Transport and Movement section, no consideration appears to be given to the impact this large development will have on the nearby village of Eaton - specifically a substantial increase in through traffic. There is reference to a traffic management scheme in Ordsall Old Village but question whether Goosemoor Lane bridge or Eaton bridge are suitable for a development of this size and the associated traffic. Believe this site would lead to a serious reduction in the quality of life for Eaton residents. Increasing traffic levels on Main Street, with a narrow bridge and lack of footpaths will increase the risk of accidents, and increase levels of pollution and noise.	The Transport Assessment for Retford has identified an increase in traffic flow through Eaton. However, this will be mitigated through Traffic calming and preventative measures aimed to deter people from using Eaton as a link between Ollerton Road and Gamston. The majority of traffic heading South will travel to the A1 at Elkesley.
1664685	Resident	Serious concerns about the resulting increase in traffic through Eaton from a development of 800 dwellings to the south of Ordsall. The narrow, single-file bridge has been damaged by vehicles twice in the past five years. In January 2018 it was closed for 4 weeks for repairs causing significant disruption to residents, and it then had to be repaired again in 2019 following an incident which resulted in a vehicle crashing through the bridge wall and ending up in the river. The bridge is not built for the volume of traffic that exits the A1 at Elkesley, travels down Jockey Lane and through Eaton towards Retford, or that travels through the village to and from Ordsall. Counts of traffic by residents in 2019 showed an average of 113 vehicles travelling through the village between 8 and 9am, and 117 between 4 and 5pm. Any increase in traffic from the proposed development will further exacerbate the problem, particularly as travelling through Eaton is currently the preferred route for Ordsall residents to access the A1 southbound rather than via the Elkesley bridge. Not only is the bridge unsuitable for the volume of traffic, but also the road through the village. There are no footpaths alongside the road, and with vehicles often parked alongside it, pedestrians have no choice but to walk into the path of the traffic. Do not allow my children to walk unaccompanied through the village for fear of an accident. Understand from the consultation event on 15th December that a 'traffic management scheme' would be in scope for Eaton should the proposed development be approved but concerned whether this would be sufficient to reduce the significant increase in the volume of traffic what would result from the development.	The Transport Assessment for Retford has identified an increase in traffic flow through Eaton. However, this will be mitigated through Traffic calming and preventative measures aimed to deter people from using Eaton as a link between Ollerton Road and Gamston. The majority of traffic heading South will travel to the A1 at Elkesley.

1664699	Resident	<p>As a resident of Eaton, very concerned about the impact of the Ordsall South development on the volume of traffic through the village. No mention of this in the plan, which seems to take the view that people will only travel locally. Given the current high volume of traffic through the Eaton, know that many people who live in Ordsall use the road through Eaton to access the A638 to travel to Markham Moor to access the A1 for work or other purposes (including to go to McDonalds as evidenced by the volume of takeaway litter along the road through Eaton and along Ollerton Road). This is currently the fastest route to access the A1 southbound rather than the Elkesley Bridge or Apleyhead junctions. This will be exacerbated if a further 800 dwellings were to be built to the south of Ordsall, not only with regard to the number of people with cars travelling to and from the development, but also the volume of deliveries to residents. The road and bridge are too narrow to accommodate the current levels of traffic, and the issue is made worse given that there is no path through the main part of the village meaning that pedestrians have to walk along the road. Already worried about this for my young children and have serious concerns that the problems will get far worse if the development is approved.</p>	<p>The Transport Assessment for Retford has identified an increase in traffic flow through Eaton. However, this will be mitigated through Traffic calming and preventative measures aimed to deter people from using Eaton as a link between Ollerton Road and Gamston. The majority of traffic heading South will travel to the A1 at Elkesley.</p>
REF071	Minerals and Waste, NCC	<p>The Southern area of this proposed allocation falls within the MSA/MCA for brick clay. As per Policy SP7, any applications will need to demonstrate the need for non-mineral development and where this is shown, the applicant should consider the feasibility of prior extraction and so prevent the unnecessary sterilisation of the mineral resource. Eecommand that Policy ST29, as per other policies within the draft plan, highlight the presence of the MSA/MCA and that any future application will need to demonstrate the need for non-mineral development in this area and if this can be demonstrated, consider prior extraction so to prevent the sterilisation of the resource.</p>	<p>This has been added to the revised Policy For Ordsall South.</p>
REF089	Resident	<p>Could the footway along Ollerton Road be widened to include a shared cycleway? Rather than a marked cycleway along the roads to the senior school and leisure centre, could it be a cycleway at the path level protected by the road kerb? There is no mention of a contribution to Education in this Plan or the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>	<p>The revised Policy for Ordsall South include the necessary improvements to transport infrastructure including improvements to walking and cycling infrastructure and public transport. This includes Ollerton Road. Education provision will come via financial contributions and forms part of the revised policy for Ordsall South and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>

REF095 - Pictures attached	Resident	<p>The houses that are proposed to be built are on land behind Bankside. This area holds a great deal of surface water which drains down to the dyke which takes water from Gamston and Eaton. It carries on below the gardens at the bottom of Bankside, under the river Idle and between two fields which runs alongside our garden and property before entering a culvert and under a driveway a neighbours garden and under the road on the five arches bridge. What the majority of people don't realise is that this culvert has collapsed which is something we have been asking the IDB to act on for the best part of 10 years. After two attempts at installing flaps it was deemed as a problem with the fall at the other end going into the river Idle therefore a problem for the Environment Agency. Despite another meeting with the IDB and the EA where the EA refused to help nothing was resolved! Lack of funds was to blame but we were told it would be done in 2 to 3 years (we are now in year 3) the last person we had dealings with has now moved on so we are back to square one! The dyke in question sits with deep water in it all year round, so hence when we have any rainfall and flooding it cannot hold any more water without being full in a short space of time and cannot drain away. The job of the IDB is conveyance of water but in this case it doesn't happen. As I write this, literally the water is lapping at my door, dangerously close to the house, our two fields, garden and outbuildings are underwater. The EA won't help by maintaining the river, the IDB won't repair the culvert and our neighbours (Goosemoor produce) refuse to repair their riverbank (the EA have said they are not responsible for it) pushing the water into our fields and garden. The dyke in question and surrounding fields below Bankside is flooded. How can you propose to build further housing when already houses in the area are in danger of flooding. Further housing will push this situation over the edge resulting in the five houses on Goosemoor Lane to flood along with houses on High Street and All Hallows. Goosemoor Lane would be closed once again as it was before for 3 days. In favour of improvements to infrastructure and progress, always told, not at the mercy of other households that it could affect downstream. If these plans are passed without extensive work done to both the culvert and without working with the EA to solve the problem of the present flooding there will be major issues for so many people in the vicinity. Asked a question about the speed of traffic coming on and off the bridge in view of the fact that we have had one fatality. The reply was that there would be traffic calming methods in old Ordsall. Since the bridge was renovated the speed of traffic coming off and on the bridge has increased considerably making it dangerous for pedestrians and school children on the narrow path. There has been several non reported incidents where people have been clipped by cars. Still nothing is done to reduce everyone's speed. It is an accident waiting to happen. At the other end of Goosemoor Lane going up to Whitehouses Road the entrance to Goosemoor produce is so dangerous. Despite someone being killed there last year, cars park on the road next to the entrance and on the path blocking it for anyone in a disability buggy or with a pushchair. Neither the owners or highways have made any improvements. Further traffic will increase the risk to life unless speed cameras are put in place.</p>	<p>The Council has prepared a Flood Risk Assessment which identifies the issues with flooding and drainage and provides recommendations for future mitigation where required. For Ordsall, the issue is surface water flooding where water runs into Ordsall off the surrounding fields.</p> <p>The assessment recommends that new water storage capacity is developed as part of the scheme where the flow of water is also sent away from the built up area.</p> <p>In addition, the Council has produced a Transport Assessment for Retford which identifies the existing traffic issues and provides recommendations for mitigation for development and their impacts. This includes both on and offsite improvements to the area.</p>
----------------------------	----------	---	--

REF097	Gamston with West Drayton and Eaton Parish Council	<p>This proposal was considered a far less favourable option for the development of new housing in the Bassetlaw District. Councillors appreciate (d) the need for some development of housing in the Retford area and conceded that Ordsall South might be a suitable choice for a gradual and contained level of development. HOWEVER • The proposal to deliver 'at least 800 dwellings during the plan period to 2037' is way too high! It was considered that a much more realistic target would be for between 100 and 200 (Not 250?) houses built in a time scale which would allow (ed) the current and future infrastructure to support these dwellings to be both in place and effective. This would ensure (ensuring) the needs of the residents could be met.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graver concerns were raised considering the impact of traffic associated with this development in terms of through traffic impacting on local villages especially Eaton. There is also concern regarding the issue of parking both on site as seen with the problems on the recent development on the old Bridon site and in Retford town centre itself. • Any residential development would produce significant additional traffic putting local roads under even more stress than at present. There is limited scope to improve the existing road system and progressively to accommodate the upgrading of these routes. • The two old bridges at Ordsall and Eaton which are very narrow and struggle with the amount of traffic passing through each village/settlement at present. • Recently Notts Highways/Via have been involved in devising and enhancing existing traffic measures in Eaton, following instances of speeding and antisocial behaviour – reckless parking. Even with recent improvements this has only had a negligible impact in terms of controlling the speed and volume of vehicles using the village as a 'cut-through' from major 'A' roads. To improve this situation will require substantial investment to reduce / manage the enormous amount of increased traffic. • Improvements for cycle and pedestrian traffic may be difficult to achieve without restricting much-needed kerbside parking on High Street in Ordsall and additional pavements for walking in the village of Eaton. In Eaton this situation is already compromised by no pavements and the fear of drivers speeding through this route on their way to Ordsall. The Council was strongly disappointed that the Transport Strategy 3 was not in place prior to this consultation as it forms a fundamental basis for the whole plan and the infrastructure which leads to the way for allocating land. • How can any item on Policy St29 (5) page 105 be justified without the above being in place? Councillors also discussed the absolute need to protect the nature of the rural communities /villages that would be impacted on by the proposed development within the draft plan. In proposing the Ordsall South development, Bassetlaw Council is more prepared to satisfy its own targets over and above the Government targets than to ensure that the residents of Ordsall and such villages as Eaton and other rural communities enjoy healthy and pleasant lives in areas of open countryside and agricultural land. Councillors appreciate that some local communities have to suffer in order for major residential developments as suggested in this Draft Plan. However, it was unanimously agreed that it would be more sensible and indeed beneficial to residents for the BDC to increase the number of houses to be built in the Bassetlaw Garden Village from the start thus being able to reduce the number of buildings in inappropriate sites such as the Ordsall South site. 	<p>The Council are required to deliver new housing and employment by National Policy. Its job is to distribute this growth to sustainable locations across the District. As Retford is the second largest settlement in the District, then it should take its fair share.</p> <p>A number of areas around Retford have been considered, but Ordsall South is considered appropriate in terms of its location and being close to existing infrastructure and services.</p> <p>Impacts from new development will be mitigated via physical improvements or by financial contributions such as health and education.</p> <p>Impacts to traffic have been assessed through the Retford Transport Assessment. This does provide recommendations for improvements to Eaton through traffic calming and preventative measures.</p>
REF106	Water Management Consortium	<p>The Boards are primarily concerned with the rate of flow and volume of water to our network of maintained watercourses, therefore the Boards support the preference for sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) and recommends that SUDS are incorporated into all developments where feasible. SUDS should be designed to mimic the pre development 'greenfield' surface water regime and must be agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority. The Boards recommend including in this section that drainage design needs to take into account climate change by allowing for an expected increase in the volume of rainfall, when assessing the storage and conveyance requirements for potential development sites. The site lies partially within the Board's district, the Board maintained Ordsall Drain is located to the eastern side of the site. The Board's consent will be required prior to any works in, under, over or within 9 metres of the bank top of the watercourse. The Board requires an easement strip along the Board maintained watercourse in order to allow for continued maintenance and future works. The Board's consent will be required prior to any increases in surface water discharge from the site being made to any watercourse, other than a designated main river. Reports of flooding to the North of the site have recently been received by the Board on land adjacent to Goosemore Lane.</p>	<p>The Council has prepared a Strategic Flood Risk – Level 2 for the site and it identifies the existing issues with surface water drainage and the</p> <p>This assessment provides recommendations for the scale and location of the Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems on site and the need for onsite water storage.</p>

REF107	Resident	<p>1. Retford whilst being a Market town and continuing to increase in population does still not support enough industry and local businesses to warrant having a larger population than it can support. Whilst you would hope that residents buying their own properties, on a new development, would be financially stable enough to support them you also have to be aware of the fact that the property may be beyond their means, plus the residents taking on social developments may have also extended themselves financially, then it would be naïve to think that a development of 800 houses would be free of tenancy problems.</p> <p>2. In agreeing this development, thought should be given to Brickyard Lane and Jockey House Lane which both lead from the A1. It is already well known, and documented, that when the A1 suffers from a serious accident, roadworks or closure, then all traffic is diverted along these roads, through Retford causing massive congestion through Ordsall, currently causing residents problems with exiting the estates already in Ordsall and creating gridlock in the town centre. Considering that my investigations show that currently to build roads averages out at £10,000,000 a mile and probably 4 miles of road to the A1 will need this upgrade and that a roundabout costs in excess of £2.6 Million pounds then the council, plus county council, will be looking in excess of £42.6 million pounds being required for the road infrastructure alone.</p> <p>3. The land to the rear of the Gleneagles estate, which will be greatly affected by this development, rises up quite steeply. If the development goes ahead how would the developers, and the council, alleviate this problem. If by the laying of an underground drainage system is undertaken then this would have to be on a grand scale in order to take away the run off from heavy rain, thawing of ice and snow etc, as the run off has the potential to cause massive flooding problems on the Gleneagles estate which has a system currently that was never designed for a new development to latch onto. If the developers decide to level the ground to the rear of the Gleneagles Estate then that would be thousands of tons of soil and spoil having to be taken away, once again causing traffic problems or being redistributed around the adjoining land. There was originally behind Sunningdale two ditch systems for water run off but one of these has vanished in recent years. Neither of these ditches were ever cleared and over the years have become blocked by fly tipping. The current ditch and drainage system could not cope with a development of this size.</p> <p>4. Within the plan currently proposed see that a school is to be included close to a new wetland's nature reserve. One would assume that this would be a Primary School with pupils, maybe from nursery age, up to 11yrs of age. Suggest that with all the best will in the world building a wetlands area close to a primary school is an accident waiting to happen. Children of a young age being of an inquisitive nature could wander off into this environment leading to a possible fatality. Appreciate this area could be fenced off but as Retford already suffers from bad maintenance to fenced off areas one could only assume that vandalism of this area will occur leaving breaches in the said fencing which will leave the area open to access by children.</p>	<p>Retford does provide local employment opportunities and sites that accommodate employment have been protected through this plan. Others are extending like those off Randall Way. The town also has good rail links to other destinations so it makes it easier for people to access jobs outside of the town and travel in a sustainable way.</p> <p>The development will incorporate a good mix of housing types and tenures with provision for affordable homes – these are houses that are below market value and homes to accommodate the elderly or disabled.</p>
REF122	NNLCRP (North Notts & Lincs Community Rail Partnership)	This site is situated on a potential walking and cycling route from the Garden Village. Extending the path through this site to Bankside would encourage access to the existing path between Church Road and Century Road enabling walkers and cyclists to reach Retford station via the subway off Tunnel Road. Recommend this path be constructed early in the development of this site. Such a path would be covered under Policy ST29 paragraph 5.iii.	<p>Where opportunities exist for the improvement of existing routes on site, these will be incorporated into the relevant site policies.</p> <p>Future improvements to the links between the Garden Village and Ordsall South will be subject to review through the review of the Local Plan.</p>
REF127	Lincolnshire County Council, Archaeological Planning Advice	Each site has been consulted on in relation to archaeology and where potential has been identified, welcome the inclusion of the advice provided.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.

REF121	Harris Lamb on behalf of Muller Property Group	<p>The land in MPG's control that was refused planning permission extends to just over 7 hectares in size. However, MPG also control an additional 12 - 13 hectares as part of the same landholding, totalling just under 20 hectares. A site location is attached. MPG note the Council's intention to allocate land at Ordsall South, Retford (HS13) for 800 dwellings. MPG wish to object to the draft allocation on the basis that if allocated and developed accordingly, then it would have an unacceptable impact on the Green Gap between Retford and Eaton. MPG's wider land holding to the north east of Retford is not affected by a Green Gap policy and could accommodate development without eroding the separation between settlements.</p> <p>In landscape terms, this is considered a significant benefit of MPG's site over the Council's preferred allocation. In light of the ability of MPG's site to accommodate development, the size of the HS13 allocation should be reduced, thereby limiting the impact of the development on the Green Gap between Retford and Eaton. The work undertaken in support of the outline planning application at MPG's site confirmed that there would be limited landscape and visual impact and as such, MPG contend that its site would provide an alternative, less constrained site than the HS13 site. In addition, the land to the north of Bigsby Road is slightly closer to the town centre than the HS13 allocation. MPG, therefore, suggest that the size of the HS13 allocation is reduced so that it limits the impact on the Green Gap between Retford and Eaton and that instead the land to the north of Bigsby Road is allocated for housing instead, and by doing so the overall housing requirement for Retford could still be met in a more sustainable way, with less impact (particularly landscape impacts). Welcome the opportunity to discuss the land to the north of Bigsby Road, Retford as consider it is relatively unconstrained as evidenced by the Officer's assessment of the recent planning application on part of MPG's land holding. Consider it is suitable for development and could make a significant contribution to meeting Retford and the District's housing needs over the Plan Period.</p>	<p>Ordsall South partly lies within the proposed Green Gap to the South of Retford. A Green Gap does not preclude development, it means that development must be appropriate to its location and setting. The design of this site is key to maintain important views south towards Eaton and the River Idle. It also means that the density of development should reflect its location.</p> <p>In order to achieve these measures, the developers must produce a masterplan that demonstrates how they have considered the Green Gap designation in their design. This forms part of the Policy requirement for the site.</p>
REF126	Retford Cycling Campaign	<p>We refer you to the Bassetlaw infrastructure plan: https://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/media/6065/idp-part-2-nov-2020.pdf (as of 12th Jan 2021), which should be read in conjunction with our views below as it refers to the Retford maps and details from page 42 onwards (at the time of writing). Acknowledge these are draft plans, and share our compliments, in principle, on the good work done by all councillors, officers, and third parties that put this together. Don't claim these pros and cons to be our ideas alone - we are influenced by the local community, our surveys, and conversations with a wide range of people and organisations. Grateful for those who share their ideas with the public, and ourselves, and where practical and possible we reference these individuals and organisations below.</p> <p>HS13: Ordsall South, Retford Pro's - provision of cycle and walking routes, which have been missed on many of the newer estates - some connectivity planning for the proposed development north of the North Road development - integration with the wider cycle network - that in our view, require improvements and maintenance to modern standards - has potential to encourage and assist people to use alternative healthy, sustainable transport, and for those that do not have a choice (e.g. children, people with disabilities) - opportunity to create a cyclepath bridge over the river idle, to link up with Goosemoor lane bridleway Con's - lack of detail in the design to provide comfort that proposed walking and cycling routes and infrastructure will be integrated, fit for purpose and work with modern design standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - lack of information on safety and educational awareness, e.g. contributions to support education for adults and children, as well behavioural design change e.g. speed at junctions, and mixing of modes of transport, e.g. foot, cycle and bus - mention of cycle markings, rather than segregated cycle routes/tracks as per LTN 1/20 - with this being a greenfield site, there is plenty of time and provision for increased space for segregated routes for cycles and pedestrians - not clear how mobility scooters, and carers and parents with buggies will be catered for - no specific mention of a provision for cycle parking, storage or hire - reducing enablement people of all ages to take on cycling 	<p>The Council has produced a Walking and Cycling Audit for Retford. This looks at the wider network throughout the town and identifies a set of recommendations. However, not all recommendations will be made through the Local Plan as this can only deal with the direct impact of its proposed growth. Any new or improved walking and cycle routes required as part of allocated development will be included within the relevant site allocation policy.</p> <p>The broader improvement measures will have to be sought through discussions with Nottinghamshire County Council, Sustrans and other bodies via grant funding.</p>

REF142	Retford Branch Labour Party	<p>The Retford Labour Party was disappointed to note that high level discussions had taken place with Developers at the following locations: 1. Peaks Hill Farm 2. Apleyhead 3. High Marnham 4. Bassetlaw Garden Village However, no mention is made of any discussion/meeting with regard to the Ordsall South (800+ houses) Development. This is poor, and the Party notes that extensive Infrastructure improvements were gained at Peaks Hill Farm (1000 houses) with a new single carriageway road being built to link the development to the A60. The Retford Labour Party expects to submit all these concerns to the Inspector in due course.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the Plan is to go ahead at Ordsall South with 800+ dwellings, it is essential that highway mitigations take place, and the three logical improvements are loop roads away from town to the A620 at Babworth, to the A638 between Eaton and Retford, and to the A1 via Jockey House. If none are delivered, there will be 850 dwellings in Ordsall joining with the already unhappy residents from Ordsall, cheated already by back word from previous intensive developments in Ordsall and cancelled highway improvements. • The Labour Party expects the Plan to secure a significant highways mitigation for the 800+ development, using the metrics of the Peaks Hill Farm development, or a significant reduction in the numbers of dwellings. 	<p>The Local Plan has evolved throughout its production with land being considered at various stages. Where land has been made available and it is considered suitable for development, the Council has continued to work with landowners and/or developers about their proposals. This includes land at Ordsall South.</p> <p>All major sites will need to demonstrate that the development provides a sustainable extension to a settlement or new settlement in relation to the Bassetlaw Garden Village.</p> <p>Land at Ordsall South is being comprehensively planned and various evidence base assessments have now been produced. These have helped form a revised policy for the site and identify what infrastructure improvements are required.</p> <p>The Council believe it is important to understand local opinion and have considered the responses to its consultation and other consultation undertaken in the area. Due to the additional work undertaken, the Council are undertaking further consultation on this during Summer 2021. This will enable the community to see the further advanced proposals for the site and the associated evidence base such as plans for flooding and transport.</p>
REF146	Elkesley Neighbourhood Plan Group	The planned 800 house development will have a major impact on the traffic using Jockey Lane, Brick Yard Lane and also moving through Elkesley – road improvements will be needed to accommodate this but not mentioned in the Local Plan. When leaving the A1 from the southbound carriageway to enter Elkesley it is barely long enough and could do with modifications as has been recognised for the exit from the A1 to the A57/A614 at Apleyhead.	The impact of the new development at Ordsall South will have a limited impact on Elkesley village. The large majority of traffic moving South along Jockey Lane will be travelling to access the new A1 junction with Elkesley and not to access the village.
REF153	Natural England	Note the provision of the Country Park in connection with this allocation and the provision of a multi-functional green infrastructure network across the site. Suggest that opportunities should be taken to increase the biodiversity of these areas and link to the wider Nature Recovery Network. Note that the golf course adjacent to this site is particularly important for Lowland heath priority habitat, which is rare in Nottinghamshire and could present an opportunity for expansion into the Country Park to create a mix of habitats.	It is expected that the Country Park will provide a large net gain in biodiversity with substantial tree planting and areas for natural green space. Opportunities will be explored to maximise the potential to link to, and extend the Nature Recovery Network.
REF169	Resident	para A.5a iii HS13 Ordsall South: there are several proposals (including Brecks Road) to provide a “marked cycle lane” along connecting streets. However, this appears to have failed to take account of the DfT’s design standard LTN 1/20 and is inadequate for a new state-of-the-art major greenfield development, which should have an ample provision of segregated cycle and foot paths incorporated into its design from the outset. A development of this scale will necessitate a complete review of the cycling needs and routes in Ordsall, perhaps to be carried out in conjunction with the proposal at A.5a ii 4 for a traffic management scheme in Ordsall old village, to correspond with ST56 A.3c, page 169. No mention or provision is made for a walking and cycling link between this site and the Garden Village at Apleyhead to correspond with the references in ST3, paragraph 5.3.34, page 42 and ST56 A.3a, page 169; this needs adding. This Policy should also extend to making provision for a new cyclepath bridge over the River Idle, perhaps in the vicinity of Bank Side in Ordsall, linking to Goosemoor Lane and the recently improved bridleway (East Retford BW34) to Thrumpton Lane.	The Council has produced a Walking and Cycling Audit for Retford which identifies issues and recommendations for development. Where development is required to provide new or improved walking and cycling infrastructure, then this will be identified as a policy requirement for the relevant site.

REF032	Resident	<p>Object to the proposed planning of Ordsall South. Do not agree that there should be any building of houses beyond the current boundary of Retford; strongly feel that the existing boundaries of Retford and Ordsall should be maintained with no further expansion given. This area needs to be protected in order to avoid the town losing its geographic identity and resulting in the area merging with areas such as Eaton. The proposal would have a huge effect on the wildlife in those fields and surrounding areas. There would be massive increase of traffic in the area, not only would this be detrimental to the environment but also to the health and safety of the current residents that live in the area. This would have an overall impact on climate change, due to the increase environmental damage and decrease of wildlife in the area. Retford as a whole cannot cope with any further increase of traffic. This proposed area, South of Ordsall, is agricultural land and should remain so. The fields to the south of Ordsall also flood when there is heavy rainfall. If this area was to be built on not only would this area be prone to flooding but also there is an increase to the current properties being flooded due to the water not being able to be absorbed into the fields as it currently is. Bassetlaw District Council have also over subscribed the requirement for the number of homes needed within the Retford area. There is no need for this development in this area.</p>	<p>The Council is required, by National Planning Policy, to plan for more homes across the District. To do this in a sustainable and reasonable manner, the Council has undertaken a series of detailed evidence base. Firstly, it is looked at the amount and type of housing and employment development that is needed over the plan period. This is then distributed around the District in accordance with local need and infrastructure constraints. For Retford, as the District's second largest settlement, it is important it takes its fair share – particularly as there is high-demand for housing within the town.</p> <p>As part of the process, the Council looks at the availability and suitability of land around the town. There are some areas where existing natural or infrastructure constraints are too significant to warrant development. These tend to be within areas where there are historical, environmental or flooding issues. The Council prioritises the use of brownfield land where possible and there are recent examples of this in Retford such as the developments on former industrial areas at Thrumpton Lane. However, there isn't enough suitable brownfield land within Retford to take the required housing growth. Therefore greenfield land is required. Ordsall South is located directly adjoining the existing built form of Retford and provides an opportunity to deliver a sustainable urban extension which includes land for new homes, affordable housing, shops and services, sport facilities and a new country park to provide recreational and environmental benefit.</p> <p>Where development requires improvements to infrastructure such as Transport or flooding, then these will form part of the development requirement within the relevant policy. These are also identified within the Council Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
REF172	Elkesley Parish Council	<p>The planned 800 house development along with a country park will have a major impact on the traffic using Jockey Lane, Brick Yard Road, and Old London Rd. Noted that there is no provision for road improvements along this stretch of highway to accommodate lighting, footpaths, cycle lanes, which promote a healthy lifestyle and would go a long way to expanding the area that villagers within Elkesley can travel without using a motorised vehicle. Would like to see provision within the plan as these improvements will be needed to ensure that safety of the public and to ensure the outlying settlements are not disadvantaged whilst new areas are being developed.</p>	<p>The Council envisages no direct negative impact on traffic into Elkesley village from the proposed Development at Ordsall South. The majority of the traffic heading South will be to access the A1.</p>

REF178	Councillors, East Retford South, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>Section 7.14.1 states: 'The site will have good access to a range of employment, retail and community facilities within the wider planned development and Retford itself.' It must therefore be assumed that the majority of employment opportunities for future residents of Site HS13 lie not only beyond the immediate local area, but beyond even the boundary of Retford.</p> <p>Given the gap between future employment opportunities within Retford and the growth in its projected population, adequate transport links to alternative employment locations are a major consideration. The Bassetlaw plan suggests at ST29 Sec 5. that development of HS13 be supported by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan, informed by Local Highways Authority advice ii. The impact on surrounding highways...including; 1. North Rd/Babworth Rd roundabout; 2. Goosemoor London Rd mini roundabout; 3. Ordsall/Babworth mini roundabout; 4. Ordsall Old Village. The scope of the suggested programme of works is too limited and ignores the obvious implications to the wider area south of the site, namely the route through Eaton village to the A638 and the link to the A1 via Ollerton Rd/Brick Yard Lane/Jockey Lane. The Impact on the natural environment is of great concern to many residents, second only to the issue of traffic. Residents are concerned about the loss of natural habitat for sky larks, owls and bats; they value the hedgerows on the sites and would prefer to see these retained. Many comments referred to the regular flooding of the eastern edge of HS13, and to the frequent impact this has on low lying areas of Retford further downstream. The occurrence of frequent flooding already causes considerable issues both locally within Ordsall and further on into Retford. This dire situation can only be exacerbated by development along the watershed of the Idle valley. Of those who are supportive of the proposal to develop HS13, eco technologies such as solar roof panels and rainwater harvesting were popular. Should the site come forward for development, the green buffer around the site, and particularly between the southern edges of the existing settlement boundary and the northern edges of the proposed development, should be wide enough to preserve the open aspect currently enjoyed by residents. When asked what potential land use they would like to see on HS13, out of 15 options available the three most popular choices were (1st) A Nature Reserve to protect local landscape and wildlife, (2nd) New green spaces for community use eg Parks and playing fields, and (3rd) Land for tree planting and enhancing biodiversity. Residents would like further details as to the ongoing management and maintenance of a Country Park, its financial sustainability and legal ownership. They greatly value the amenity of the open countryside and the easy access onto it via well used public rights of way and other longstanding routes. The residents of Ordsall value the landscape in which the community sits, and enjoy the natural environment around them. The development of the open land to the south of Ordsall was only supported by 65 residents, 13.1% of the total respondents. Policy ST29: Sec 4. a) Make provision for public realm improvements in Ordsall Local Centre ... This is particularly welcome. The Local Centre is extremely well used, and parking continues to be an issue for both nearby residents and for those using the shops and services. Investment in improvements, coupled with new facilities within HS13 to serve the immediate needs of its residents, will be a positive gain for Ordsall. Doubts remain, however, as to whether a second local centre would be sustainable, given the close proximity of the newer Ordsall local centre to the preexisting and long established Ordsall local centre. Local residents have concerns over the capacity of the local Primary school being exceeded if HS13 is developed. Anecdotal evidence from those using the school suggest that although 'basic need' provision maybe adequate for current use, the capacity within school for assemblies, dining, PE, Drama etc is already stretched. Growth in pupil numbers requires more than desks in classrooms if children are to experience a full curriculum. Type of Homes: Survey responses show support for the suggested mix of housing types with Sheltered homes and bungalows being particularly popular. However, most people do not want to see a development of 800 on the site. 67% would prefer to see a development of under 100 homes, with only 20 people supported a development of 800. Overall, 20% are in favour to some extent of seeing HS13 coming forward for development, 23% are unsure, and 57% oppose all development on this site.</p> <p>Conclusion: There are clearly some potential benefits to the inclusion of HS13 in the local plan. However, there are obvious concerns around the impact on existing services, infrastructure, the natural environment including flooding, and traffic. Whilst there is some provision in the plan to mitigate the impact of development, and some potential gains for the local community, there is anxiety that what is promised is not always what is delivered. Further, the lack of employment opportunity with easy reach of Retford, and the policies promoting Retford as a retirement enclave cannot be supported. On balance, we do not support the bringing forward of HS13 into the Bassetlaw Local Plan.</p>	<p>The strategy for the Local Plan proposed improvements to transport infrastructure more widely including the potential for a new railway station at the Bassetlaw Garden Village, improved bus services and walking and cycling infrastructure. This will help the community access jobs and services in a more sustainable way.</p> <p>The Council have considered the responses to the local survey that was undertaken. This information has been useful and has helped inform the proposals for the site and the revised policy.</p> <p>The proposals for the site include a comprehensive and sustainable development that includes a mix of housing types and tenures, new services and facilities, green spaces, a county park, new wildlife habitats, flood prevention measures and transport infrastructure.</p> <p>The development will be phased alongside the provision of new or improved infrastructure over the plan period.</p>
REF182	Anglian Water	SUPPORT Anglian Water is the water undertaker for Retford and has no objection to the principle of residential development on this site.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.

REF207	Resident	<p>The main concern with this proposal is the risk of flooding, the land between Marsh Lane and Bankside has natural springs and as the name Marsh Lane suggests is marshy and floods. Over recent years there are several times each year when our gardens are underwater and with more land built on this will only increase. Currently the footpath is not accessible as it is under water. The footpath was initially for parishioners to go between Ordsall Church and Eaton Church; it was not designed for the constant use of walkers, runners and cyclists as a consequence this is being eroded and destroying the lawned area of the gardens this passes through. This is the current situation without the proposed building of more housing. The wildlife in this area is wide and varied, listed below which have concerns will be lost, not listed the normal wildlife which can be found. Bats, Barn Owls, Little Owls, Buzzards, Lapwings, Sparrow Hawks, Frogs, Toads, Hares, Foxes, Deer There used to be Kingfishers along the dyke but due to the constant flooding have been lost. I walk, run and cycle in the area but don't feel safe at times due to the amount and speed of the traffic which will only increase. There have been many incidents recently and in some places such as Eaton there are not even footpaths. Have the residents in Eaton been made aware of this proposal as the increased traffic will be going through their village. There are 2 old narrow bridges one entering Ordsall from London Road and the other in Eaton. The one in Ordsall is sometimes closed due to flooding and the one in Eaton closed due to traffic accidents and the need for repairs If the planning does go ahead the housing should be for the high end market to attract money and investors to the area.</p>	<p>The Council has prepared a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (Level 2) for this site. It recognises the risk of surface water flooding to the area and provides recommendations on how the development could reduce the threat of surface water runoff from the site into neighbouring residential areas. This includes flood mitigation measures such as sustainable drainage systems and onsite water storage. The provision of green infrastructure such as the country park will also provide opportunities for water storage.</p> <p>Any development at Ordsall South will have to demonstrate that it will not increase the risk of surface water flooding on the site or to nearby areas.</p>
REF197	Resident	how long will the subsidised bus service run for? Will it run at times allowing people who work in Retford's retail and hospitality sectors to get to and from work?	This will be dealt with at the planning application stage and form part of a legal agreement. The development will occur in a number of phases so any contributions towards infrastructure will also be phased appropriately.
REF201	Severn Trent	<p>Severn Trent are generally supportive of Policy 29, in particular the reference to the use of SuDS within bullet point 1.d).</p> <p>Recommend that there is a reference to the drainage hierarchy. The site is situated on a ridge line, but both the east and west boundaries of the site are indicated to be adjacent to watercourses, therefore no connection of surface water to the sewerage network shall be permitted. It is vital that this is picked up within a site wide drainage strategy, so that development is not delivered in small parcels that are not able to utilise a sustainable outfall. Severn Trent would recommend that Water Efficiency design and Water re-use is outlined within policy 29 to ensure that development is carried out in a sustainable way, making the most of the resources available. Recommend that the 110 l/h/d water efficiency standard is incorporated to ensure that developers understand that what is expected from them from the outset. Ordsall South is located within a Source Protection Zone (SPZ), please refer to the Protection of Groundwater sources section of our response.</p>	These recommendations have been included within the revised Policy for Ordsall South.
1666086	Resident	This has to be the most ridiculous suggestion of all. The road infrastructure is insufficient to cope with the current new housing never mind adding to it with such large development. No mention of a new school, have any of your officers ever visited Ordsall Primary at the beginning and end of a school day? It is carnage. The houses from this new development would presumably want to access Retford town centre via the south entrance to the town. The bridges over the river Idle at Ordsall and Eaton are narrow and unsuitable for heavy traffic, the bridge at Eaton is single lane only and has been damaged several times in recent years. Parked cars on the High Street in Ordsall mean it can be slow and difficult to travel along so I am not sure why traffic calming measures are needed?	The Council has prepared a Transport Assessment for Retford which looks at the existing traffic issues and provides recommendations to improve the road network through new development. This includes both onsite and offsite road improvements to Ordsall and Eaton.
1668443	Resident	The land this is being planned for is often waterlogged. How will this effect and already very low water pressure? The view from my garden, which was the reason we purchased our home, will be destroyed,	The revised Policy for Ordsall South will incorporate mitigation measures for flooding and drainage measures.
1669723	Resident	Would like to know how you plan to integrate at least 1200 cars onto the roads in Ordsall. At the moment it's very difficult to cross the roads particularly near the site of the planned build and on Ollerton Road. It's fine to say you will improve the roundabouts but what about the roads leading to the said roundabouts. And if you do a country park where will all the traffic go. Will you also build the infrastructure at the same time as the house building or will we have to petition for them after the building finishes like with the crossing outside the school by Persimmon. Understand this land has already been purchased by builders if this why you change plans to build at Bevercotes traffic wise this would have been much better.	The Council has prepared a Transport Assessment for Retford which looks at the existing traffic issues and provides recommendations to improve the road network through new development. This includes both onsite and offsite road improvements to Ordsall and Eaton.

1670177	Resident	<p>As a resident of Ordsall, object to the proposal for 800 houses to be built in "Ordsall South" on the outskirts of the built up area. Disagree with the statement in the draft plan that this would be a "sustainable and wellintegrated" development as it is outside the established boundaries of Ordsall, which were already extended into the countryside by recent building off Ollerton Road. The number of houses proposed would overwhelm and dramatically change the character of Ordsall, which is still absorbing the new developments on the former Bridon Ropes site and elsewhere. Unavoidably, the "Green Gap to Eaton" will be reduced, significantly affecting the access of Ordsall and Retford residents to open countryside. There is very little consideration of the aspiration in the Plan for "biodiversity net gain" with no detail on a "country park" and a "green buffer" and feel this development would reduce the "easier access to better quality green space" described in the "Spatial Strategy: Green and Healthy". The increase in traffic from a development of this large size would lead to large increase in congestion on the narrow local roads, insufficiently considered in sections 7.14.12 and 7.14.13. For example, work on the roundabouts will not improve this situation and would lead to Ollerton Road/Jockey House Lane being used even more often as a "rat run" to access the A1 than occurs at present. The risk of flooding in Retford from the Idle river would be increased by runoff from building on Flood Zone 1 land adjacent to areas acknowledged to be in Flood Zone 2 and 3. These fields by the river flood regularly at present and the amount of water would increase. Object to this proposal for too large a development, in the wrong place on a green field site with a severely detrimental impact on Ordsall and the other communities south of Retford.</p>	<p>The Council is required, by National Planning Policy, to plan for more homes across the District. To do this in a sustainable and reasonable manner, the Council has undertaken a series of detailed evidence base. Firstly, it is looked at the amount and type of housing and employment development that is needed over the plan period. This is then distributed around the District in accordance with local need and infrastructure constraints. For Retford, as the District's second largest settlement, it is important it takes its fair share – particularly as there is high-demand for housing within the town.</p> <p>As part of the process, the Council looks at the availability and suitability of land around the town. There are some areas where existing natural or infrastructure constraints are too significant to warrant development. These tend to be within areas where there are historical, environmental or flooding issues. The Council prioritises the use of brownfield land where possible and there are recent examples of this in Retford such as the developments on former industrial areas at Thrumpton Lane. However, there isn't enough suitable brownfield land within Retford to take the required housing growth. Therefore greenfield land is required. Ordsall South is located directly adjoining the existing built form of Retford and provides an opportunity to deliver a sustainable urban extension which includes land for new homes, affordable housing, shops and services, sport facilities and a new country park to provide recreational and environmental benefit.</p> <p>Where development requires improvements to infrastructure such as Transport or flooding, then these will form part of the development requirement within the relevant policy. These are also identified within the Council Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
1670113	Resident	<p>Believe that with building these houses the road network in Ordsall will not cope. Currently Goosemore bridge is old and even struggles for large vehicles. Eaton bridge to the east is weight limited so your putting up to 800 houses increasing capacity in a small village and not upgrading road networks. Recipe for disaster. Strongly oppose the plans</p>	<p>The Council has prepared a Transport Assessment for Retford which looks at the existing traffic issues and provides recommendations to improve the road network through new development. This includes both onsite and offsite road improvements to Ordsall and Eaton.</p>
1670841	Resident	<p>The land in first hand experience is already wet to the point that in mid summer, tractors cannot pass over a large area around the middle of the field, due to sinking of their axles. And putting 800 houses on said field with 800 roofs catching water will no doubt increase the flooding potential of the area around us. With the new potential houses there could be up to and more than 1600 more vehicles on inadequate surrounding roads. And recent history tells us all that developers will soon rid themselves of planned obligations to financially contribute to surrounding highways. And the plan to turn beautiful existing countryside with existing walks into a man made country park with walks on footpaths and cycle routes? Terrible thinking. Would building more houses at the planned site Bassatlaw Garden Village be a far more realistic, safer, and above all a better option due to the planned houses being built are obviously aimed at people not from this area and are no doubts commuting using the A1.</p>	<p>The Council has prepared a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (Level 2) for this site. It recognises the risk of surface water flooding to the area and provides recommendations on how the development could reduce the threat of surface water runoff from the site into neighbouring residential areas. This includes flood mitigation measures such as sustainable drainage systems and onsite water storage. The provision of green infrastructure such as the country park will also provide opportunities for water storage.</p> <p>To address traffic and transport, the Council has prepared a Transport Assessment for Retford which looks at the existing traffic issues and provides recommendations to improve the road network through new development. This includes both onsite and offsite road improvements to Ordsall and Eaton.</p>

1671151	Resident	<p>The number of houses proposed for Ordsall South (800) is far too high. The arterial routes into Retford from these roads will place an enormous burden on Ordsall Road, and the combined traffic from the Ordsall South and Garden Village on Babworth Road, Hospital Road and Ordsall Road are in excess of what a small undeveloped road can take. Small improvements to the mini roundabout on Babworth Road will not mitigate this. Babworth Road serves a primary school and 2 secondary schools and yet there is no safe cycle route on Hospital Road. Some areas within Bassetlaw have better developed road systems which are much more suitable. The sharing out of the housing requirement does not reflect the prior development spending on these areas or the suitability of sites, putting a higher burden on areas which have not benefited from infrastructure spending. I would like to see a much lower assignment of houses to Ordsall South, due to the large number of houses already planned for the Garden Village at five lane ends.</p>	<p>The Council has prepared a Transport Assessment for Retford which looks at the existing traffic issues and provides recommendations to improve the road network through new development. This includes both onsite and offsite road improvements to Ordsall and Eaton.</p> <p>Existing health and education provision can be accommodated within existing facilities. However, an area of land has been safeguarded on the site for future social infrastructure if it is required.</p>
1671525	Resident	<p>Object to the proposal being considered further in its current form. The reasons for this are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It would appear that part of the housing in this proposal is to be built on land believed to be at risk of flooding. 2. No consideration has been taken into account of the infrastructure required to service this proposal. 3. The local road infrastructure will not support this proposal in its current form. 4. No account appears to have been taken of the effects that this will have on other nearby villages such as Eaton, Gamston and Elkesley such as increased traffic, noise and pollution. 	<p>Existing infrastructure capacity has been assessed through the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan evidence base. Various detailed assessments have been undertaken to investigate local issues such as flooding and traffic. These help to understand existing issues and identify appropriate mitigation for development where it is required.</p> <p>Any required infrastructure improvement form part of the revised Policy for the site or through other policies within the Local Plan.</p>
1669725	Resident	<p>How are you going to integrate at least 1200 cars on the roads in Ordsall? It is hard at present trying to cross the roads particularly near the proposed site and all along Ollerton Road. It is alright saying you are going to improve the roundabouts but what about the road leading up to said roundabouts? Why do we need a country park bringing again more traffic when Climber Ruffled and Sherwood are so close by? Will the infrastructure be built alongside the house build or will we have to petition as we did with the crossing outside the school? Understand the land has already been purchased by builders is this why you changed from Bevercotes to Ordsall? Would have thought Bevercotes would have been the better option?</p>	<p>The Council has prepared a Transport Assessment for Retford which looks at the existing traffic issues and provides recommendations to improve the road network through new development. This includes both onsite and offsite road improvements to Ordsall and Eaton. Other assessment look at other parts of the District and assess the impacts of all proposed development on the road network include those between Retford and Worksop.</p> <p>The location of the Garden Village has changed due to impacts to protected ground nesting birds at Bevercotes. The proposed location at Morton has less planning constraints and is closer to both Worksop, Retford and has the potential to provide wider infrastructure improvements such as a new railway station.</p>

1671392	Resident	<p>object to the element of the plan which covers the area where I live.</p> <p>1. Principle of the development The proposal is to create 800 new homes in Ordsall. This is a massive development and will hugely change the area. This would be a massive development in any area in fact and the numerous impacts should be fully considered. Although there are government requirements in terms of development, nowhere is there an expectation that such a large number of properties are placed in a single area. Smaller developments should be considered across the region.</p> <p>2. Transport and accessibility Ordsall is currently accessed via 4 main routes. Two of these have the same basic source (Babworth road), one comes across a very narrow bridge at Goosemoor and the final access route is via narrow and unlit country lanes from the A1 and Eaton. None of these roads are suitable for significant increase in traffic that would be caused by a development of 800 homes. Average car ownership per household in the East Midlands is 1.33, so this could result in over 1000 additional cars using these 4 access roads. The roads currently are barely adequate for existing usage and the additional level with significantly impact on travel times, congestion and pollution. Given the narrow bridges and roads and the fact that the access roads pass a primary school there will be an increased risk of accidents. As we have seen, any incidents on the A1 sends a significant increase of traffic through Ordsall and any road closures of the existing routes, due to roadworks or flooding, causes gridlock. Significantly increasing the number of cars in the area can only make this worse. Whilst there are hopes that public transport links can mitigate this, the reality is that the current public transport links don't mitigate the current issues and proportionate increases will be unlikely to impact positively. Education East Midlands area averages just over 2 children per household. Allowing for the intended 160 homes for older residents, this would suggest an additional 1200 children at various ages will be new to the area. There is not going to be sufficient capacity in the current schools to accommodate this and there is no sign of additional education provision in the plan.</p> <p>Shopping There are currently 3 general stores in south Ordsall, a couple of pubs, a takeaway, a chemist and a hairdresser. The shops are generally busy and have inadequate parking for their customers. A significant increase in custom is likely to make this far worse, increasing the risk of accidents and pollution. Whilst the current plans allow for some retail development it remains to be seen how viable these are.</p> <p>Employment The plan anticipates increased employment resulting from the development. This "build it, they will come" notion is ill conceived and unrealistic. Retford has had significant additional property development int he past few years (in Ordsall at the Bridon site for instance) without there being any significant local employment. There is nothing to suggest that the new development will have greater impact. If that is the case the occupants of the new properties will be commuters either entirely by car or by train or bus. This will increase traffic flow at the pinch points at rush hour times.</p> <p>Drainage There is already a significant drainage problem with the proposed development land, as I write this they are significantly waterlogged and the river idle is subject to flood warnings. Increased development will significantly increase runoff into the river and will result in downriver flooding.</p> <p>Wildlife In the fields subject to the proposed development have seen all manner of wildlife including deer, foxes, rabbits, kestrels, insects. These will inevitably be pushed further afield by the development. The proposed development will have a serious detrimental impact on Ordsall and therefore object to this part of the plan.</p>	<p>The Council is required, by National Planning Policy, to plan for more homes across the District. To do this in a sustainable and reasonable manner, the Council has undertook a series of detailed evidence base. Firstly, it is looked at the amount and type of housing and employment development that is needed over the plan period. This is then distributed around the District in accordance with local need and infrastructure constraints. For Retford, as the District's second largest settlement, it is important it takes its fair share – particularly as there is high-demand for housing within the town.</p> <p>The Council has produced a Transport assessment for Retford which looks at existing traffic issues and provides recommendations for development in terms of mitigating any adverse impact it proposes.</p> <p>Similarly, a Flood Risk Assessment has looked at existing flooding a drainage issues and provided recommendations for improvements. Particularly towards surface water runoff and the provision of onsite water storage facilities.</p> <p>The development will incorporate a new Local Centre within the development which will provide opportunities for local retail, community space and businesses to establish.</p> <p>In addition land has been safeguarded on site for future social infrastructure such as health and education if it is required.</p>
---------	----------	--	---

REF066	Resident	<p>As a resident of Eaton, very concerned about the impact of the Ordsall South development on the volume of traffic through the village. There is no mention of this in the plan, which seems to take the view that people will only travel locally. However given the current high volume of traffic through the Eaton, know that many people who live in Ordsall or to the worksop side of eaton and surrounding areas use the road through Eaton to access the A638 to travel to Markham Moor to access the A1 for work or other purposes (including to go to McDonalds as evidenced by the volume of takeaway litter along the road through Eaton and along Ollerton Road). See traffic increasing for access to Rampton and the power stations and then we have traffic from Markham moor side of the A638 using eaton as a cut through for Ranby prison and also for employment in Worksop. This is currently the fastest route for Ordsall residents to access the A1 southbound rather than the Elkesley Bridge or Apleyhead junctions. Why go the long way, on a road that is badly pot holed and no street lighting , when a direct route is available . This will be exacerbated if a further 800 dwellings were to be built to the south of Ordsall, not only with regard to the number of people with cars travelling to and from the development, but also the volume of deliveries to residents. The road and bridge are too narrow to accommodate the current levels of traffic, we have parking issues due to volumes of people using the river for dog walking and general recreational purposes and the issue is made worse given that there is no path through the main part of the village meaning that pedestrians have to walk along the road. Already worried about this have serious concerns we have a serious accident waiting to happen, and a parish council that does not appear to see how big an issue this is, and that the problems will get far worse if the development is approved.</p>	<p>The Council has prepared a Transport Assessment for Retford which looks at the existing traffic issues and provides recommendations to improve the road network through new development. This includes both onsite and offsite road improvements to Ordsall and Eaton.</p>
REF039	Resident	<p>800 homes at Ordsall South is a very large housing development which will have a great and permanent impact on the neighbourhood, local environment and amenities etc. It is disappointing to learn projects of such size are even being considered let alone proposed in modern times and believe the effects of such will only be negative for the area and environment. It is concerning how such large scale changes to areas and peoples lives can be made by the decisions of relatively few people. The Bassetlaw area has seen much growth in recent years, with many new housing developments already built in and around Retford and Worksop. These continue rapidly in some areas such as Gateford and Shireoaks and clearly many more planned. There is a clear approach to increased urbanisation with little thought to the long term consequence of current policy. Live in unprecedeted times with great changes ahead with regard to how we live, work and travel. The need for traditional urban areas for shopping and office space is declining rapidly as the need for open natural space increases which will likely create opportunities for repurposing and potential for much more decent quality residential areas to replace some urban areas, with all facilities close by. This will be more apparent in larger towns and cities countrywide. Am an Ordsall resident and am concerned the traffic on Main St is already busy at peak times and any planned alterations (traffic calming etc) will only be negative for residents. There are at least 4 long term empty homes close to ours and question how many more in the Bassetlaw area. What is being done to reduce these empty properties and look at other resourcefully efficient ways to increase homes in the area without further building on open land. Question the need for such rapid growth (highlighted by some official comments) and believe this to be more about commercial/political progress than a genuine need for housing. A measured approach of multiple, small scale plans spread across the region, would surely have a lesser and fairer impact. Any future development on open farmland should always be kept to a minimum with much greater emphasis on the natural environment and the look and feel of the area. This has to become a priority with undeniable evidence of natural and environmental decline worldwide (there were Skylarks in these fields last summer, now in rapid decline due to habitat loss like so many other species). There are a number of open footpaths on the site with far-reaching views which, even if retained would become closed urban stile alleys and loose most of there appeal for people and nature. This again, will only be negative. Other developments nearby do not sit well in the landscape, especially when viewed from the southern approach to Retford. A much larger tree planting scheme should become the norm, which should effectively cloak the development and in time contribute to woodland and biodiversity to have a positive impact on the area, rather than another bland very large housing plan which will likely do the opposite.</p>	<p>The Bassetlaw Local plan has been progressing for a few years and has been evolving over that time. The Council has to considered a series of options across the District and then provide a strategy on how the growth is to be delivered.</p> <p>Additional growth is a requirement by National Planning Policy and it is the Councils responsibility to distribute that growth accordingly across the District.</p> <p>For Retford the strategy involves allocating both brownfield and Greenfield Land. This largely because there isn't enough brownfield land to accommodate Retford's need.</p> <p>These sites have been considered alongside other options but provide the most sustainable option for the plan.</p> <p>In addition, assessments on local infrastructure capacity have also taken place to determine whether additional provision is needed as part of the developments.</p>

REF070	Resident	<p>As a resident who has lived adjacent to open country side for 36 years fear for the wildlife that could be lost due to this development. Appreciate the need for housing also feel the need for our bio diversity in the form of many species of birds, hedgehogs, frogs , toads, butterflies, bees and may other species that are reliant on the established hedgerows that adorn the proposed area. Would like to see that a green corridor of a considerable size is made available for the protection of our wildlife along the hedgerows that lead from ollerton road up past the houses that already back on to the fields and who already have many species of wildlife in the hedgerows and gardens feel in the 21st century with the emphasis being on climate change and bio diversity that this should be an intrinsic need in the planning of such a big area. propose at least a 20 metre green corridor alongside the gardens off glen eagles way</p>	<p>A development of this scale must provide a net-gain in biodiversity. The development will incorporate a significant level of green infrastructure which will provide habitats for local wildlife and recreational benefits for the community.</p> <p>These will be supported by a network of new green corridors and walking and cycling opportunities that will help connect the green spaces and areas of the site together.</p>
REF072	Resident	<p>As a resident and a Parish Councillor of Eaton extremely concerned about this proposed development NOW even though it is not due to commence until 2027. Appreciate that Bassetlaw District Council is being encouraged by the Government to provide an enormous amount of new housing in the next 16 years. However consider that this rate is almost double what is required using the Government's recommended method of calculation. This is supposedly justified by employment growth which is expected to result in substantially increased inwards migration. Have reservations about the scale of the increase in employment planned for and consider that it is enormously over-ambitious. The scale of house-building proposed in the Ordsall South proposal seems excessive and suggest that this proposed site should be totally abandoned. Have considerable reservations about this development in terms of: - Additional traffic would produce an enormous amount of additional traffic putting local roads under even more stress than at present. There is limited scope to improve the existing road system and progressively to accommodate the upgrading of these routes. There are 2 old bridges at Ordsall and Eaton which are very narrow and cannot cope with the amount of traffic passing through each village/settlement in 2021. Recently Notts Highways/Via have been involved in devising and enhancing existing traffic measures in Eaton following instances of speeding and antisocial behaviour. Even with recent improvements introduced this has only had a negligible impact in terms of controlling the speed and volume of vehicles using the village as a 'cut-through' from major 'A' roads. The mini-roundabouts at the north end of Ordsall and at Whitehouses are even now exceptionally congested with no opportunity to make alternative new/enhanced roadways for the proposed Ordsall South development. - Cyclist and pedestrian usage Improvements for cycle traffic may be difficult to achieve without restricting much-needed kerbside parking. As there is only a very small area with a pavement, anybody walking in or through Eaton has to negotiate an increasing number of dangerously driven vehicles cannot walk in the village. There is no way that this situation could be improved as the existing road through the village is so narrow. - Additional facilities If the Ordsall development goes ahead, there must be arrangements in place to secure the funding and provision of all the additional retail, health and community facilities. understand that the proposed school as mentioned in the Plan has been abandoned thus putting much pressure on existing school provision becoming overloaded and disrupted whilst further expansion takes place. Usually the health, educational, infrastructural facilities appertaining to a new residential site are not built until the housing programme is well-developed so yet again existing residents would have to suffer with over-used facilities and services until Bassetlaw Council provides the supporting services. Over a period from 2027 to 2038 this could result in absolute chaos. - Protection of Rural countryside Strikes me that Bassetlaw Council is more prepared to satisfy Government targets than to ensure that the residents of Ordsall and such villages as Eaton and Gamston enjoy healthy and pleasant lives in areas of open countryside and agricultural land. If the scale of house-building in the Retford and District part of the Draft Plan was reduced, perhaps there would be no need for the 800 houses to be added to Ordsall. This development would not become a blot on the surrounding countryside causing immeasurable challenges to local road networks, services and most importantly the indigenous population. Appreciate that some local communities have to suffer in order for major residential developments as suggested in this Draft Plan. Would be MORE SENSIBLE for the Council to increase the number of houses to be built in the Bassetlaw Garden Village as the infrastructure would already exist and could be tied in with the proposed development. This would be preferable to tagging a huge residential development on to the southern area of Retford where there are insufficient services and an unviable road infrastructure. It brings to mind the saying that the Ordsall South development would be 'Like a carbuncle on the face of an old friend!'</p>	<p>The Council has produced a Transport Assessment for Retford which identifies existing traffic issues and provides recommendations for development in terms of mitigation required.</p> <p>For Eaton, there are traffic calming and preventative measures as part of the mitigation package.</p> <p>The site will provide new infrastructure in terms of homes, local services, public transport and green spaces. The green spaces will provide significant opportunities for wildlife and recreation.</p> <p>Flood Management proposals are also being incorporated.</p> <p>Existing education and health provision can accommodate the proposed development. However, an area of land has been safeguarded on site for social infrastructure such as health and education facilities if they're required in the future.</p>

REF082	Resident	<p>Having participated in the on line event regarding Ordsall South yesterday evening it was apparent that there is very little detail forthcoming. No doubt this is because the plans are not yet drawn/submitted by developers. What was apparent the lack of an up to date understanding of this part of Ordsall/Retford. General questions submitted were not answered in my opinion and the impression from the facilitator was that this development is a fait accomplis regardless of what local residents concerns and objections are. Hope that this is not the case and BDC are not wasting mine and others' time. It was disappointing not to have been able to view the introduction to the on line event. This was apparently due to a technical hitch. Sure we were told it would be sent on to us. Nothing ever arrived. Received an email response in regards to the questions asked on the online consultations. Many questions again were not answered sufficiently and merely deferred to further further transport studies etc. This information would be imperative from the outset. What has also become apparent is that many local residents are completely unaware of these plans. Fastening notices to the odd lamppost is not a particularly effective way of drawing attention to this development taking into account we have been in some kind of lockdown for months. Not many people are out and about to see the odd notice that's been put up. Not everyone uses social media nor read the local magazine which contained a short article. Maybe a more effective way would be to write to each household in Ordsall and inform residents seeing as this plan will affect most if not all of them in one way or another. Either you want a consultation in the true sense and engage with the local residents or you don't.</p>	<p>The consultation in January introduced the principle of development at this site. As the Local plan process proceeds, more detail will become available. The proposed consultation over the summer, will provide residents with up to date information about the proposed layout and evidence base such as infrastructure, transport and flooding.</p> <p>The Council is hoping that through the easing of lockdown measure, it can hold a series of public events in the community.</p>
REF082	Resident	<p>Live in a road overlooking the fields planned for this 800 house development and to say am disappointed with the plan to build here is an understatement. Moved here five years ago after 30+ years living on the outskirts of London. My intention being to retire to my rural roots. You can call this Nimbyism if you wish but do not personally wish to be swamped by a massive housing estate and all of the issues that will bring to this area. TRAFFIC/HIGHWAYS - the proposed site has one road in and one road out along Ollerton Road/West Hill Road. One direction towards Ordsall and Retford (an alternative route via a narrow and already busy High Street/All Hallows Street/Goosemoor Bridge) the other towards the A1 and Elkesley. This is a country road and doubt would manage an increase in through traffic which will be generated by an 800 house development. There is already an issue with speeding motorists coming into Ordsall along this route despite there being clearly displayed 30mph signs and a warning matrix on the way into Ordsall. The same for the route over Goosemoore Bridge. When asked how traffic would be managed safely, the response was that the mini roundabout at Babworth would be updated and possibly a oneway system through the High Street! A high street that is narrow with dangerously narrow pavements already and used as a cut through/race track by local boy/girl racers. So one suggestion (a one way system) will create a nice circuit for these idiots to use. Without any doubt Eaton village would be another cut through. A small village with a small country road leading to it and through it. This will cause significant issues running through the village. The ridge in Eaton has been hit a number of times and was faulty recently repaired. There has already been one fatality in recent months. Any increase in traffic will undoubtedly increase the risk of more. Both Ordsall and Eaton have small bridges that will struggle to cope with a rise in traffic volume. Both areas flood regularly and often render the roads impassable and are therefore closed to traffic. Closures of the A1/M1 north and southbound result in traffic being diverted through Retford on a regular basis. This causes complete gridlock. What are the contingencies for this? Ordsall is often the only route in and out! This will only get worse with an increased volume of traffic from the new development. More traffic also equates to poor environment through exhaust emissions etc. Again not good for local residents to have to endure. More danger to residents in terms of accidents causing serious injury or fatality. FLOODING - it is well known that Ordsall is prone to flooding in particular the High Street and Goosemore Lane both of which are often closed to traffic for days or weeks on end due to flood water. In fact on old maps these areas are described as marshes so clearly have flooded for centuries. The fields/ditches to the east side of Bank Side have flooded three times in the last five years. They have in the last week flooded again and it's only December. This has encroached on the footpath bisecting the gardens on Bank Side along with the adjacent field making it impassable for much of the footpath. This has prevented it from being used or those having the will to trudge through the shin deep water have been forced into the adjacent fields. There are natural springs running down the fields adjacent Bank Side which already cause saturated ground in that area, draining into the ditches. Where will this water be diverted when the fields (marshland/flood plain) is already saturated/flooded? No amount of pipe work or drainage is going to deal with the additional run off water. There is nowhere else for it to go other than already saturated ground. Come and have a look at the fields adjacent to Bank Side at present if you need any convincing. Concrete, tarmac and paving this area will only compound the issue. Suggest that you have a look at the fields between Bank Side and the River Idle and the extent of the flooding at present. We</p>	<p>The Council is required, by National Planning Policy, to plan for more homes across the District. To do this in a sustainable and reasonable manner, the Council has undertaken a series of detailed evidence base. Firstly, it is looked at the amount and type of housing and employment development that is needed over the plan period. This is then distributed around the District in accordance with local need and infrastructure constraints. For Retford, as the District's second largest settlement, it is important it takes its fair share – particularly as there is high-demand for housing within the town.</p> <p>As part of the process, the Council looks at the availability and suitability of land around the town. There are some areas where existing natural or infrastructure constraints are too significant to warrant development. These tend to be within areas where there are historical, environmental or flooding issues. The Council prioritises the use of brownfield land where possible and there are recent examples of this in Retford such as the developments on former industrial areas at Thrumpton Lane. However, there isn't enough suitable brownfield land within Retford to take the required housing growth. Therefore greenfield land is required. Ordsall South is located directly adjoining the existing built form of Retford and provides an opportunity to deliver a sustainable urban extension which includes land for new homes, affordable housing, shops and services, sport facilities and a new country park to provide recreational and environmental benefit.</p> <p>Existing employment area of the town have been protected for such uses and some are expanding such as Randall Way off North Road.</p> <p>Retford has a good train service to other destinations and therefore provides the opportunity for residents to travel further afield for employment in a sustainable manner.</p>

		<p>are only in the middle of January. Imagine what this area will be like in March! This is becoming an increasingly frequent occurrence. No amount of drainage is going to be able to deal with this volume of water. It has nowhere to go!</p> <p>WILDLIFE/ENVIRONMENT - there is a good variety of flora and fauna supported by the fields, remaining woodland, hedges and River Idle. Have ducks, swans, frogs, toads, newt, a wide variety of garden and farmland birds, herons, egrets, red kites, buzzards, sparrow hawks, kestrels, bats (need proof feel free to pay me a visit on summer evenings), badgers, deer, foxes, rabbits etc are all supported by our current environment. Stealing more land will severely effect their ability to survive going forward. Creating a "country park" and a "wetlands area" is no replacement for natural environments. Gradually eroding our nature by developing in these areas by removing hedges, fields and trees. We already have a wetlands area due to the significant flooding.</p> <p>It is of note that during the first COVID lockdown and more recently lockdown 3, there was an increase in footfall utilising the footpaths in and around this area. This caused a significant amount of damage to footpaths, farmers' fields and river banks with discarded litter being an issue too. An increase in the local population is going to compound this issue. The amount of plastic bottles, food wrappers, plastic bags, clothing and dog muck was beyond a joke. This is without doubt going to increase in the years to come. Don't want to live on the edge of such an area. Lost count of the number of times cleared up litter that has been left by inconsiderate individuals. Currently the footpaths in the area are under water due to the flooding. Something that happens with in reading regularity.</p> <p>CURRENT RESIDENTIAL AREAS - living on the Bank Side/Farm View estate have a safe area to live and peace and quiet. There is a good mixture of older and younger residents. Access/egress is via Farm View. Any increase in traffic would devastate this small estate. There is a suggestion that access to the new development would be via Bank Side. How do you intend to compensate residents for the damage and reduction in property value this will cause?</p> <p>SERVICES - A development of 800 dwellings will draw a population of some 2,000 to 3,000 people. Services in BDC, NHS, NCC etc are already stretched. Judging by the potholes in the road your stretched services will be even more stretched. How do you intend to provide for this extra capacity without reducing services for current residents? No such services will be included in this new development. What services will be made available or improved upon for current residents? It is my understanding that this area had been put forward for development as it is a 20 minute walk into Retford. Now unless you are intending to have 50k Olympic race walkers moving into this new development then there is no way on this earth that anyone will be able to make that distance in 20 minutes. This is a fallacy. Also how many people do you think are going to be encouraged on to a bicycle? Think you need a bit of a reality check. Have the other housing estates encouraged a greater uptake of cycling? Like to see the statistics! A few questions would like answered</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> What safeguards are in place to ensure that developers complete the estate that authority is given for. Developers promise the earth and rarely deliver what are in the plans eg The Brambles estate in Retford. Allegedly large sums of money change hands to allow developers to get out of clauses! What services are going to be provided/improved to current Ordsall residents? What will be the increase in council tax to pay for this? How will you compensate me for loss of value on my property and disruption to my environment in terms of pollutants and noise? How will BDC ensure current services are not stretched further? What employment/businesses have been brought into Retford from the numerous estates that have been built over the last five years? How many dwellings one recently built are currently vacant? How will you pay for an increase in the need for policing? Notts Police are already stretched. What consultation has taken place with the Environment Agency and NRA? A development of this size will devastate this area and it will not be an improvement. There are numerous housing estates that have been built around Retford and only one actually fits in with the town itself. That being Blossom Grove. The remainder stand out like a sore thumb. Stand alone housing estates do not create a harmonious community. Retford is at serious risk of becoming a soulless commuter town for workers travelling to the big cities for their employment. <p>A housing estate of this size will severely effect the countryside and its plants and animals. It will be hugely detrimental to the plants and animals. It will place a huge pressure on local roads and infrastructure in this whole area. These roads are country roads, not London Road or North Road. They will not cope with the huge increase in traffic</p>	<p>The development will incorporate a significant level of new and improved green spaces and walking and cycling infrastructure that will provide space for wildlife and for recreation by the community.</p> <p>Where development requires improvements to infrastructure such as Transport or flooding, then these will form part of the development requirement within the relevant policy. These are also identified within the Council Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
REF100	Resident	As a resident of Eaton can only envisage more and more traffic coming - at speed - through the village if this building work goes ahead, even in the short term if fewer houses are built than the 800 envisaged. The main road through Eaton is already a rat run for commuters, putting extra strain on the historic bridge over the River Idle.	Traffic calming and preventative measures for Eaton village have been identified within the Retford Transport Assessment.

REF110	Resident	<p>Resident of Eaton and am strongly against the size of development laid out in this Draft for the extension to Ordsall however accept that some more restrictive development must be allowed. The complete lack of consideration to the effects this would have on the village of Eaton is inexcusable at this stage. The fact that a key policy on transport has not been included does not sit well with myself as it has been stated more than one infrastructure is the key to land allocation so how can this be omitted.</p>	<p>The Local Plan provides a strategic plan for the District. It recognises the importance of individual settlements through the provision of design and character. Eaton is considered a rural settlement and its character will be preserved through various policies within the Plan.</p>
REF110	Resident	<p>Item 2 it states (a) Deliver at least 800 dwellings during the plan period to 2037 My question is why is the words "at least" included? While accepting there is a justification for some development in the Retford area and the site at Ordsall south would be an obvious choice for a gradual and contained level of development 800 is way in excess for the time scale of this plan. 100 - 250 over the time would be more in keeping and would enable the integration and improvements to all infrastructures including waste, roads, schools and retail. The plan make reference to maintaining sightlines to the hamlet of Eaton but there is nothing in the plan that indicates Eaton would be protected from the development of Ordsall South. Would a large area be allocated for parking with in the area for visitors to the country park at Whisker Hill as you indicated you would like this to be a destination point with Bassetlaw ? and has consideration been given to the effects of the incoming traffic on the local roads. Item 3 point 4 Would it not be a better buffer if you consider moving the country park on HS13 to wrap round both the West and South Boundaries ensuring a softer break between agricultural land and Development ? Item 3 point 5 Have addressed parking for non residential development however following the complete lack of sufficient parking per household the development at Bridon which has caused issues with emergency services being unable to get can you ensure this is included in the masterplan. Item 5 point 2 How come there is no note of financial contribution to any traffic calming / management in the village of Eaton be it traffic lights at the narrow bridge or development of calming measures along the length of Main St. The fact this has been omitted cannot be down to the lack of the Transport Assessment as none of the point shown in this point should appear! Item 5 There is no reference to the bridges crossing the River Idle am sure with your local knowledge are not built to cope with either your plans of improved walking and cycling routes let alone the huge increase in traffic. Can you explore the possibilities, If this development was to go in its current format a feasibility study as to the merits of building a new road down Marsh lane and across to either Goosemoor or London roads to ensure your wish of a safe route to Retford town centre could be made by all users. Item 7.14.13 At what time in the process of this plan would you expect to see plans being put forward to improve the traffic using Ordsall High St along side pedestrians and cyclists it my concern</p>	<p>The term 'at least' applies to all allocated sites as issues to do with viability and delivery may change of the plan period. Ordsall South is a long term site due to its scale and the delivery of this site will be phased over the plan period.</p> <p>The development applies to the directly to the south of Ordsall up towards the Golf Corse. Vehicular access to the site will be via Ollerton Road which will form part of its improvements.</p> <p>Traffic and other impacts to infrastructure have been assessed and a number of recommended mitigation measures have been identified, including traffic calming and traffic preventative measures within Eaton village.</p> <p>Wider improvements to the network are also proposed along with improvements to walking and cycling infrastructure.</p>
REF161	Residents	<p>Concerned about the extent and positioning of the Ordsall South proposal: 1. The effect on surface water run off from the development on the River Idle and the flood plain. Doubts that the full extent of the impact on the local drainage and flooding will be appreciated. The River Idle has been in flood for some time and is already problematic threatening housing and transport on Goosemoor Lane. Climate change will certainly add to this and it is unlikely that the system will cope with further run off. The eastern area of the development bordering the dyke is currently again under flood; the flood plain and fields bordering Goosemoor Lane have not drained nearly all year following high rain levels last year and the ground remains saturated with expectation of further flooding. The culvert draining the dyke water into the river has been blocked for some time adding to the extent of the flooding. The information suggests that a flood management plan will be developed including best ways to manage surface water run off. Would have expected that before development plan approved that a robust flood management plan be in place. 2. The transport routes to the new development. Understand that the transport assessment (Bassetlaw Transport Study)concluded that there is no need for a new road to feed the development from the east and central Retford. The main centres to the east of Retford are and will be major areas for employment. Central Retford will still provide employment, entertainment, schooling and shopping. The transport will result in excessive traffic on Goosemoor Lane or through Eaton. Neither of these routes are suitable for additional usage. They are already dangerous roads with cars spreading and difficulties negotiating the bridges. It is inconceivable that this was not identified by the study.</p>	<p>The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment identifies that there are surface water runoff issues within the area. It recommends that the development incorporate sustainable urban drainage infrastructure as well as onsite water storage capacity which will be designed to hold water and prevent it from simply running off into the neighbourhood.</p> <p>The Retford Transport Assessment assessed the existing issues and traffic capacity on the road network and has provided a series of recommended highway mitigation measures as part of the development of the site. These include both onsite and offsite measures.</p>

REF176	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>It is recognised that the council has an obligation to build housing stock and that it makes sense to develop on a wide space of land, as opposed to several smaller areas. It is encouraging that much thought has gone into this development, with the aims that it should be a sustainable living environment with green space, including a country park, although further detail on who would be responsible for maintenance of the park is needed. There has been consideration to walking and cycling, which should be integrated within a wider network. Better cycling infrastructure is welcomed, however many residents in Ordsall need to use street parking (for example, Brecks Road) and this should be taken in account. Ordsall was once a small village which has grown over the years. An additional 800 houses, which would see upward of 2000+ new residents, needs to ensure that appropriate infrastructure is in place. A convenience shop and a recycling centre has been included on the plan; detailing of what a health centre means (for example, a new surgery, a satellite doctor surgery, pharmacy) should be clarified. A risk assessment on what this could mean for the police, ambulance and fire services should also be carried out, for instance, will funding for an additional community police officer be required? It should be ensured that there are enough school places for families who may settle in the area. 800 new houses will also see more stress on roads, which would already benefit from improvements, and it is encouraging that contributions to improve the roundabouts have been noted. However, there are already bottlenecks at the river bridge at Goosemoor Lane and the railway bridge at West Carr Road. Additionally, Goosemoor Lane is also subject to flooding which also restricts an access point. Flooding has become an increasingly serious problem in Bassetlaw, including parts of Ordsall. Although there are no plans to build in flood zones 2 and 3 on the site, leaving these for green space with dwellings located in flood zone 1 as the preferential area, floods can still cause disruption to residents, even if their homes are not flooded. An example would be if Goosemoor Lane was to flood and block an access point, which in turn adds more stress to other areas. Been suggested that the housing allocation is twice that recommended by the government to allocate housing need. With this in mind, is a development of quite this size and scale required for Ordsall? If this development is to go ahead, work should not begin until arrangements are in place to ensure the future of the needed infrastructure and community facilities are secured.</p>	<p>The maintenance of green spaces will form part of planning agreements.</p> <p>A significant level of green infrastructure will be incorporated into the development. Part of this will include a network of new and improved walking and cycling infrastructure that will help connect green spaces and places together. It'll help encourage residents to walk to facilities and to nearby areas. Connection to the wider countryside and local services and facilities will also be improved.</p> <p>The Retford Transport Assessment has assessed the current traffic issues and road capacity within the area. It has provided a series of recommendations for mitigation measures to help improve the road infrastructure within the area. These include both onsite and offsite measures.</p> <p>In addition, the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has identified that there are surface water runoff issues within the area and it has provided recommendations for new drainage and water storage infrastructure on site. These will help to reduce the threat of surface water runoff into Ordsall or the new development.</p> <p>Existing education and health infrastructure can accommodate the projected development at this site. However, the allocation has safeguarded land for additional social infrastructure such as health and education facilities if they're required in the future.</p>
--------	---	--	--

REF183	Resident	<p>You enthuse over this site but the words could apply to almost any proposed developments – “sustainable”, “well integrated”, “open spaces and community use”, etc. What you seem to ignore is the impact of flooding – including on residents gardens – as well as having no firm proposals for traffic management. For context: Retford is a town with two main water routes: River Idle crossed by road bridges at Goosemoor Lane, Albert Road, Bridgegate and Amcott Way; Chesterfield Canal with road bridges at Hospital Road, Carrolgate, Arlington Way, Grove Street, Leverton Road and Welham Road.</p> <p>The town is also crossed by the East Coast railway line with road bridges at Babworth Road and London Road and three crossing points for non-motor vehicles. The railway line from Sheffield to Lincoln is crossed by road bridges at Ordsall Road, Ollerton Road, London Road with level crossings at Thrumpton Lane and Grove Lane. Any development in Retford has to take into account the traffic capacity of these crossings. Transport and Movement all you say is “Development should be supported by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan”. This should have been done before this site is proposed for development. A meeting I attended, in my time as a Councillor, with the Council Leader on 10 October 2012 indicated his preference for developing land on Ollerton Road, Ordsall so there has been more than enough time for detailed work to have been done. Residents can have no faith in BDC based on past performance. When the council was looking to develop land at Newlands it commissioned a traffic study which recommended traffic lights at the Ordsall Road/Babworth Road junction – a condition eventually agreed at Planning Committee but later overturned on developer application. This traffic study did not look at the impact this development would have as regards traffic through “Old Ordsall” – High Street, All Hallows Street, Goosemoor Lane River Bridge or Ollerton and Welbeck Roads where the shops are. There are errors – there is no North Road/Babworth Road roundabout; there is no Goosemoor London Road mini roundabout. There is a roundabout where Hospital Road meets North Road; there is a mini roundabout at the London Road /Whitehouses Road junction. More information needs to be provided as to how you will get a marked cycle lane along the whole of Brecks Road. Need to be clearer on what is meant by “a traffic management scheme in Ordsall Old Village” – is this a euphemism for a one way system? It will not be much use looking at “a subsidised high frequency bus service” if a traffic management scheme means people living further away from bus stops. When work to High Street and a diversion using All Hallows Street and Ollerton Road was in place people found it more difficult to use the bus as stops were further away. This was a particular difficulty for people if they had mobility issues. That diversion also put more traffic along Ollerton Road which as you are probably aware is particularly congested at the Welbeck Road junction. It also added to the length of a journey (0.7 mile) which does not help a green agenda. So how much traffic do you think High Street, All Hallows Street, Ollerton Road and the Goosemoor Lane River Bridge can take? This needs to be addressed before you decide to allocate more land for housing in Ordsall. Affordable Homes the council needs to be much clearer and open. Developers often receive permission to build and then come back with an argument that sites are not viable with the provision of affordable housing. These need to be published for transparency. In my time as a councillor was asked about a development at Whitehouses where the developer sought to lift the condition for 8 affordable houses. Asked for that to go to Planning Committee so that there was accountability but it would be much better if all such requests were done in public. Flooding At 7.14.10 you recognise how close the River Idle is to your proposed site. It is not clear that you are aware of current and past flooding at the eastern edge of your proposed site allocation. The Ordsall to Eaton footpath crosses several private gardens which have again been flooded and on occasion the footpath has been unavailable to most unless in the possession of wading equipment. Unless they have already done so it may be a good idea for elected members and officers to walk this route now to see the impact of water running off your proposed site - know that Cllr. Clarkson is aware of flooding issues as recently met him on the flooded footpath. “A Flood Risk Assessment will be required” should be done before allocating not when planning applications are made. Residents have seen an increase in flooding and while some of this may be as a result of climate change the growth of housing and hard landscaping that has taken place in Ordsall must be a contributory factor.</p>	<p>The development of this site will be locally distinctive. A masterplan for the site is being prepared and this will detail the layout and scale of development. This site is particularly sensitive as it an edge of settlement development and therefore its impact on the environment and the proposed Green Gap will need to be carefully considered through the design of the site.</p> <p>The development of the Local Plan has included an evidence base which looks at the impact on the environment, the capacity of infrastructure and the type of housing that is needed and where.</p> <p>The evidence base and the recommendations that come as a result of it provide the detail to inform the proposed policy for the site and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Transport infrastructure has been assessed through the Retford Transport Assessment and this details what measures are required to the existing network in order to accommodate the scheme. This assessment provides up to date information that has been agreed by the County Council.</p> <p>Similarly, the Flood Risk Assessment provides a series of measures to reduce the impact of surface water flooding to the community.</p> <p>The benefit of planning for growth is that infrastructure improvements will form part of the sites requirements through policy. Due to the out of date Core Strategy and the lack of allocated sites for development means that the District has been subject to speculative developments where not all infrastructure has occurred with development.</p>
--------	----------	--	--

REF117	Barton Wilmore on behalf of land owners	<p>Our client owns a substantial proportion of land to the western side of the allocation (to the west of Ollerton Road). The remaining land within the allocation, including those to the east of Ollerton Road, are owned by two other landowners. All three landowners are in a collaboration agreement to promote the land for development which is being led by our client who has a demonstrated experience in promoting land through the planning process as with its land at Harworth. Landownership is straightforward for this proposed allocation with a clear commitment from all parties to ensure delivery. The Site was put forward as part of the Local Plan 'Call for Sites' and has been promoted through the Council's previous Local Plan consultations. It benefits from excellent connectivity to Retford, which itself benefits from two rail links and existing public transport. Retford has a strong housing market and the site allows for ease of 'out-commuting' to the A1 and higher order employment locations, without all traffic travelling through the Town Centre of Retford. As such, Ordsall South represents a highly logical site for residential-led development. Noting the context, our comments on the draft Local Plan correspond with the headings and relevant sections of the Draft Local Plan. Appended are: • Development Framework Document (Barton Willmore December 2020); • Transport and Access Strategy (Development Transport Planning Ltd); and • Landscape baseline assessment (Barton Willmore). These form the baseline for development at Ordsall South, alongside these submissions. Reiterate our client's desire to collaborate with the Council, Members and stakeholders at Ordsall South to deliver a high quality residential development that the District can be proud of.</p>	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF117	Barton Wilmore on behalf of land owners	<p>Welcome Policy ST29 and HS13 "Ordsall South". The land to the south of Retford is a sustainable and attractive location for housing development and will underpin the success of the housing market within the District. The strategic location of the Site benefits from access to the A1 and highways connects to the surrounding settlements without having the need to pass through the centre of Retford. Committed to working with the Council to deliver this project. The baseline documents form the case for development at Ordsall South, alongside these planning submissions. The documents provided demonstrate that the allocation can accommodate the number of homes required by the Council's spatial strategy and that there are no 'show-stoppers' to delivery. The accompanying Development Framework provides a conceptual design for land uses, a streets hierarchy and landscape strategy, including identifying a number of high-level design principles which the landowners are committing to ensure that Ordsall South is a high-quality development. The Landscape Assessment sets out how the allocation does not impact upon the wider countryside. There are no national or local landscape designation affected and the report concludes that development would be framed within the existing built form of Retford. The Site is suitable for development as it is largely devoid of any significant landscape features and the land is largely flat. The report also sets a strategy of planting and landscape features which will be used to add a rich variety and demarcated southern boundary to Retford. The network of PROWs will be enhanced, and a new community country park provided. Transport and Access Strategy addresses movement for vehicles, cycling and pedestrians. It considers the opportunity of the site to link with existing bus routes that serve Ordsall and access the existing mainline railway stations. The report identifies possible access points into the site. It demonstrates that development of the site can be brought forward in a sustainable way, without resulting in unnecessary traffic movements through Retford Town Centre. Turning to the Policy working wish to make the following comments: Part 1 a): recognise the Council's comments about a Retford – Eaton 'Green Gap'. Address this in the landscape report. Do not agree that a Green Gap policy is justified (see our comments on ST40), recognise that Eaton is a separate hamlet and that good design would not wish to 'swallow' such a settlement. In the case of Eaton, there is a considerable distance between, the hamlet and the allocation plus a river. Allocation at HS13 does not affect the character of that place. Part 1 a ii): do not support delivery of 15-20 dwellings per hectares. This is an extremely low net ratio and would result in the inefficient use of land. 30 dwellings per hectare is more normal without comprising the requirement for large areas of public open space and a country park in this location. The criterion also conflicts with Policy 32 which requires 30 dph in Retford. Part 1 c): The site is largely Flood Zone 1 and an FRA will be provided as part of the Council's validation requirements. There is no need to have this criterion. Part 2 a): support the delivery of at least 800 homes by 2037. This is achievable for a site in an established housing market. Part 2 b): support the stated mix of accommodation. Part 3 a): support the identified Green Infrastructure strategy of the site including the 23Ha country park and woodland areas. This is a significant planning benefit and will allow for biodiversity net gain. It is also a good opportunity to involve the community and other stakeholders to deliver a significant benefit for Retford. Part 4 a): The Local Centre and</p>	These comments have been addressed, where relevant through the focussed consultation document, specifically Policy 29 Part 1 a ii); Part 4 a) and Part 4 b).

	<p>sentiment that this is only of small scale is accepted. The convenience store must be Use Class E, as F2a can only be provided where it is more than 1km away from another facility. That could not be achieved given existing facilities in Ordsall. Part 4b): should be deleted. There is no justification for s106 monies to go to public realm at Ordsall Local Centre from a housing allocation, especially when the allocation already requires facilities on site as well. Part 5: object to part 5 as it is a shopping list of funding requests for projects elsewhere. Highways report identifies that there is a need for connectivity to existing infrastructure and for some local highway improvements. This is accepted and discussions will advance with Nottinghamshire County Council as Highways Authority.</p> <p>Parts a) iii) 4 suggest unspecified off-site public realm improvements which are not reasonably related to the site. Part B): Welcome further discussion with the Council regarding the Ordsall South Masterplan Framework, including who is responsible for producing this and the Council's internal approval process of such a document.</p>	
--	---	--

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
1643764	Resident	Traffic?? Tuxford village centre is already dangerous, planners NEED to visit Tuxford during rush hour periods, Village centre sits between 90 new homes and the A1.	An appropriate access will need to be created along Ollerton Road to accommodate the development. Offsite mitigation may be required subject to the design and layout of the scheme. There will be a cycle and pedestrian access from the site on to Long Lane so residents can access the local facilities in a sustainable way.
REF056	Resident	<p>In the introduction to the Bassetlaw Local Plan item 1.2.2 states: The Local Plan explains how many new homes and businesses are needed, where they should be located and how and when they will be delivered. It sets out how the town centres will be supported and improved and identifies any additional infrastructure (such as new roads and schools) which is needed to support development and explains how this infrastructure will be delivered. The plan is clear, laudable, and comprehensive, but sadly our first experiences of the plan being put into action in Tuxford suggests a lack of knowledge about this community. As a consequence, new housing developments are located on greenfield sites when other options are available. Tuxford's major problems include: A large area of sub-standard housing stock</p> <p>A lack of greenfield playing space Collapsing infrastructure – especially drains Derelict and damaged heritage buildings</p> <p>A town centre blighted by high (probably illegal) levels of air pollution from HGV traffic</p> <p>Fortunately, the actions necessary to resolve these problems contribute to delivering the strategic objectives of the Bassetlaw Local Plan. In the early 1960s a large housing estate was built between the top of Gilbert and Faraday Avenues to accommodate miners coming to work on the local coalfields. The houses were hastily erected using pre-cast concrete sections and had a 30-year design life. Today, almost 60 years later, they are still there, some in private hands and some in BDC ownership. Most of the houses have large gardens, and the central rows of concrete and asbestos garages have been mostly removed leaving a very large area of land with a very low-density housing load. Given that the houses do not meet modern housing standards and given that the basic infrastructure of drainage, water and power are already there, does it not make sense to re-develop this area of the town first rather than building on greenfield sites? The area is very close to the only local playing field and is within a short, safe walk of Tuxford Academy. Redevelopment of this area would also obviate the need to build on the Gilbert Avenue playing field – the only area for greenfield sports in Tuxford. It is the intention of the new owners of the large site on Eldon Street presently occupied by Platts Harris to make this site available for housing development in the near future. The new owners intend to register this intent with BDC before the 20th of January. Between the capacity of the Platts Harris site and the redevelopment area mentioned above there is more than enough space to satisfy the requirements of the Local Plan without building on green land and depriving the community of its only playing field.</p>	<p>There are not enough available or suitable brownfield sites within Tuxford to accommodate the level of growth required. The Council are now only taking one of the proposed sites forward in the Local Plan and this is the one off Ollerton Road, not the one to the South of Gilbert Avenue. This sports facility is protected under the Local Plan. Planning permissions granted since 1st April 2018 will contribute towards the 250 requirement for Tuxford. The proposed allocation at Ollerton Road will contribute a further 75 new homes leaving a need for 45 new homes.</p> <p>When other sites become available such as brownfield sites, these could make up the remaining housing requirement for the community. In addition, the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan could also allocate sites to make up any remaining housing requirement.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
REF060	Notts County Council	The Policy should provide a route sufficiently wide to accommodate a future bus route to the southern boundary of the site to safeguard the potential of future development to the south.	Noted. This has been added to the Policy Criteria
1664659	Resident	Could you please let me know with so many housings being built is the possibility of adding a skate park for the youth?	The site will provide some public open space. Tuxford already has a Skate Park at the former village hall site and it has capacity for additional usage.
1665937	Tuxford Town Council	<p>The Local Plan on the face of it, delivers a comprehensive outline of what Bassetlaw needs to implement to complete the growth necessary set out by the Government. Unfortunately, little thought has gone into the allocation of the extra houses, that the plan feels Tuxford should deliver. It has allocated a growth of 20% as opposed to a growth of only 5% in the surrounding villages. When challenged BDC explain that the 20% allocation is due to the fact that Tuxford already has the services necessary to absorb this growth. Tuxford Town Council would like to state that currently Tuxford has major problems regarding its infrastructure and until this is rectified it would be economical suicide to put the Town under more pressure. The Drainage system is outdated and not capable of serving the existing community. There have been three major road closures in the last year, cutting off one part of the town from the shops and services. This problem has still not been resolved and sewerage seeps from the drains, along with the appalling smell. There have been two major water leaks, flooding part of the town. Again, due to outdated infrastructure. Both schools and doctors surgery are at their capacity for pupils and patients.</p> <p>Tuxford has a lack of community facilities and a minimum of greenfield playing space. Traffic density and major pollution problems blight the town Centre and its approach roads. This has a detrimental affect not only connected to health and wellbeing of the residents, but to the adverse effects these vehicles have on the many historic buildings. Recent surveys have been carried out to count the volume of traffic Tuxford experienced over an 11-hour period. This showed that 625 Heavy Vehicles passed through the town Centre and even more alarmingly 325 vehicles per hour were counted. The Highways Department at Nottinghamshire County Council have been alerted to these problems and been informed that because of this high movement of vehicles, Tuxford now has the worst Pollution levels in the whole of Bassetlaw (reported by Bassetlaw District Council). Have suggested a weight restriction, or a ring Road would ease the problems. To date we have not received a response. Understand that Bassetlaw District Council are obligated to deliver new housing, and of course Tuxford would benefit from this, but would urge you as a Council to first of all look at addressing the many problems outlined and instead of forging forward with building, look to first solve the many problems we have outlined. Currently, we do not have an active District Councillor to represent Tuxford and its residents. In the last consultation, which was held in Tuxford, it was documented that 30% of the residents who responded to the proposed sites, were in favour of site NP 10 for development (off Lincoln Road). Only 18% were in favour of NP 04 (Ollerton Road). We understand that NP 10 was not deliverable due to Nottinghamshire County Council Highways objections, yet they have approved the site on Ollerton Road, which will not only add to our existing problems of traffic and pollution but go against the preferred site that Tuxford voted for. It is also using a green field site when brown field sites are available. Building is already underway to give Tuxford 86 affordable/social housing on Ashvale Road, to forge ahead with another housing estate before addressing the problems, would in the Town Council's opinion, be detrimental to the town. Already have several planning applications for new housing within the town and feel this would be a better and more agreeable way of absorbing the extra need for housing, rather than yet another dense housing estate. This would be monitored, to be in keeping with this historic town which Tuxford Town Council and its residents are proud of.</p>	<p>Tuxford is considered a Large Rural Settlement due to its size, level of services and facilities and the role it provides as a service centre to nearby villages. The Council recognises that the land around Tuxford is heavily constrained, but this does not necessarily mean that development cannot take place. The Local Plan is being prepared alongside an evidence base which details the existing and future infrastructure needs and requirements. Relevant stakeholders and infrastructure providers have all been consulted on the proposals. This includes the utility companies. They confirm that the level of growth identified for Tuxford can be accommodated, with mitigation where necessary. Where mitigation is identified this will form part of the policy requirement and be identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. National legislation states that development can only contribute to infrastructure needs generated by the impact of that development. It is not possible to secure improvements to existing issues. The Town Council are correct in liaising with the County Council with regard to existing highways matters. Community consultation is just one factor that should be taken into account when considering development. It is important that sites are also suitable, available and deliverable. Some sites the public previously favoured are considered unsuitable due to their particular impact i.e. highways or are contrary to national/local policy. If a site has gained public support, but then it is later demonstrated that it is not suitable to accommodate development, then it cannot be taken forward. The Council will continue to work with the Town Council through the Neighbourhood Plan review process so that it can seek to accommodate any of the remaining growth requirement moving forward.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
REF067	Resident	<p>Have great concerns over the additional water drainage from the proposed housing plan for the area behind Lodge lane Industrial estate . My property runs alongside the old A1 now the B1164. Prior to the early 1980s. , a culvert running under the railway embankment onto my garden must have been closed off as never had a drop of water down it . Starting in the early 80s, waste foul water , bags of rubbishy and raw sewage started to pour out . Eventually the sewage was stopped due to the work of a young lady from Burton on Trent who insisted on the estate treating its sewage correctly. Around 2020 tons of fine clippings came down the culvert apparently from a new road being made, following this the next rainfall produced a massive volume of water through the culvert ,far too much for the pipe which goes under the B1164 to cope with resulting in my garden being flooded then pouring like a river onto the road flooding down to Sutton on Trent . Believe the cause of the sudden increase in volume is due in part to the drainage gullets which used to run down either side of Lodge lane getting blocked as we used to see these fill up . Have reported the situation many times always getting incident nos. and promise of a visit within 14 days , not once has there been any visit . Due to the floodwater we have had a serious accident when a car drove int it and finished up on its roof. Hope you can help with this problem and possible worse future situation . Will send separately photo / video of the current situation during rainfall</p>	<p>Part of this area of Tuxford has received planning permission for affordable dwellings. This land is accessed off Ashvale Road. The proposed development site to the rear of this and off Gilbert Avenue is no longer an allocation within the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan. The only site identified within the Local Plan for residential development is land off Ollerton Road for 75 dwellings.</p>
REF075	Resident	<p>Great concerns over the inevitable additional water drainage from the proposed housing plan for the area behind Lodge Lane industrial estate. My property runs alongside the old A1, now the B1164. Prior to the early 1980's a culvert running beneath the railway embankment onto my garden must have been closed off since there was never a drop of water from it. Starting in the early 80's waste water, bags of rubbish and raw sewage started to pour out, eventually the sewage was stopped due to the work of a young lady from Burton-on-Trent who insisted on the estate managing their sewage treatment. Around 2020 tons of fine stone chippings came down apparently from a road being made, following this following heavy rainfall the culvert pipe shot out with tremendous force storm water, far too much for the pipe which goes under the B1164 to cope with resulting in my garden flooding and the water going onto the road, flooding the northern side of the carriageway down to Sutton-on-Trent. Believe the cause of the massive of water is due to one or both of the drainage gulley's alongside Lodge Lane having been closed off since there used to be an overflow from there. Have registered many times the problems getting incident No's and promises of a visit within 14 days, now over 20 years. Never had a single visit. Have had a serious accident already where a car travelling towards Tuxford from Sutton on the dry side, rounded a bend, hit the flood and finished up on its roof. Hope you can help with this and possible worse future situations. Will try and send an email with videos of the flooding.</p>	<p>Part of this area of Tuxford has received planning permission for affordable dwellings. This land is accessed off Ashvale Road. The proposed development site to the rear of this and off Gilbert Avenue is no longer an allocation within the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan. The only site identified within the Local Plan for residential development is land off Ollerton Road for 75 dwellings.</p>
REF076	Resident	<p>Your plan using prime agricultural land should not go ahead without due reference to the fact that we are no longer part of Europe and will possibly need this land for food production in the coming years.</p> <p>Proposal for 250 dwellings before 2037 does not take account of the environmental impact on Tuxford particularly Newcastle Street and Eldon Street which are already at full capacity with parked vehicles during the daytime. People do not walk to the shops anymore and a development here would add to the congestion. The amenities, are already stretched i.e. doctor's surgery in particular. Do not have information regarding the schools but Tuxford Academy students are bussed in from surrounding areas which adds to the traffic congestion from 8.30am to 9am and again mid-afternoon. Say no additions or improvements are identified in the plan, surely this must be the first consideration before any building is commenced. If building is to go ahead, your alternative dispersal plan would be better providing this is not using agricultural land but small plots which cannot be used for any other purpose.</p>	<p>National policy does not prevent the use of agricultural land for development. Instead it requires that if considered necessary lower quality agricultural land is used. Tuxford is considered a Large Rural Settlement due to its size, level of services and facilities and the role it provides as a service centre to nearby villages. The 250 homes is consistent with other Large Rural Settlements. Planning permissions granted since 1st April 2018 will contribute towards the 250 requirement for Tuxford. The proposed allocation at Ollerton Road will contribute a further 75 new homes leaving a need for 45 new homes.</p> <p>When other sites become available such as brownfield sites, these could make up the remaining housing requirement for the community. The Land Availability Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal has assessed the site, alongside others that were put forward for consideration, and this is considered one of the most sustainable due to its location near Ollerton Road and its close proximity to the Town Centre and its facilities. With a new</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
			dedicated cycle and footpath connection from the site into Long Lane, then this will provide a clear and safe path for residents to use the nearby services such as the school and shops. There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. The Council recognise the infrastructure concerns and the revised Policy includes securing financial contributions to improve health facilities and schools. These will mitigate any impact resulting from the development.
REF088	Resident represented by Town-Planning.co.uk	<p>Summary of Representation</p> <p>a) For the reasoning we set out in the detailed representation below we consider that the proposed allocation NP04 would have an unacceptable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • landscape and townscape impact; • relationship to existing built form; • impact on the significance, character and appearance of designated heritage assets; • relationship to nearby land uses including the nearby wind turbine; • level of accessibility; • impact on highway and pedestrian safety; and • impact on Grade 2 agricultural land. <p>b) Consequently, the proposed allocation and Policy 30 and Policy ST16 would fail the tests of soundness as we explain in detail in the following sections and it would not constitute sustainable development.</p> <p>c) For the reasoning we also set out in the detailed representation below we consider that the Local Plan fails to justify the strategic approach in Policy ST1 to justify the level of housing proposed for both the District as a whole and to Tuxford as a 'Large Rural Settlement'.</p> <p>d) Allocation of this site in isolation, leaving the Neighbourhood Plan to find additional sites has also resulted in a fundamentally unsound approach to site assessment where all reasonable alternatives have not been considered. It also prejudices and unduly constrains the preparation process of the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan which is not in the best interests of planning. A continued community led approach to site allocation in Tuxford should be undertaken in common with the approach pursued in the other 'Large Rural Settlements'.</p> <p>e) Unfortunately, there is a lack of clarity regarding a number of fundamental matters relating to the proposed allocation NP04. We explain this in detail later, however this has seriously undermined public confidence in the Local Plan process and has hindered effective public consultation. The LPA has unfortunately also failed to provide a detailed rationale to all respondents on the points they raised as part of the earlier consultation phase. This has also undermined public confidence and understanding of the Local Plan process. f) We support the concerns set out by Tuxford Town Council in their representation in objection to the Local Plan. Including their concerns about the suitability for Tuxford to accommodate additional growth at the level proposed; the failure to consider a wider range of small allocations throughout Tuxford; and the lack of recognition for the findings of the public consultation on the sites put forward in the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>The Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>The Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan has been designed from the outset to reflect and sustain the invaluable role that neighbourhood plans play in the spatial strategy for the District. The intention is to provide a District-wide framework, that will effectively support the development of neighbourhood plans (which provide local-level detail), but will also provide effective policies in the absence of a neighbourhood plan, whether a community has opted not to produce one, or where development is still in progress.</p> <p>Crucially, neighbourhood plans need to be community-led. The District Council acknowledges that there is apparent local interest in reviewing the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan, but also that progress to this effect has been sporadic since discussions about a review commenced in mid-2018. This is not a criticism, as there is no requirement to undertake a review. However, the lack of progress to this effect could leave Tuxford vulnerable to a speculative development once the 20% housing requirement proposed in the Bassetlaw Local Plan is enforceable. Work to progress the Bassetlaw Local Plan has sought to address this potential vulnerability by proposing housing allocations in Tuxford, and by drawing-upon insights acquired through our work to support the review of the Neighbourhood Plan, alongside other technical assessments. We appreciated that our strategy would be of significant local interest, and may still be in need of refinement, and so ensured that opportunities for the public to view, query, and comment on the proposals were maximised.</p> <p>Relatedly, we have consistently noted that, as a Draft, potential challenges to the proposals in the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan are welcomed. Moreover, particularly in the case of Tuxford, we</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
			<p>were clear that alternative proposals for housing sites could be explored as part of a review of the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to these being progressed in a timely manner, ahead of the Local Plan being formalised. Again, whilst we are aware that interest in doing so has been voiced, on numerous occasions, this has not yet gained traction. We remain committed to supporting the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan, and would welcome further dialogue with the Town Council as to how they wish to proceed.</p> <p>Housing Numbers and Spatial Strategy</p> <p>The methodology for calculating local housing need is set out in Paragraph: 007 Reference ID: 2a-007-20190220 of the Planning Practice Guidance</p> <p>The standard method for assessing local housing need provides a minimum starting point in determining the number of homes needed in an area. It does not attempt to predict the impact that future government policies, changing economic circumstances or other factors might have on demographic behaviour. Therefore, there will be circumstances where it is appropriate to consider whether actual housing need is higher than the standard method indicates.</p> <p>Circumstances where this may be appropriate include, but are not limited to situations where increases in housing need are likely to exceed past trends because of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • growth strategies for the area that are likely to be deliverable, for example where funding is in place to promote and facilitate additional growth (e.g. Housing Deals); • strategic infrastructure improvements that are likely to drive an increase in the homes needed locally; or • an authority agreeing to take on unmet need from neighbouring authorities, as set out in a statement of common ground. <p>In the case of Bassetlaw the minimum calculated need is 288.</p> <p>The Council commissioned GL Hearn with Iceni Projects Ltd and Justin Gardner Consulting to undertake a Housing Needs Assessments and Economic Development Needs Assessment (update to 2019 report) for the district. The purpose of this now combined Housing and Economic Development Need Assessment (HEDNA) Study was to assess future development needs for housing (both market and affordable) and employment land across Bassetlaw District.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
			<p>The assessment was published in November 2020 and now forms part of the evidence base which the Council will use in preparing and updating the Local Plan.</p> <p>Evidence from the 2020 HEDNA indicates that there is a need to increase the housing requirement to support economic growth.</p> <p>The 2020 Bassetlaw HEDNA focusses on a supply led approach rather than a demand led approach. The supply led approach provides a range for net additional jobs: 9,735 – 11, 236 jobs. It concludes that up to 591 dwellings per annum would support the level of economic growth proposed.</p> <p>This approach is considered to be realistic and reflects the active position on the ground.</p> <p>Over the past five years, since 1 April 2016, 2919 dwellings have been delivered, averaging 584 per annum within the Bassetlaw. Delivery over the last two years has been significantly higher.</p> <p>Most of the requirement for the rural areas will be met from existing commitments with planning permissions, and from sites already allocated in made neighbourhood plans (see rural settlement study update paper)</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework states that “in order to promote sustainable development rural housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. New rural housing and other development should also support the broader sustainability of villages, and that all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby.”</p> <p>On that basis and following consultation with local community, Policy ST2 identifies a percentage growth rate based on the existing Parish dwelling number (as of 13th August 2018 - when the data was collected). The growth percentage for the Large Rural Settlements is set at 20%, whereas the Small Rural Settlements at 5%.</p> <p>All of the large settlements have met or exceeded the requirement through existing commitments and from sites already allocated in made neighbourhood plans (see rural settlement study update paper)</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
			<p>At 20% Tuxford's need works out at 250 dwellings during the Plan period. As of 1 April 2021 there are 108 commitment on sites with planning permission in Tuxford. Over the past 3 years there has been just 3 homes delivered in Tuxford.</p> <p>There are no new allocations proposed in the Large Settlements except for the site proposed south of Ollerton Road, Tuxford which will meet the identified specific growth requirements of that large village. This will provide the opportunity for Tuxford to grow and thrive, and will support local services.</p> <p>Land off Ollerton Road, Tuxford is situated on the western edge of Tuxford and is considered to be a suitable site which would extend the built up area up to a logical boundary. The Land Availability Assessment 2020 identified the site as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford. The site is identified as available and deliverable from 2027.</p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal</p> <p>The SA will be updated to reflect that the minimum number of dwellings required is 75. The SA uses a GIS system to calculate the distance between the site and services. As explained in paragraph 2.44 of the November 2020 SA Report (and previous SA Reports), distances are measured in straight lines from the boundary of a site. This ensures consistency between appraisals, given that it cannot be known which route people will take to work, school or leisure destinations and this is likely to vary depending on the starting point of each individual's journey. This analysis shows that the site is wholly within 800m of Tuxford Clinic.</p> <p>The Council has consulted and is in direct communication with the Education Authority on school capacity and what, if any, additional provision is required. This is likely to be dealt with as a financial contribution from a development to the Education Authority.</p> <p>The assessment is in line with the site appraisal criteria set out in Table A5.2 (Appendix 5) of the November 2020 SA Report and previous SA Reports. This ensures consistency between appraisals of site options. Other than access to a GP surgery (see response above), the specific issues raised are outside the scope of site assessments, as they are not part of the site appraisal criteria. Air quality is considered under SA objective 10 and access to a primary school is considered under SA objective 4. However, we do not hold data on 'areas of poorer air quality'</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
			<p>(given that there are no AQMAs in Bassetlaw), ‘noise corridors’ or primary school capacity and therefore cannot assess these consistently across the District. These can be more clearly stated as data limitations in the next iteration of the SA Report and through discussions with relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>Heritage</p> <p>The Heritage Assessment includes an assessment of the site and all other reasonable alternatives. No insurmountable issues have been identified. BDC Heritage has made recommendations regarding site assessments which should be undertaken to inform the development management/decision making process. As part of a planning application, the applicant will need to provide evidence of any potential heritage impact through a heritage Assessment.</p> <p>Landscape and Amenity</p> <p>Natural England has been consulted on the SA Methodology and on Bassetlaw Local Plan. No objections have been raised about the SA methodology or about the proposed allocation of the site at Ollerton Road, Tuxford.</p> <p>The Council has produced a Landscape Assessment and this looked at the whole site in terms of its potential impact, including its edge of settlement location. This was done for all other sites within the Local Plan. In addition, the Council’s Conservation Team’s comments were also factored into the landscape issues. The feedback was then used to help inform what sites, or part of sites, were suitable for allocation. Where landscape issues remain, these can be dealt with through the sensitive design of the edge of settlement site.</p> <p>The Landscape Assessment document and its recommendations has been subject to public and stakeholder consultation any relevant feedback has been incorporated into an updated report.</p> <p>The Council’s Environmental Health Team have not raised objections or concerns about the impact of the nearby wind turbines.</p> <p>Transport and Accessibility</p> <p>The Bassetlaw Transport Assessment, which looks at the impact of the proposed growth within the Local Plan on the existing highway network, has not identified any significant impacts to Tuxford. The Highways Authority has also not raised any</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
			<p>particular concerns over the principle of development on this site. They have stated that a new and suitable access to the site is needed from Ollerton Road along with improvements to the footpaths.</p> <p>The applicant will need to demonstrate, through a transport assessment and travel plan, that the proposal will not lead to unreasonable impacts to the highway network. Where unreasonable impacts are demonstrated, then the transport assessment will need to detail what mitigation is needed to offset these impacts raised through the transport assessment. These will need to be agreed by the highways authority.</p> <p>Flood Risk and Drainage</p> <p>The development is not located within any higher risk flood zones. The Council not nearby drainage capacity issues and are in discussions with Severn Trent Water about these and District wide problems. The Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment provides recommendations for development. The development will be required to address surface water flooding and demonstrate that the development will not lead to an increase of flooding nearby - as per National Planning Policy - through a full and detailed Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
REF088	Resident represented by Town-Planning.co.uk	<p>Summary of Change Requested</p> <p>g) Delete the proposed site NP04 and allow the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan to consider other reasonable alternatives as part of a comprehensive analysis and consideration of all other potential sites around Tuxford including both potential Brownfield and Greenfield sites.</p> <p>h) Within Tuxford there are a number of potential previously developed sites or sites where existing uses perhaps no longer represent the most beneficial use. These sites may more appropriately used for residential development with their existing use relocated for example to modern premises on an industrial estate. Such sites could include land to the rear of 10 Newcastle Street; Former Goods Yard on Lincoln Road; the Platts Harris site; and Land around Eastfield Farm.</p> <p>i) In our view other potential sites Brownfield and Greenfield around Tuxford would have a better relationship to existing built form.</p> <p>Detailed Representation</p> <p>1. We continue to object to the proposed allocation of Site NP04 (Ollerton Road, Tuxford) contained in Policy 30 of the Regulation 18 version of the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan 2018-2037. I note that on the Policies Map the site is actually referred to as HS14 and the covering policy is listed as ST30. For the avoidance of any doubt, we will refer to the site as NP04 as per Policy 30. We consider that it fails the tests of soundness as follows:</p> <p>Tests of Soundness Positively Prepared Justified Effective In general conformity with national policy</p> <p>Lack of Clarity</p> <p>2. It is also noted that policy ST16 lists the site NP04 as having an area of 1.5Ha and a capacity of a minimum of 90 dwellings. Whereas the introductory text to Policy 30 in paragraph 7.15.2 lists the site area as 3.9Ha. It claims that this site size is drawn from the Land Availability Assessment (LAA), however we find this claim confusing as Appendix F of the LAA (2020) assessed site LAA476 which was a much larger site of 39.4Ha. Table 12 in the LAA main document itself does not list any site area. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan also identifies the site as being 3.9Ha. Consequently, there is confusion within the various policies and documents as to what size of site the Local Plan is actually seeking to promote.</p> <p>3. These inconsistencies are extremely unfortunate and may have resulted in confusion amongst the public. Changing site references during the Local Plan preparation process was described by an Inspector at a public examination where we were present as 'a highly regrettable mistake that had led to public confusion and had undermined the Local Plan preparation process by the necessary audit trail through evidence being less than transparent.'</p> <p>4. Further inconsistencies exist then with the site being referred to as HS14 in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, as such anyone searching for reference to site NP04 in the IDP would find no information.</p> <p>5. As the Policies Map Inset for Tuxford does not indicate any scale; we are therefore unable to accurately measure the site from the Policies Map itself. However, we have overlaid the Policies Map Inset onto a scaled plan on Nottinghamshire Insight Mapping. Using the measuring tools on that mapping system indicates the site to be 2.90Ha.</p> <p>6. This casts doubt on whether the site is actually 1.5Ha or 3.9Ha as the Local Plan suggests. As you will be aware having an accurate site measurement is fundamental to determining an appropriate site capacity figure. If the site is 3.9Ha as the Local Plan suggests then the gross density would be 23.07 dwellings per hectare; whereas if it is only 2.9Ha as our measurement seems to suggest then at the same density the capacity would be 67 dwellings; or at 90 dwellings the gross density would be 31.03 dwellings per hectare. As the figure of 90 dwellings is indicated to be a minimum, this would increase the gross density even further if more than 90 dwellings were actually delivered.</p> <p>7. Policy ST32 of the Local Plan states that: "Within the Large and Small Rural Settlements densities should reflect the character of the settlement and local housing needs, unless otherwise promoted through a Neighbourhood Plan." Given the lack of clarity over the precise site area the density cannot be assessed with any certainty and as such how it reflects the character of the settlement as required by Policy ST2 is uncertain.</p> <p>8. There are also further inconsistencies in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) which we highlight later on when we address that document. Notably the in paragraph 6.247 the SA indicates that site NP04 is allocated for 75 dwellings.</p> <p>Previous Consultation</p> <p>9. Although it is recognised that there is no legal obligation for the Council to respond to every point made by</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
		<p>respondents in consultation it is disappointing that the LPA has not chosen to respond to the lack of evidence and the inconsistencies we raised in the previous consultation. In addition, local residents are very disappointed that the LPA seems to have copied a standard response for most of the detailed submissions they made.</p> <p>Housing Need</p> <p>10. The Bassetlaw Local Plan is now proposed to be based on an even higher annual housing provision of 589 dwellings per annum in Policy ST1 (up from 478 in the previous version). This is more than double the 288 indicative local housing need published in December 2020 using the MHCLG revised methodology. As you will be aware this data table sets out the housing need for each local planning authority using the method that the Government has produced following a backlash to a consultation in the Summer of 2020. Widespread concern was that the standardised methodology did not focus on major urban areas sufficiently but instead resulted in too much development in rural districts. It is notable that the indicative figure for Bassetlaw has reduced from 307 per annum to 288.</p> <p>11. It would seem somewhat perverse that at a time when the Government considers that Bassetlaw should find even less housing; the Local Plan proposes to find even more land for housing. The rationale behind the revised MHCLG methodology was set out in the press release that stated:</p> <p>12. "A housing need formula is currently used to provide a starting point in the process of local planning for new homes. An updated method will now be introduced to help councils to enable the delivery of 300,000 homes a year by the mid-2020s, while prioritising brownfield sites and urban areas.</p> <p>13. Under the proposals, cities will be encouraged to plan for more family homes – which are the right size and type for families to live in – and to make the most of vacant buildings and underused land to protect green spaces. The plans will encourage more homes to be built in England's 20 largest cities and urban centres, boosting local economies by supporting jobs in the building sector, and revitalising high streets with the footfall new residents bring."</p> <p>14. Whilst the Local Plan might want to pursue a growth strategy based on a higher annualised housing provision for the period 2018 to 2037; this does not justify the allocation of inappropriate or unsuitable sites. As such there is no unmet strategic housing need requirement to justify the allocation of site NP04.</p> <p>15. The Local Plan Policy ST1 proposes 'about 1,400' dwellings for the 'Large Rural Settlements' which includes Blyth; Carlton in Lindrick and Costhorpe; Langold; Misterton; and Tuxford. In Policy ST2 a total of 250 dwellings are indicated to be proposed for Tuxford.</p> <p>16. The Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan (2016) indicates that Tuxford has 1,213 dwellings, Policy ST2 indicates that 'Large Rural Settlements' should not exceed the number of dwellings in these settlements by more than 20%. Taking the Neighbourhood Plan base figure, the 20% maximum would therefore be 242 dwellings, a little lower than stated in Policy ST2. The Spatial Strategy Background Paper indicates a 2018 base number of dwellings in Tuxford as 1,252 dwellings; if this figure is taken then a 20% increase maximum would be 250 dwellings. However, these figures suggest that there was already growth of 3.2% between the 2016 Neighbourhood Plan figure and the 2018 figure in the Spatial Strategy Background Paper.</p> <p>17. According to the Bassetlaw Rural Monitoring Table (December 2020) indicates that some 102 dwellings are committed already in Tuxford. These commitments already contribute to the housing requirement of 250 dwellings identified for the plan period. This leaves a further 148 dwellings to be found for the remaining 17 years when assessed against the Policy ST2 figure.</p> <p>18. The monitoring includes all residential planning permissions and completions at a settlement level since 1st April 2018. For Large and Small Rural Settlements, the baseline date for the proposed housing requirements per settlement is also set from 1st April 2018. Therefore, residential planning permissions granted after that date will contribute towards the required growth figure for the respective settlement.</p> <p>19. Put another way in the first two years of the plan period Tuxford has some 41% of its proposed housing requirement already committed. Given this there is no requirement for the Local Plan to find it necessary to allocate a site in order to be delivered early in the plan period. The existing commitments in Tuxford will see growth of 8.4% in the number of dwellings within a short period of time. Accordingly, it would not be unreasonable for any additional</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
		<p>allocations to be delivered in the later phases of the plan period.</p> <p>20. Indeed, if the overall housing figure for the district were revised down from 589 dwellings per annum to only 288 dwellings per annum as the MHCLG methodology suggests. Then the Tuxford pro-rata figure would reduce from 250 dwellings to 122 dwellings across the plan period. In which case the remaining housing to be found in Tuxford would only be 20 dwellings. In this respect the overall housing figure to be found for Bassetlaw is directly relevant as to whether in fact any additional housing allocations need to be found at all for Tuxford.</p> <p>21. Unusually there is no housing background paper or other evidence document to help readers understand the unmet residual level of housing for the 'Large Rural Settlements' or the choice of distribution for the site allocations in the Local Plan between the 5 settlements in this category. Of these 5 'Large Rural Villages' only Tuxford has had allocations identified. It is noted for example that Misterton has no allocations or committed housing sites identified in the Local Plan.</p> <p>22. It is understood that Blyth; Carlton in Lindrick and Costhorpe; and Misterton have neighbourhood plans either made or in the final stages. However, the Local Plan does not indicate any detail as to how many dwellings these neighbourhood plans allocate; this further compounds the inability for plan users to understand how the Local Plan is aiming to deliver the identified housing figure for the 'Large Rural Settlements'.</p> <p>23. It would appear that the proposed 1,400 dwellings for the 'Large Rural Settlements' actually differs to the individual figures in Policy ST2; which in fact only adds up to 1,297 which is quite different.</p> <p>24. In this respect the allocation of site NP04 would make a contribution towards delivering the housing figure identified for Tuxford. However, the site would result in planning harm that outweighs the benefit of housing delivery; particularly given the Local Plan proposing more than double the annual housing provision in the latest MHCLG standardised housing requirement. In addition, there are other reasonable alternative sites elsewhere in Tuxford that would be more appropriate.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
REF088	Resident represented by Town-Planning.co.uk	<p>Relationship to Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>25. Paragraph 5.1.51 of the Local Plan indicates that 'growth will be met primarily through Neighbourhood Plan allocations, by appropriate planning applications and a Local Plan allocation for Tuxford. Growth should not exceed the number of dwellings in these settlements by more than 20%, unless identified by a Neighbourhood Plan.'</p> <p>26. It is unclear as to why only Tuxford has been chosen by the Local Plan to have a hybrid approach of having one site allocation with the remainder to be found by the Neighbourhood Plan. This approach undermines the work on the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan and does not allow either the Local Plan or the Neighbourhood Plan to consider all reasonable alternatives. Indeed, the LPA refers in the Site Selection Methodology in relation to all other possible sites in Tuxford to "Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan is in the process of being reviewed and all potentially suitable sites in the LAA can be considered for allocation through this process." Consequently, the Local Plan hides behind the review of the Neighbourhood Plan as a reason not to allocate every other possible site in Tuxford.</p> <p>27. This approach is manifestly unreasonable and lacks the fairness and open & transparent process that must underpin any Local Plan production process.</p> <p>28. As indicated already Tuxford has some 41% of its proposed housing requirement already committed. Given this there is no requirement for the Local Plan to find it necessary to allocate a site in order to be delivered early in the plan period. The existing commitments in Tuxford will see growth of 8.4% in the number of dwellings within a short period of time. Accordingly, it would not be unreasonable for any additional allocations to be delivered in the later phases of the plan period. Accordingly, the rationale the Local Plan seeks to put forward for including one allocation has no sound basis.</p> <p>29. Tuxford has a 'made' Neighbourhood Plan and this plan is currently undergoing a review. As part of that review process there has been consultation on possible site allocations. This was undertaken in September 2019 and the fact that an allocation has now been included in the draft Local Plan is undermining the Neighbourhood Plan process, including the consultation undertaken. In addition, local residents are now confused about the relationship between the Neighbourhood Plan consultation and the inclusion of two sites in the previous draft Local Plan; and one site in this version of the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>30. The Neighbourhood Plan consultation responses were returned to Bassetlaw DC which does not help with confusion between the two separate plans.</p> <p>31. The Town Council has recently received an update on the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan on the 7th January 2021. We are aware that the day after (8th January 2021) the Town Council also had a meeting with Bassetlaw District Council to discuss moving forward the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. Progress on the Neighbourhood Plan has become stalled due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. However, it is clear that the Town Council and the LPA remain committed to moving forward the review of the Neighbourhood Plan. Accordingly, this remains the most appropriate forum through which to consider land allocations across Tuxford building upon the progress on site allocation options already undertaken in the early work on the Neighbourhood Plan review.</p> <p>Evidence</p> <p>32. As we raised previously the proposed site NP04 has not been comprehensively assessed in either the Land Availability Assessment process or the Site Selection Methodology in the form proposed for allocation. In the updated evidence to support the latest version of the draft Local Plan this fact has still not been addressed.</p> <p>33. The Local Plan has failed to properly assess all reasonable alternatives in terms of site assessment options. This appears to be as a consequence of the incomprehensible decision to treat Tuxford differently to all other 'Large Rural Settlements' by looking to allocate a site in the Local Plan rather than have all site allocations considered in the Neighbourhood Plan process.</p> <p>34. Potential reasonable alternatives such as site NP10 (east side of Tuxford off Lincoln Road) or NP11 (south of Tuxford east of Ashvale Road); warrant serious consideration. Site NP11 could for example provide scope within it for a relocated and expanded Primary School linked to the Secondary School. Also, the recent granting of planning permission for the relocation of the Co-op convenience store on Ashvale Road will move more of the core services and facilities of Tuxford to the east of the A1 closer to other sites such as NP10 or NP11.</p> <p>Landscape Impact</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
		<p>35. The proposed site allocation NP04 was not assessed within the ‘Site Allocations: Landscape Study’ document (dated November 2019). As we stated in our previous representation the proposed allocation was not supported by sufficient robust evidence to justify its allocation. Its omission from proper assessment in key evidence documents rendered the proposed allocation and the entire Local Plan unsound. That document only looked at proposed allocations in Harworth/Bircotes; Worksop; Retford; alongside possible employment sites around Markham Moor and the possible sites considered for a new settlement. Accordingly, in the original Landscape Study, the failure to assess sites in Tuxford appeared to be a serious omission, particularly given that this is the only settlement proposed for site allocations which has not been assessed in landscape terms.</p> <p>36. Site NP04 has now been assessed in the ‘Landscape Assessment Addendum Report’ (October 2020). Rather confusingly this assessment uses the site reference LAA476; which in other documents is the reference used for the much larger site. In this document the assessment has however looked at the allocation currently proposed. However, even with this Addendum Report there is still a fundamental omission in that there has been no landscape assessment of the other reasonable site options in Tuxford.</p> <p>37. It is notable that the ‘Landscape Assessment Addendum Report’ is damning in its conclusions on the landscape impact of the site. On visual connectivity it says: “The site is clearly visible from the West, along Ollerton Road looking East. It is also clearly visible from the rear gardens of The Pastures and the houses off Long Lane. The public right of way, running along the eastern edge of the site provides clear views West over countryside. In addition, the site is highly visible from further West along Long Lane, a byway/farm track.”</p> <p>38. It describes the site as: “Although there are clear site boundaries to the North, East and South, the western boundary is completely undefined within an open extensively farmed landscape, as part of a very large field.”</p> <p>39. The Report concludes: “The site adjoins the built-up area however, it clearly extends into open countryside and occupies a prominent position in the local landscape. It is a medium-sized site which could make a reasonable contribution to the overall dwelling requirement. However, the harm to open countryside and landscape interests that would result from development is likely to outweigh the benefits of new housing.”</p> <p>40. On the basis of this evidence the site allocation is not justified and given the clear and demonstrable harm that the LPA acknowledge; the site should be removed.</p> <p>41. The proposed allocation of site NP04 conflicts with the made Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan; which states on landscape matters in paragraph 59: “Where the site is on the edge of the town, it is important that the setting of the town and the visual connections with the countryside are maintained. Tuxford nestles in attractive rolling countryside; the topography of the town is discussed in the Tuxford Place Analysis and the rolling hills that surround the town afford views out to the countryside that are highly valued by local people.”</p> <p>42. Policy ST2 of the Local Plan also requires: “The proposal positively responds to the design principles as identified in Policy ST37, and any relevant characterisations studies as part of a neighbourhood plan.” The proposed allocation conflicts with the above Neighbourhood Plan analysis, consequently it therefore also fails to meet the requirements of Policy ST2.</p> <p>43. The Local Plan in paragraph 7.15.4 states: “The site is within a semi-rural location. Careful, sensitive design must respond appropriately to the characteristics of the site identified by the Site Allocations Landscape Assessment (2019), ensuring it has a positive impact on the setting of the landscape and the impact on views, particularly from the north and west.”</p> <p>44. The Local Plan has failed to refer to the conclusions of harm that would arise to the landscape in the ‘Landscape Assessment Addendum Report’. The LPA is seeking to ignore this evidence which does not support its position.</p> <p>45. Policy ST37 of the Local Plan requires development to appropriately protect and enhance existing landscape features, natural and heritage assets as an integral part of the development. The landscape harm that the ‘Landscape Assessment Addendum Report’ confirms means that the proposed site allocation would conflict with Policy ST37.</p> <p>46. Policy ST39 requires development to respond to the visual relationship and environment around settlements and their landscape settings; and maintain significant views of sensitive skylines, river corridors, key landscapes and heritage features, and be supported by a landscape and visual impact assessment. The proposed allocation of NP04 is not supported by the ‘Landscape Assessment Addendum Report’; accordingly, it fails to accord with Policy ST39.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
		<p>Factors such as the increased light pollution arising from a development of 90+ dwellings on a key entrance to Tuxford would increase the landscape impact.</p> <p>Heritage</p> <p>47. The 'Bassetlaw Heritage Methodology' (November 2020) which undertakes site assessments with regard to the historic environment fails to assess site NP04 or indeed any other reasonable alternative site in Tuxford. Once again this is a serious omission, particularly given that this is the only settlement proposed for site allocations which has not been assessed in heritage terms. This seems to be a particularly surprising omission given that the site NP04 lies on the opposite side of the road to the Tuxford Conservation Area, a designated heritage asset.</p> <p>48. The lack of site assessment in this latest methodology means that the proposed site allocation has not been properly assessed as required by Policy ST37. The SA identifies a major negative impact on heritage assets, as such the proposed allocation would conflict with Policy ST37. It would also conflict with Policy ST44 and Policy 45 which both look to protect the historic environment and heritage assets respectively.</p> <p>Transport</p> <p>49. The 'Transport Study Update' dates from January 2019 and is based on the former spatial strategy that is no longer proposed. As such this evidence document is out-of-date and does not support the proposals now being advanced in the Local Plan.</p> <p>50. The site assessment methodology for both of the proposed Tuxford site allocations indicates that these need to be supported by a strategic transport model including the fact that several off-site junctions may require capacity improvements. Given this conclusion it is surprising and disappointing that the 'Junction Assessments Report' dated January 2020 does not assess the impact on any junctions within Tuxford. Given the nature of the low bridge in the centre of Tuxford; the presence of the A1 slip roads; the A6075; and the use of the B1164 as a local diversion route for the A1 there are particular highway considerations in Tuxford. These should have been assessed in order to confirm what off-site junctions may require capacity improvements and whether such improvements can actually be delivered.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
REF088	Resident represented by Town-Planning.co.uk	<p>Sustainability Appraisal</p> <p>51. As we highlighted in the previous consultation the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) contains contradictory information in relation to the assessment of site NP04. The same contradictions are contained in the November 2020 SA. As such this document remains fundamentally flawed and undermines confidence in whether the site has been properly assessed. The site is assessed in Table 6.5 (SA Findings for Living Communities (Policies ST16-36)) and in the Table A6 - 45: Land south of Ollerton Road, Tuxford (NP04).</p> <p>52. The differences between the SA tables are as follows: see PDF</p> <p>53. These differences involve more than a third of the SA assessment criterion, as such this is a substantial level of difference.</p> <p>54. The SA also rather confusingly in paragraph 6.247 indicates that site NP04 is allocated for 75 dwellings; whereas in paragraph 6.248 the SA indicates that site NP04 is allocated for 90 dwellings. As this part of the SA remains dated January 2020 in the page footer it would suggest that the SA itself for Policy 30 has not been updated to take into account more recent evidence. In particular the SA fails to have taken into account the finding of harm in the 'Landscape Assessment Addendum Report' (October 2020).</p> <p>55. We have taken the SA assessment in the Table A6-45 in the appendices as our starting point as this relates to the site NP04. This table is also dated November 2020 and as such would appear to represent the most up-to-date assessment. This concludes that the site is likely to have a significant negative effect on the SA objectives of 'land use and soils' and 'cultural heritage'. We agree with these conclusions which weigh heavily against the suitability of this site to be allocated. It also concludes that there would be a negative effect on the SA objective of 'landscape and townscape'. We consider this underplays the harm identified in the 'Landscape Assessment Addendum Report' (October 2020).</p> <p>56. However, in addition in our judgement the SA appears to incorrectly assess other aspects of the site, the differences between the SA table A6-45 and our assessment are as follows: See PDF</p> <p>57. Whilst the site location does provide reasonable accessibility to some town centre services and facilities there is poor accessibility to some key services including the secondary school and GP surgery. Tuxford suffers from limited accessibility due to the road bridge under the A1 being the only connection between the two halves of the Town. The site is not within 800m of the GP Surgery as the SA suggests, it is 910m away from the closest part of the site by the most direct route and 1.6km from the secondary school.</p> <p>58. The proposed development would result in harm to primary school capacity as we explain in detail later. Policy 30 does refer to contributions towards the improvement of the existing public right of way at Long Lane for pedestrian access into the town. However Long Lane is not an adopted highway and we understand that the Lane has no clear ownership. Accordingly, this policy requirement cannot be delivered and this will make the social integration of this site more difficult. The proposal involves no regeneration benefits, given this and the issues of accessibility and integration and impact on primary school capacity means that we consider that the proposal has a 'mixture of positive and negative effects' on Regeneration and Social Inclusion.</p> <p>59. In terms of Health and Wellbeing the poor accessibility to the GP Surgery; along with the need to enter an area of poorer air quality and a noise corridor (under the A1) to get to the GP Surgery; and the distances required to access other primary healthcare facilities together with harm to primary school capacity means that in our view the proposal has a 'mixture of positive and negative effects' on this criterion. In addition, any allocation in Tuxford will result in vehicle movements through the A1 underbridge, this is an area of poorer air quality and as this provides the only pedestrian and cycle linkage between the two halves of the town in our view it must be deemed 'uncertain' what effect the site would have on the air quality criterion.</p> <p>60. Parts of Long Lane is at high risk of surface water flooding and the Environment Agency surface water flood risk mapping indicates that the farmland proposed to be allocated is the source of this surface water. Consequently, the allocation of this site has the potential due to the topography to exacerbate this surface water flood risk, therefore we consider that the assessment should be 'uncertain' what effect the site would have on this criterion.</p> <p>61. The site is within the shadow of an existing wind turbine, there was previously concern expressed about the inter-relationship between this wind turbine and development with regard to noise and shadow flicker. There has been no assessment of this aspect, as such there is potential that new development could result in the need to cease use of</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
		<p>the wind turbine. Therefore, we consider that the assessment should be 'uncertain' what effect the site would have on the climate change criterion.</p> <p>62. In terms of the impact on landscape and townscape the comments of BDC Planning Policy on the Neighbourhood Plan concluded that: "The landscape is very open, with long distance views to the south west. Character: the site adjoins a residential area which is suburban in character with residential development to one side. However, the site is not contained and is very open in character." This view of the LPA and is not currently reflected in the SA conclusions. The proposed site has no existing boundaries to the south or west and would represent an artificial subdivision of a large area of high-quality farmland.</p> <p>63. As identified earlier the 'Landscape Assessment Addendum Report' (October 2020) concluded: "The site adjoins the built-up area however, it clearly extends into open countryside and occupies a prominent position in the local landscape. It is a medium-sized site which could make a reasonable contribution to the overall dwelling requirement. However, the harm to open countryside and landscape interests that would result from development is likely to outweigh the benefits of new housing." This harm is in our view underplayed in the SA document.</p> <p>64. The site is located within the Mid-Nottinghamshire Farmlands Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone MN11 and is classified for conserve and reinforce. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'good' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. Introduction of a stark urban edge would harm the existing landscape character where the transition from the open fields to the town is mitigated by existing mature boundary treatments; the dipping topography; and the single storey nature of the western half of The Pastures.</p> <p>65. The site will be highly prominent from the western approach along the A6075 where the site will be unduly visible due to the approach road being over 10m in height above the site. The A6075 is at 75m AOD west of the Walkers industrial estate and is 73m AOD as you approach past the Walkers industrial estate; the site is at a height of around 60 to 62m AOD. Therefore, on this approach you get clear uninterrupted views of the edge of Tuxford; these views become more prominent as you reach the Walkers industrial estate.</p> <p>66. Given the previously stated conclusions of the LPA in the 'Landscape Assessment Addendum Report'; the landscape character sensitivity; the lack of any existing boundaries; and the prominence; we are of the view that the site would have a 'significant negative' effect.</p> <p>67. In our view the SA continues to fail to comply with paragraph 32 of the NPPF which states: "Local plans and spatial development strategies should be informed throughout their preparation by a sustainability appraisal that meets the relevant legal requirements. This should demonstrate how the plan has addressed relevant economic, social and environmental objectives (including opportunities for net gains). Significant adverse impacts on these objectives should be avoided and, wherever possible, alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued. Where significant adverse impacts are unavoidable, suitable mitigation measures should be proposed (or, where this is not possible, compensatory measures should be considered)."</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
REF088	Resident represented by Town-Planning.co.uk	<p>Landscape & Townscape and Heritage Assets</p> <p>68. We have explained above under the SA heading the landscape and townscape impact including lack of physical boundaries, topography, prominence in views and landscape sensitivity which we don't repeat here for brevity. As already identified the 'Bassetlaw Heritage Methodology' (November 2020) has not assessed site NP04, this further undermines the robustness of the SA conclusions on heritage.</p> <p>69. Harm to these SA objectives would be exacerbated by the need to create a 2m wide footway along the highway which would require the removal of the existing hedgerow along Ollerton Road. Furthermore, the Ollerton Road street lighting will also require extending accordingly as will the village gateway signing and road markings. This will significantly change the western gateway into the town and result in a harsh urban gateway rather than the semi-rural gateway that exists at present.</p> <p>70. The proposed site in our view would represent a stark bolt-on to the sensitive edge of Tuxford. In this regard it conflicts with Policy ST2 that requires: "The location and size of the proposal does not conflict with the character and built form of that part of the settlement." Policy ST39 also requires development on the edge of settlements to: "Create a soft edge between the existing built form and the countryside." The proposal would create a harsh edge to the built form and would therefore conflict with Policy ST39.</p> <p>71. This change from semi-rural to harsh urban character would change the character and appearance of the Tuxford Conservation Area which runs along the southern side of Ollerton Road. This would harm the significance of this designated heritage asset and the provision of housing would not represent a public benefit that is sufficient to outweigh this harm, particularly when there are reasonable alternative sites available elsewhere that do not result in heritage harm and when the site is not required to meet the actual strategic housing need due to the Local Plan choosing to over-allocate housing. Consequently, in our view the statutory duty in s72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 on local planning authorities to preserve and enhance conservation areas while undertaking their planning duties.</p> <p>72. The adjacent part of the Conservation Area is within the Market Place character area where the Character Appraisal indicates that: "The historic layout and plan form of the character area is predominantly characterised by buildings that front onto the street, often directly onto or close to the highway. Any new development, including infill or replacement, should seek to respect this character." If this character were to be followed this would introduce substantial harm through the strong urbanisation of Ollerton Road. Modern suburban type of development that would be likely in a modern housing estate would be contradictory to this character which would also harm the character or appearance of the Conservation Area gateway.</p> <p>73. Paragraph 194 of the NPPF states that: "Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification." In this case we consider that there is no such justification, as such the policy and allocation conflict with national planning policy.</p> <p>74. It would also conflict with paragraph 127 c) of the NPPF which requires planning policies and decisions to ensure that developments: "are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);"</p> <p>75. The open rural character of this gateway to Tuxford was considered in Appeal APP/A3010/W/18/3197118 which was for the site on the opposite side of the A6075. In that appeal the Inspector stated: "The significance of the appeal site as part of the conservation area is derived from its openness which reflects the historic context of the rural settlement and its relationship with the surrounding agricultural land. Whilst the site has not been in agricultural use for some time it has remained free from development and, in its village edge location, preserves the rural character context and setting of the built environment." Although for the site opposite the Inspector was clear that the land on Ollerton Road made an important contribution to the 'village's countryside setting'. The proposed allocation NP04 would be far greater in size; would be more prominent in landscape views than that previous appeal site. Consequently, it would result in even greater levels of harm than the Inspector concluded was appropriate to justify dismissal of the appeal opposite.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
		<p>Environmental Constraints 76. Paragraph 170 b) of the NPPF seeks planning policies and decisions to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: "recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland;" The site is Grade 2 agricultural land which is of high quality and forms part of the definition of 'best and most versatile agricultural land'. Policy ST1 looks to minimise the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3 agricultural land, where practicable. As such the allocation of site NP04 conflicts with Policy ST1. 77. Grade 2 agricultural land is defined by Natural England1 as: "Very good quality agricultural land - Land with minor limitations which affect crop yield, cultivations or harvesting. A wide range of agricultural and horticultural crops can usually be grown. On some land in the grade there may be reduced flexibility due to difficulties with the production of the more demanding crops, such as winter harvested vegetables and arable root crops. The level of yield is generally high but may be lower or more variable than grade 1." 78. Although most of Tuxford lies on Grade 2 agricultural land the proposed site here forms part of an extensive tract of best and most versatile agricultural land which makes it of greater agricultural benefit. Reasonable alternatives exist around Tuxford such as the 12 hectares of land between Lodge Lane and the Tuxford Academy which will become landlocked and unconnected to wider agricultural land. 79. The proposed allocation would result in housing becoming closer to the site of the wind turbine permitted under 50/10/00046. Condition 6 on this consent requires "The level of noise emissions from the combined effects of the wind turbine shall not exceed 5dBA above the background noise level at any occupied property." The proposed allocation extends into the yellow area illustrated in Figure 5.1 Noise Emissions in the Environmental Appraisal which supported application 50/10/00046; as such there is potential for the site allocation to prejudice the operation of this wind turbine which would reduce the contribution that it can make to climate change. The noise emission contour was developed having regard to the advice in ETSU-R-97: The assessment and rating of noise from wind farms which remains the relevant advice as specified in Planning Practice Guidance (Reference ID: 5-015-20140306). There has been no assessment as to the effect the proposed allocation would have on the wind turbine utilising ETSU-R-97: The assessment and rating of noise from wind farms.</p> <p>80. The consent for that turbine also has a condition 5 which states "No development shall commence until a scheme to satisfactorily alleviate the incidence of shadow flicker at any occupied property with windows facing towards the wind farm has been submitted to and approved in writing by the District Planning Authority." It is understood that a scheme to discharge this condition includes shutdown periods; although the actual details discharging the condition are not published on the LPA website.</p> <p>81. The Figure 6.1 Shadow Flicker in the Environmental Appraisal which supported application 50/10/00046; indicates that the proposed allocation would be located within the zone for shadow flicker potential. Given this if allocated the site would be likely to impose further restrictions on the operation of the wind turbine due to complaints that would be likely to arise which may be deemed to constitute statutory nuisance. 1 https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/agricultural-land-assess-proposals-for-development/guide-to-assessing-development-proposals-on-agricultural-land#agricultural-land-classification-alc 82. The proposed allocation has significant potential to adversely affect the operation of the existing wind turbine which would not be in the interests of proper planning or the impact on climate change. In this respect the proposed allocation would not constitute sustainable development as set out in paragraph 8 c) of the NPPF and undermine the ambition of paragraph 148 of the NPPF for the planning system to support the transition to a low carbon future.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
REF088	Resident represented by Town-Planning.co.uk	<p>Accessibility and Highway Impact</p> <p>83. As indicated earlier whilst the site location does provide reasonable accessibility to some town centre services and facilities there is poor accessibility to some key services including the secondary school and GP surgery.</p> <p>84. Tuxford suffers from limited accessibility due to the road bridge under the A1 being the only connection between the two halves of the Town. Policy 30 does refer to contributions towards the improvement of the existing public right of way at Long Lane for pedestrian access into the town. However Long Lane is not an adopted highway and we understand that the Lane has no clear ownership. Accordingly, as we indicated earlier this policy requirement cannot be delivered and this will make the social integration of this site more difficult.</p> <p>85. The proposed allocation would represent a ‘bolt-on’ to the edge of Tuxford with few opportunities to create integration and linkages. It will be reliant upon pedestrian and cycle access running alongside the main A6075 which provides for a poor environment due to the HGV movements to/from the Walkers industrial estate and the Boughton industrial estate which is reliant on the A6075 for access due to low bridge in Ollerton. For example, Clipper logistics, a large scale B8 storage and distribution use for ASDA and others based at Boughton industrial estate is frequented by lorries too high to get under the low bridge in Ollerton.</p> <p>86. There has been no assessment of the traffic generation from the proposed allocation as such the requirement for junction capacity improvements has not been assessed. Accordingly, the impact of a new access onto the A6075 on the free flow of traffic and in particular the relationship to HGV traffic using the Walkers industrial estate has not been assessed.</p> <p>87. The A6075 road adjacent to the proposed site has a natural dip in the road, this creates a partial blind spot for cars entering or leaving the village. This has the potential to limit the potential locations for any new access and would be likely to need the access to be created on the rise which together with the slight curve in the A6075 would result in any new access being highly prominent in the streetscene.</p> <p>88. The Highway Authority has recently objected to application 20/01644/FUL opposite the proposed site NP04. Their concerns include the fact that: “The site is currently located within the Ollerton Road 50mph speed restriction. The existing 30mph speed limit will therefore require extending to a point southwest of the southwestern most access. The Ollerton Road street lighting will also require extending accordingly as will the village gateway signing and road markings. Nevertheless, the site would remain at the edge of the 50mph limit. Vehicle speeds will therefore be expected to be reasonably high.”</p> <p>89. Long Lane is a narrow lane which is not an adopted highway which directly serves around a dozen properties. Existing residential householders have indemnity insurance in place to protect their right of use due to this lack of ownership. It has no defined footway and as a shared surface private road pedestrian and vehicular conflict already arises.</p> <p>90. The lane is not of sufficient width to allow two vehicles to pass and we understand that Long Lane is already used for regular access to agricultural fields by farm vehicles/heavy goods vehicles. It also provides access to Westwood Farm on occasions, access to maintenance of wind turbine on land owned by Westwood Farm, access to maintain the railway line and bridges by Network Rail and associated contractors. This use already presents a conflict between vehicles and pedestrians using the footpath or residents and their children living on Long Lane. Encouraging greater use of the public right of way would exacerbate the potential for vehicular and pedestrian conflict. This would not achieve the requirements of Policy ST37 of the Local Plan to prioritise safe, easy and direct pedestrian, cycle and public transport movement, and ensure the safe, convenient movement of all highway users.</p> <p>91. In relation to Long Lane the LPA has failed to take into account the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long Lane adjacent to the proposed site cannot be used as part of the size/area calculation as it is not privately owned and is a common lane; • No assessment has been made on the usage of Long Lane by additional pedestrians and cyclists from the proposed site; specifically, with regard to the risk to their safety particularly for the elderly/children/cyclists due to width of Long Lane only being 4.5 metres with no ability to widen the lane; • Long Lane has existing poor surface water drainage issue because there are no drains, surface water along the lane includes water run-off from the adjoining fields and the introduction of development has the potential to exacerbate 	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
		<p>surface water run-off;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long Lane already has 12 existing residential properties which generates a number of vehicle movements, including service vehicles; this is a greater number of dwellings that would normally be permitted on a shared private road. This increased number of vehicle movements on the lane where vehicles cannot be segregated from pedestrians and cyclists using the public footpath already poses a risk to highway and pedestrian safety which would be unnecessarily increased by the proposed allocation; • The above conflict is already increased by the use of the lane by large agricultural vehicles, HGV's and trailers servicing the fields up to and including Westwood Farm. Further vans and HGV's also use the lane to service the wind turbine and single-track railway on the south side of Ollerton Road; and • Legal searches during land/property purchasing by existing residents of Long Lane, have indicated that there is no proof of private ownership of Long Lane; consequently, a number of the residents have indemnity insurance in place to cover legal costs in the event of an ownership/usage challenge coming forward from a third party. NCC Highways have confirmed that NCC have no interest in the maintenance and upkeep of Long Lane according to the documents they hold. <p>92. The proposed site will be unduly reliant upon the A6075 to provide pedestrian and cycle linkages to the services and facilities of Tuxford. Much of the length of footway between the proposed site and the junction of Ollerton Road with Eldon Street is a narrow footway less than 1m in width immediately adjacent to a carriageway frequented by HGVs. As such the proposed site allocation will struggle to be in a position to take the opportunity to improve the scope for access on foot; to provide a street layout that allow for easy pedestrian connections within and between neighbourhoods; to provide a layout that encourage walking, take up opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes; to provide safe and suitable access to the site for all users, to give priority to pedestrians both within the scheme and neighbouring area; address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport; and to create a place that is safe that minimises conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles. This would result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety and a failure to take the opportunities available to improve the character and quality of the area and the way it functions. Accordingly, the proposed allocation would be contrary to the objectives of paragraph 84, 91, 108, 110, 122, and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>93. The Highway Authority has recently objected to two proposed developments opposite the proposed allocation (20/01644/FUL & 20/01654/FUL). In the latter of these the Highway Authority specifically identify the need to consider the existing 'dip' in the carriageway with regard to visibility. They stated: "The applicant should provide accurate survey data to demonstrate that appropriate visibility splays are achievable from each proposed access, taking into account the vertical and horizontal alignment of Ollerton Road, plus the site gradients. A speed survey may potentially be required to establish vehicle speeds on Ollerton Road. Visibility in the vertical plane should normally be measured from a driver's eye height of 1.05m above the road surface (at the 2.4m 'X' distance) to a height of 0.26m. It would be unacceptable to 'lose' the headlights of an approaching vehicle in a dip within a visibility splay. All of the land within the splays must be within the applicant's control." The LPA has not demonstrated that a safe access can be secured into the proposed site allocation having regard to both the vertical and horizontal alignment of Ollerton Road. As such the Local Plan fails to demonstrate the potential impacts of development on transport networks can be addressed satisfactorily as required by paragraph 102 of the NPPF.Infrastructure Demand</p> <p>94. The site as with all new housing development will generate demand of additional pupil numbers. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan indicates that site NP04 will generate a need for 20 primary school places and 15 secondary school places.</p> <p>95. Obtaining school capacity figures is not particularly straightforward as these are often not widely published, we have therefore used the school capacity figures published by Ofsted. It is accepted that parental choice impacts upon school planning and forecasting, however it would be reasonable to assume that development within Tuxford will impact on pupil numbers at Tuxford Primary Academy and Tuxford Academy.</p> <p>96. Tuxford Primary Academy has a capacity of 240 pupils, but the school is currently oversubscribed by having 333 pupils. The 2021-22 Nottinghamshire school admission statistics anticipates the roll to be 339 pupils. This represents</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
		<p>an anticipated roll of 99 pupils in excess of capacity, which is 41% over capacity before any additional development occurs. 97. The allocation of Site NP04 and the other committed housing of 102 units will collectively generate additional demand for a further 43 pupils (NP04 – 20; commitments - 23). This will result in an anticipated roll of 142 pupils in excess of capacity, which would then be 59% over capacity. 98. Tuxford Academy has a capacity of 1,462 with current numbers standing at 1,554. The 2021-22 Nottinghamshire school admission statistics anticipates the roll to be 1,550 pupils. This represents an anticipated roll of 88 pupils in excess of capacity, which is 6% over capacity before any additional development occurs. 99. The allocation of Site NP04 together with the committed 102 other dwellings collectively generate additional demand for a further 32 pupils (NP04 – 15; other commitments 17). This will result in an anticipated roll of 120 pupils in excess of capacity, which would then be 8% over capacity. (Note – this figure would be increased by development proposed outside Tuxford but within the catchment area which covers other large settlements such as East Markham and also extends beyond Bassetlaw into Newark & Sherwood) 100. Although financial contributions will be sought for expansion, it is noted that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan assumes that this additional capacity can be accommodated within expansion at existing schools. However, in relation to the Primary Academy the school site measures 11,991m² including the Sure Start Centre and Nursery or 10,847m² excluding the Sure Start Centre and Nursery. The Primary Academy operates on a constrained site with no additional land available for expansion. 101. Nottinghamshire County Council² states that a 210 pupil Primary School requires a gross area of 10,900m², with a 420 pupil Primary School requiring a gross area of 19,300m². With the increased pupil numbers arising the Tuxford Primary Academy will potentially have a total of 382 pupils. The Tuxford Primary Academy site is only sufficient in size for a 210-pupil school which is in fact less than its designed capacity. With the predicted impact of the developments proposed in Tuxford the school site will be around 8,450m² too small. This will substantially harm primary education in Tuxford and as such the Local Plan should be planning for a second site for the school or the relocation of the school to a new site and redevelopment of its existing site for housing. In this respect there would seem to be more logic in planning for a more comprehensive development centered on NP11, the Ashvale Road committed housing site and a new primary school created as part of an extended education campus next to Tuxford Academy. Other Matters 102. The proposed allocation would require the diversion of a low voltage electricity line, although not uncommon the required re-routing would need to be along the eastern site edge and along Long Lane which would not aid a layout that could successfully integrate with the existing built form. Conclusion and Change Requested</p> <p>103. For the reasoning set out above we consider that the proposed allocation would have an unacceptable impact on a number of specific matter as we summarise in the 'Summary of Representation' section at the beginning of this document. The changes we request to the Local Plan are also set out in the 'Changes Requested' section at the beginning of this document.</p>	
REF113	Resident	<p>I am objecting to the proposed site NS14 / NP04 on behalf of the six residents in my household.</p> <p>Confusion and inadequate responses to opposition</p> <p>My previous opposition to what was originally referred to as NP04 and now for some reason (perhaps to further cause confusion) is referred to as HS14 that was submitted appeared to have a 'cut and paste' response, with a number of items being completely ignored as shown in the below link:</p> <p>https://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/media/5962/st23-ollerton-road-tuxford.pdf</p> <p>I also note that the same 'cut and paste' replies were used for most comments / oppositions made and it appears from this that there was an entirely negative response to this site from local residents, myself included. I will therefore reiterate my points again below so they are not ignored for the next phase and I would like to expect a full response to all points both original and new:</p> <p>Original Opposition to NP04 Now referred to as HS14</p> <p>Tuxford is a small town with little on offer in the way of employment. It is highly likely that most houses on the site would be using motor vehicles to leave Tuxford for their place of work elsewhere. NP04 is a very large site with very clear impact to traffic and town infrastructure. It appears no traffic survey has been completed for this site and it would have a direct impact on the existing traffic problems found at the intersection of Ollerton road (A6075) and</p>	<p>The number of homes on the site has been reduced to 75. This takes into account the size of the site and the level of land required for infrastructure. A safe and suitable access to and from the site is required from Ollerton Road.</p> <p>Any adverse traffic impacts will need to be mitigated where appropriate and this will be detailed within a traffic assessment as part of any planning application.</p> <p>The education authority has not raised any objections to this site. However, contributions may be necessary from the development to support local educational provision.</p> <p>There is not enough suitable or available brownfield land to accommodate the level of growth for Tuxford. Some land outside of the development boundary has been considered, but</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
		<p>Eldon Street (B1164) and the intersection of Newark road/Newcastle street to Lincoln road (A6075). This is just the impact to the closest roads to the site but it would also push problems further into Tuxford with queuing from the A1 on Ashvale road (A6075) becoming worse.</p> <p>PG 98 - Policy 24: Site NP04 Ollerton Road, Tuxford</p> <p>3. a) Tuxford primary school has a capacity of 240 pupils, currently they have 333 pupils. The secondary school has a capacity of 1462 with current numbers standing at 1554. How will this be supported by the contributions for expansion?</p> <p>1. The land is Grade 2 agricultural land which I have been informed should not be developed upon according to the national plan. Please confirm or clarify if my understanding is incorrect.</p> <p>2. Previous sites that were put forward in the local plan, NP09 and NP10 were rejected by the council as they fall outside the envelope, I am under the belief NP04 also falls outside the envelope. I'd therefore like to understand why this is being put forward as it seems conflicting reasons are being used per site if this is the case.</p> <p>3. Previous planning permission has been sought on land opposite this site for development (http://publicaccess.bassetlaw.gov.uk/online-applications/propertyDetails.do?activeTab=relatedCases&keyVal=000HU9CSLI000) and has been refused twice. The details for the refusal are not available on the website but local knowledge was given that it was due to the impact to traffic on Ollerton road.</p> <p>4. The houses could be affected by sun flicker and noise from the nearby wind turbines. Additional opposition and comments</p> <p>We also have a number of additional points to raise as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan doesn't appear to factor in current development taking place within Tuxford. Currently there are 86 houses in development and several other planning applications within the town. It appears that a bolt on approach to meeting the housing requirement has been taken with very little consideration towards policy, the Neighbourhood plan or residents' comments. • I appreciate the need to increase housing numbers nationally but some rural places are better suited to accommodate growth than others. Specifically when looking at services (water/draining etc) and existing overstretched road infrastructure. • Why was NP10 rejected when the flow of traffic would be more suitable, i.e. access to A1, A57, Secondary School. • Ref 119 & Ref 454 in the link: https://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/media/5962/st23-ollerton-road-tuxford.pdf - Points made by WH Betts are worrying, as they specifically reference future expansion of the site. BDC also refer in their responses to reducing the initial site size as part of the very first round of consultations, it appears that if this is agreed, there is a very real risk they could revert back to the larger site size at a later date, outside of the Local Plan. This appears to be a very obvious gateway approach to a larger expansion. • Long lane is an unadopted highway and has no known ownership. Residents have indemnity policies should anyone claim ownership. As such how can this be used for pedestrian access to the village under its current state of repair. How would the council improve this? • The 'Landscape Assessment Addendum Report' clearly concluded, "the harm to open countryside and landscape interests that would result from the development is likely to outweigh the benefits of new housing". <p>I have copied the following from the Draft plan and it seems the Ollerton Road site does not meet all items listed:</p> <p>"Proposals in the Large Rural Settlements; through site allocations in this Plan, through made neighbourhood plans, or through appropriate development within their development boundaries will be supported where all of the following are met:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Proposals should not exceed the number of dwellings in the eligible settlement(s) in their Parish, by more than 20% individually or in combination with other housing developments with planning permission or through site allocations in respective neighbourhood plans or this Local Plan; 2) Each proposal should not exceed 1 hectare in size, unless it forms part of a site allocation in respective neighbourhood plans or this Local Plan; 3) The location and size of the proposal does not conflict with the character and built form of that part of the 	<p>there are other factors that determine whether a site is considered suitable or not for development.</p> <p>Any adverse impact from noise will need to be mitigated through the design of the development.</p> <p>The plan has taken account of any planning permission granted since the 1st April 2018 and these will contribute towards the 250 homes that are required for Tuxford.</p> <p>Long Lane will only have access to and from the site for pedestrians and cyclists as its a formal public right of way. No vehicular will be made to the site from Long Lane.</p> <p>The landscape report looked at the wider landscape issues and the site area had been reduced to reflect those concerns. The boundary towards the open countryside to west will be to be designed to account for its rural setting.</p> <p>Policy ST2 has since been revised and the criteria for Large Rural Settlements has been updated. The reference to 1 hectare or less has been removed.</p> <p>The site is 3 hectares and this is suitable for 75 dwellings which is a smaller number than 90 which was proposed previously. This removes the discrepancies between different parts of the plan.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
		<p>settlement;</p> <p>4) The proposal positively responds to the design principles as identified in Policy ST37, and any relevant characterisations studies as part of a neighbourhood plan."</p> <p>The published notice posted on the local Tuxford street lamps states the following:</p> <p>Proposal: 90 dwellings and supporting infrastructure</p> <p>Location: Ollerton Road, Tuxford, Newark, NG22 0NJ</p> <p>The allocated site boundaries are highlighted in red on the plan as part of the notice, with specific site boundary locations identified in relation to adjacent topography including road positions, adjoining land boundaries and existing housing. (note: the plan shows Long Lane as incorporated within the proposed site, this Lane does not have established legal ownership, existing residents have indemnity insurance in place to protect their interests against a future claim being made by a third party on the ownership and usage). No actual site size is published on the plan.</p> <p>The identified site using the boundaries on the published plan measures 28560 sq. metres (2.865 hectares) to the south western boundary location (this also enables distance to the nearest wind turbine and industrial estate to be calculated, although both are not shown on the published plan). This represents 73.23% of the 3.9 hectares listed below:</p> <p>The Bassetlaw Infrastructure Delivery Plan Part 2 (Nov 20) page 60 states the following:</p> <p>HS 14 Ollerton Road Tuxford</p> <p>Site Area 3.9 hectares</p> <p>Number of Dwellings Minimum of 90 units</p> <p>The Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan 2018-2037 p78 refers to the site as NP04, identifying 1.5ha available with a minimum number of dwellings as 90. Page 106 of the same document item 7.15.3 refers to 3.9 hectares and 7.15.5 refers to at least 90 homes.</p> <p>As is shown from the above information there is a discrepancy between the information in the documents published by Bassetlaw District Council which is misleading to the general public. In light of the discrepancy identified please also confirm which size of land has been used to calculate the proposed housing density for the site and is the proposed number 90 or a minimum of 90?</p> <p>Facilities Distance</p> <p>One of the reasons that the NP10 site was rejected was that it was too far away from the facilities of the village. The measurements below are from the closest point on the relevant site and do not take into account where the new road access would be or any hazard in that location. 6 of the 8 facilities are further away with NP04/HS14 with many more hazards than with the dismissed NP10 site. Also, the flow of traffic to 6 of the 8 facilities would be through the centre of the village which is where the main congestion is.</p>	
REF127	Lincolnshire County Council, Archaeological Planning Advice	<p>2. Policies 17 to 30 (Site Allocations)</p> <p>Each site has been consulted on in relation to archaeology and where potential has been identified, I welcome the inclusion of the advice provided.</p>	Thank you for your comments.
REF182	Anglian Water	<p>POLICY 30: Site NP04: Ollerton Road, Tuxford (page 107) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Anglian Water is the water undertaker for Tuxford and has no objection to the principle of residential development on this site.</p>	Thank you for your comments

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
REF192	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:</p> <p>7.15.6 on page 106 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road. Although "Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Travel Plan & Transport Assessment for the site." it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:- "Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction." Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90+houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.) The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. Please see Appendix i – a recent unofficial Traffic Survey undertaken by myself and Y Cooper recording traffic using A6075 West in both directions during these peak times. Please note this was during COVID restrictions and therefore can be assumed to be lower than usual.</p> <p>The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain.</p> <p>It has been suggested at the open Consultation Events that Highways may consider locating a roundabout near the Industrial Estate entrance to help ease traffic congestion. This would not help, as observation (not yet evidenced) shows the majority of traffic travelling to and from the Ollerton Road / Eldon Road junction carries on along the A6075 and past the Industrial Estate. HGV vehicles are using this route to access the Clipper site and others at the Boughton Industrial Estates due to the low bridge at Boughton.</p> <p>In addition, as the greatest number of vehicles recorded by the recent Traffic Survey (Appendix i) are cars, it can be presumed that many use the A6075 as a route from the A1 to Ollerton, Edwinstowe, Worksop, Mansfield & beyond. It is, in effect a "Rat Run" which needs attention, not more traffic trying to access it from a new development site.</p> <p>Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for a minimum two years or more.</p> <p>Transport & Accessibility p107</p> <p>5.v Proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane. I would respectfully suggest that the Bassetlaw Plan is naïve in thinking that residents on the new development will use this to any great extent and will therefore add to the problematic parking / traffic issues Tuxford residents already experience when using the local shops. It can be observed at any time that the majority of shop users arrive in vehicles, as do many taking children to school, probably because they are on their way to and from work in other areas.</p> <p>There are apparently plans for the Co-op to move to a site on Ashvale Road, therefore even less incentive for residents on the new development to walk along an improved footpath on Long Lane.</p> <p>POLICY ST46: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page144 states:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by 7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; <p>Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw.</p>	<p>The Council has consulted the Highway authority – Nottinghamshire County Council on the principle of up to 90 dwellings at the site. They raised no objection in principle subject to a detailed transport assessment and Travel Plan through any future planning application.</p> <p>The proposed policy identifies the need for a single access point off Ollerton Road for vehicles and pedestrians and the need to provide new or improved footway connections from the site into the town centre.</p> <p>Off site highway mitigation is unknown until detailed plans are submitted to the Council.</p> <p>An improved footway from the site via Long Lane will provide a convenient connection to the shops and school. Due to the limited parking in the town centre, it will help encourage more people to walk or cycle from the site to access those services and facilities.</p> <p>Where the development causes an impact to local infrastructure, then contributions will be sought from the developer to mitigate any adverse impacts. This could be Open Space, Health, Education or highways.</p> <p>The reason for the air quality in parts of the town to be lower than average is the fact the A1 runs through the centre. In times of heavy traffic is when the air quality is at its poorest. The site on ollerton road is located away from the A1 so it should not lead to a further reduction in air quality.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
		<p>However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. The proposed development of site NP04 would increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at that junction and throughout Tuxford – an increased health risk to residents on The Pastures (where several over 65's already have respiratory health issues) and all Tuxford residents.</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>The Bassetlaw Plan presentation at the open Consultation Events stated that future development should be “where the infrastructure can cope”, and “should have a negative effect on the residents”.</p> <p>The infrastructure in Tuxford is at breaking point – GP surgery & primary school at maximum, the sewerage system in the centre of town needing emergency repair twice within 12 months, the highways over used and causing major traffic congestion for residents. It is only a matter of time before there is a serious traffic incident with potential loss of life.</p> <p>Tuxford has already had 102 dwellings built or committed for development since 2018, and is struggling to cope with that so far. Development of a further 90+ dwellings will be the straw that broke the camels back. Even a few small developments within Tuxford without an improved infrastructure could be catastrophic. The traffic congestion within Tuxford has been overlooked for too long, and needs to be addressed as a matter of urgency, before any further development is considered.</p> <p>Please see attachment Appendix i</p>	
REF192	Resident	In the BLP on p106 it says the site NP04 is "identified as deliverable from 2027" Does this mean completed or started?	This state that the site is likely to commence from 2027 onwards.
REF201	Severn Trent	<p>Severn Trent would recommend that Water Efficiency design and Water re-use is outlined within policy 30 to ensure that development is carried out in a sustainable way, making the most of the resources available. We would also recommend that the 110 l/h/d water efficiency standard is incorporated to ensure that developers understand that what is expected from them from the outset.</p> <p>We would also recommend that the policy incorporates references to the Drainage Hierarchy and SuDS to ensure that development is undertaken in a sustainable way. There are known constraints on the downstream sewer network, therefore there is an increased likelihood that development could increase downstream flood risk, by implementing the Drainage Hierarchy and SuDS design this risk could be reduced. There is a surface water system in close proximity to the development therefore no surface water will be permitted to connect to the foul sewer network.</p>	Water efficiency and water reuse is identified through Local Plan Policy. Flood and drainage issues such as the inclusion of SuDS will be included within the strategic water and drainage policies as previously agreed.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
REF049	Resident	<p>We would like to add our comments again to the proposed Bassetlaw Plan, specifically that part which affects our local community in Tuxford. Tuxford is deemed as being able to accommodate a significant increase in dwellings without any reference to any additions, improvements or additional funding in infrastructure, schools or doctors. We would suggest that these dwellings would put an additional, serious strain on these services. Even during the pandemic crisis the traffic situation at peak times is dangerous -particularly between the junction of Ollerton Road and Eldon Street. The environmental impact on pedestrians has not been taken into consideration which has been exacerbated during the pandemic as people are queuing outside shops and the post office. HGV's meeting each other in the centre of the village often brings all vehicles to a standstill and endangers other road users and pedestrians alike. The impact of the additional dwellings between Ollerton Road and Long Lane is particularly problematical. Newcastle Street is bottlenecked at peak times with cars going to the school, vehicles coming off the A1 northbound, and vehicles and pedestrians accessing the Coop supermarket with street parking on both sides of the road. This would be increased by the number of new vehicles that additional dwellings would bring. We understand that the plan for the extra dwellings in Tuxford does not take into account the existing residential development that has been ongoing since 2018 as part of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. This should be looked at as part of the Bassetlaw Plan. May we also ask why our previously submitted opinions and comments cannot be considered at this juncture?</p>	<p>The Council has consulted the Highway authority – Nottinghamshire County Council on the principle of up to 90 dwellings at the site. They raised no objection in principle subject to a detailed transport assessment and Travel Plan through any future planning application.</p> <p>The proposed policy identifies the need for a single access point off Ollerton Road for vehicles and pedestrians and the need to provide new or improved footway connections from the site into the town centre.</p> <p>Off site highway mitigation is unknown until detailed plans are submitted to the Council.</p>
REF051	Resident	<p>This plan was proposed, discussed and consulted on less than 12 months ago. All of the previous objections should still be valid. The council appears to be focused on forcing through this scheme by hoping that objectors will be weary of the process. For a rural community to be considering using prime agricultural land, directly adjacent to pensioners housing, to build a minimum of 90 houses is fundamentally wrong.. Brown field sites should be the priority, followed by non agricultural land.. This whole plan smacks of taking the easiest option for developers profit margins and nothing at all to do with maintaining the countryside and rich agricultural heritage of Tuxford.</p>	<p>The site is considered a sustainable and suitable location for some residential development. The original area put forward at the start of the process has been reduced and now the number of dwellings proposed is 75 units.</p> <p>There are not enough available or suitable brownfield sites in Tuxford to accommodate the level of required development.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
REF123	Resident	<p>There is little evidence to show that the residents of Tuxford are being consulted on this and other proposals. Tuxford is a small town with little on offer in the way of employment. It is therefore highly likely that any development would increase the number motor vehicles travelling through Tuxford to their place of work. The building of at least 90 houses would have a very clear impact to traffic and the town infrastructure. Specifically the intersection of Ollerton Road (A6075) and Eldon Street (B1164), the intersection of Newark road/Newcastle street to Lincoln road (A6075) and the impact on the heritage area of Eldon Street. The only traffic survey to date was completed by concerned residents in October. This highlighted the issues that had been raised repeatedly and presented for consideration at the previous Bassetlaw planning meeting. Tuxford is in the unenviable position of having the worst pollution in Bassetlaw. Development of this size can only exacerbate the problem. There are also the issues of the impact on the existing services in Tuxford. Currently the secondary school has a capacity of 1462 pupils and has at least 100 pupils over this number on roll. The primary school is has a capacity of 240 pupils with more than 30% more than this on roll. The primary school is already beyond the recommended area required for the number of pupils and has little room for expansion. Similarly there would be an impact on health provision.</p> <p>The land is Grade 2 agricultural land which, according to the National Plan, should not be developed. Within the compass of the town there are a variety of brown field and green field sites that could provide for reasoned and planned development. The site is on one of the highest points in the town and would have a major visual impact from all southern aspects. The only sites that received any form of support from a very concerned populace were on the Lincoln Road beyond the railway line, sites NP09 and NP10. These were rejected by the planning group because they were deemed too far away from local services. With the redevelopment of the Co-op to a new site on Ashvale Road the town will have 3 small supermarket outlets, 2 of which will be closer to the Lincoln Road sites without having an impact on pedestrian crossings, the busiest road junctions and the narrow heritage Eldon Street. The same applies to the secondary school, the playing fields, the doctor's surgery, the playground, access to Lincoln and access to Newark. The Ollerton Road/ Eldon Street area has an infrastructure that was developed during the last century and before. There have been repeated failures of both the water and sewage systems in recent times causing complete road closures. The volume of proposed housing and its location on the highest area of the town should give cause for concern.</p>	<p>There have been several consultation events over the last couple of years regarding development within Tuxford and for this proposed site. The Council has also met with the Town Council and community at a number of these events since 2019.</p> <p>Land around Tuxford is heavily constrained whether it heritage, landscape, traffic, flooding or the environment so careful consideration on the location of growth has been undertaken through the Council's Sustainability Appraisal and Site Selection process.</p> <p>The site, although constrained, offers the most sustainable option for accommodating some residential development, whilst limiting the impact on nearby areas or other constraints.</p> <p>Where the development causes an impact to local infrastructure, then contributions will be sought from the developer to mitigate any adverse impacts. This could be Open Space, Health, Education or highways.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
REF124	Resident	<p>It is clear that this plan has been put forward without any real form of consultation with the residents of Tuxford. When the original sites were put forward in 2019 as part of the Bassetlaw Plan the only areas that received any level of support were NP09 and NP10. This is basically because the residents are aware of the issues with traffic flow throughout the town. Of particular concern is the oldest, busiest and narrowest part of the town, Eldon Street, and the junctions to the Ollerton Road and Egmont Road.</p> <p>Both of these sites were rejected by the planners as being too far from the amenities on offer.</p> <p>With the proposed development of a newly sited Co-op the town will have three super markets, two of which would be closer to sites NP09 and NP10 than NP04. The same applies to the doctor's surgery, the secondary school, the playing fields, the play ground, access to Lincoln and to Newark. None would have to negotiate the busiest junctions, the narrowest main road or any of the pedestrian crossings.</p> <p>There does not appear to have been any traffic survey carried out by Bassetlaw Planning. The only one has come from concerned resident volunteers. The results of this survey, carried out on a normal weekday, with Covid restrictions for business premises in place, highlight the volume and the movement of cars and heavy lorries through the heritage areas of the town. An examination of Google maps, a picture taken on a quieter non school day, shows the essence of the problem quite clearly.</p> <p>The proposed development is on prime agricultural land, located at one of the highest points in the town. It would have a major visual impact on the aspect of the heritage areas of the town from all views from the south. There have been regular repairs to the services in the centre of the town, both sewage and water mains needing major work, resulting in total road closures. A development of at least 90 houses would only exacerbate these problems. Tuxford is the most polluted area in the whole of Bassetlaw. Development on the proposed scale would do nothing to alleviate this. All community services- doctors, primary school, secondary school are currently well beyond their capacity. Further development would have a major impact. In particular to the primary school that has no room for further growth.</p> <p>Any future expansion needs very careful planning involving full consultation with the people to whom this will have the greatest impact- the residents of Tuxford.</p>	<p>There have been several consultation events over the last couple of years regarding development within Tuxford and for this proposed site. The Council has also met with the Town Council and community at a number of these events since 2019.</p> <p>Land around Tuxford is heavily constrained whether it heritage, landscape, traffic, flooding or the environment so careful consideration on the location of growth has been undertaken through the Council's Sustainability Appraisal and Site Selection process.</p> <p>The site, although constrained, offers the most sustainable option for accommodating some residential development, whilst limiting the impact on nearby areas or other constraints.</p> <p>Where the development causes an impact to local infrastructure, then contributions will be sought from the developer to mitigate any adverse impacts. This could be Open Space, Health, Education or highways.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
REF028	Resident	<p>We support the development of the site for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tuxford has had little development recently and there is a need for new housing. Building new houses in Tuxford will give more opportunity for people to live in the rural area rather than lack of housing forcing them to live in Retford or Worksop. It is important for young people, who have grown up in Tuxford and the local area, to have the option to live in Tuxford. 2. Tuxford is an ideal site for development because it has facilities such as good schools, shops, library, community centre and a doctors surgery. The village has good road links with the A1 and A57 close by. 3. The site has no flood risk. 4. The site is only a short walk to shops, café, the library and the primary school. 5. Access to the site from Ollerton road is good. 6. Houses only border the site on one side, the other sides are farmland, and therefore only a small number of people will border the development. 7. The site could expand beyond the area currently marked should further housing be required in Tuxford. 8. We support the development of the site. The site only forms a small part of the land we farm and we will be able to continue to farm when the site is developed. <p>We live close to Tuxford and farm all around the town with two farm yards in the centre of the town. We have many friends and family members who live and run businesses in the town. As local people we are appreciative of the beautiful and historical area and welcome the opportunity to help to ensure that the development enhances Tuxford.</p>	Thank you for your comments.
REF143	Resident	<p>Reasons for objection:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development on arguably the highest quality of land in the district. Grade 2 soil that is suitable for growing vegetables as well as cereals. 2. Green belt land is a specially designated area of countryside protected from development. Protection from urban sprawl and to encourage development within settlements of which Tuxford has many. 3. Traffic. I suggest any bassetlaw planning official observe the Eldon Street/Ollerton Road junction and the Newcastle Street/Eldon Street junction between 7.30- 9.30 am and 15.00-17.00. Tuxford is more or less gridlocked on a school day and to expect another 100 dwellings to embark on the junction to Eldon Street is extremely naive to the problems. Opinions from a resident of Newcastle Street and council tax payer of 12 years. 	<p>Land around Tuxford is heavily constrained whether it heritage, landscape, traffic, flooding or the environment so careful consideration on the location of growth has been undertaken through the Council's Sustainability Appraisal and Site Selection process.</p> <p>The site, although constrained, offers the most sustainable option for accommodating some residential development, whilst limiting the impact on nearby areas or other constraints.</p> <p>There is no Green-Belt land in Bassetlaw – Green Belt is a Planning Policy Designation that affords the highest protection from inappropriate development.</p> <p>The Council has consulted the Highway authority – Nottinghamshire County Council on the principle of up to 90 dwellings at the site. They raised no objection in principle subject to a detailed transport assessment and Travel Plan through any future planning application.</p> <p>The proposed policy identifies the need for a single access point off Ollerton Road for vehicles and pedestrians and the need to provide new or improved footway connections from the site into the town centre.</p> <p>Off site highway mitigation is unknown until detailed plans are submitted to the Council</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
REF145	Resident	<p>Policy no. 7.15.7 – “my concern is the service of Long Lane. No doubt those going to work in the morning will use Ollerton Road entrance. Those at home will use cars on Long Lane. Will Long Lane be resurfaced. This road is bad enough now without any extra traffic”.</p>	<p>There will be no vehicular access to the proposed site via Long Lane. The only access will be for pedestrians and cyclists similar to that at the Pastures.</p>
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	<p>It is disappointing to note that this particular site NP04 has been included as opposed to the site off Lexington Gardens and St John’s College Farm, previously annotated as NP16 in the Neighbourhood Plan. Although the site had a planning refusal in August 2018 and the subsequent appeal dismissed, it was clear from the Inspector’s decision that this was due to several technical issues of overlooking, orientation and the general mix of house types but certainly not due to any policy or locational issues. Indeed the site had an Officer’s recommendation for approval and Conservation had no issue.</p> <p>The existing range of agricultural buildings regarded as contributing positively to the character of the area have all been carefully and thoughtfully restored, renovated and converted to dwellings and along with the now carefully restored listed St John’s Farmhouse provide and retain much of the original character.</p> <p>Within the previous Neighbourhood Plan allocation NP16 refers to this site. Having read this several times I cannot find a single negative point, only positive statements and positive guidance on taking a scheme forward, all of which were included and considered previously. The sustainability appraisal scores a significant positive for housing delivery, health and well being and only a minor positive with regards to economy skills, regeneration and social inclusion and transport but it is still a positive. It is suggested there would be a significant negative on land use (grade 2 soil) and cultural heritage although, as a matter of record, the previous application and appeal confirmed this scheme to have no adverse impact on the heritage assets. This issue can therefore be satisfied. When NP16 is compared to the site on Ollerton Road, Tuxford, Policy NP04, it is difficult to understand how NP04 should progress over NP16, the latter having been subject to close scrutiny and, as stated before, technical issues prevented an approval being granted.</p> <p>NP04 is open countryside, it is located on the edge of the village and, as indicated, will have negative impacts on the open views of farmland (southern part). It too has grade 2 soil and it does not have any conservation constraints, identical to NP16. NP04 will provide a housing estate on the entry into Tuxford from Ollerton, this may or may not be a bad thing but there is one thing for certain, it will change this approach into the village for good. No such issue or constraints apply to NP16. It is in many respects a typical “infill” site. All issues regarding highways, drainage, services, contributions etc have been resolved and none found wanting. All in all, NP04 has less positive effects than the previously allocation off Lexington Gardens/St John’s College Farm (NP16). On this appraisal basis, NP16 should have been included over NP04. However, with the obvious shortfall the Lexington Gardens site should now be reinstated. With a desire to see 250 homes in Tuxford it is clear that this conurbation has capacity and could provide more homes even beyond the proposed figure of 250 and could easily accommodate housing allocations removed from the Apleyhead proposal.</p> <p>Tuxford has all of the infrastructure, services and social provision to accommodate major growth and further expansion in the homes provision would ensure that all of the services etc are retained and with developer contributions many could be expanded including the much needed village hall.</p> <p>NP04 is identified also as requiring possible access through allocations NP05 and NP15, neither of which are included within the Draft Local Plan. If this is the preferred access aim then it is unclear how this can be achieved over land that is not allocated. Throughout the LAA process, NP16 was appraised and recommended to be taken forward (LAA202). NP16 was also identified within the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. Throughout all of the above mentioned documents including, of course, Bassetlaw’s Draft Local Plan I cannot identify a single strong negative reason or indeed any reason at all as to why this site should not be taken forward. As such my objection is based on the omission of NP16 from the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan and the clear lack of justification for doing so. The section relating to Tuxford is therefore incorrect, inaccurate and unacceptable.</p>	<p>All land around Tuxford is heavily constrained and the Sustainability Appraisal has looked at these areas in detail. The Council maintains its SA recommendations and criteria for Tuxford.</p> <p>Land at Lexington Gardens has been refused planning permission partly due to the impact of traffic and landscape. The site on Ollerton Road provides an appropriate location to accommodate some growth whilst minimising the impact to the surrounding area and infrastructure. The site will need a detailed transport Assessment to identify what, if any, impacts there will be to the existing road network and whether mitigation is required. From a strategic point of view, the Highways Authority hasn’t raised concern over the impact of this site.</p> <p>The site’s density has been reduced so it’ll now only include around 75 dwellings rather than 90 which means it will include a density of around 30dph which is a similar density to that of the adjoining Pastures development. Appropriate landscaping are also required to protect the wider landscape quality and preserve private amenity of nearby residents.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
		<p>Policy 30: Site NP04 suggests a density of 90 dwellings on this particular site. I feel 90 is excessive and would result in a very cramped appearance. However, even with 90 there is a massive shortfall in this small town, 250 required and 90 allocated. Even if one includes the recently approved and commenced site adjacent to Ashvale Road there would still be an identified shortfall of over 100 houses.</p> <p>The site adjacent to Ashvale Road has been granted planning permission for a mix of social housing including some rent to buy (24), social rented (22) and 40 shared ownership, 2 and 3 beds, all of which would be classified as affordable housing. This does not provide a mix as required by current local policies and some of the aims put forward within the previous Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>However, it does address a shortfall of affordable housing within the district.</p> <p>The appraisal in the Neighbourhood Plan of the Lexington Gardens/St John's College Farm site carried out by LUC (identified as NP16) scored:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 significant positive effects. 3 minor positive effects. 2 significant negative effects and 1 minor negative effect. <p>Given that one of the significant negative effects relates to Archaeology and Conservation with the latter already having been satisfied and the former, ie Archaeology, can be mitigated for and protected against, it would appear that this negative aspect is grossly overstated. The statement that the site includes historical agricultural buildings is incorrect, these buildings are outside this allocation and have already been converted to dwellings with the approval of both Planning and Conservation Officers.</p> <p>NP04, Ollerton Road site, scored only 1 significant positive effect with the site being close to the play area, cemetery, surgery etc. It scored 4 minor positive effects.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST31 - AFFORDABLE HOUSING			
REF040	Misterton Parish Council	Page 110, Policy ST31 Should a 'local connection' requirement be included so that affordable housing is available as a priority to those who have grown up in the village?	Bassetlaw has local connection criteria when it comes to the Council's housing waiting list. This list is also used to nominate applicants for Housing Associations, as most use the Council's choice based lettings to receive applicants and they also advertise through it. With regard to Discounted Market Sale and First Homes, the Council uses a local connection as part of the 106 agreement. It should be noted that local connection is Bassetlaw wide, not settlement specific. The Council has no control of this because it is a legal requirement. However, Housing associations do tend to give consideration to households from a specific village when it comes to allocating, and they have final say on who they put in their properties.
REF101	East Markham Parish Council	<i>In reference to the January 2020 DLP</i> East Markham Parish Council fully endorses this policy and requests that it is enforced.	Support welcome and noted.
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Area Plan	Page 110, Para 7.16.17 – It is welcomed that again Neighbourhood Plans are accepted as part of the planning and development process. However, it is acknowledged that most of Affordable Housing will be financed and created from significant developments, Neighbourhood Plans do try to play their part where possible by not following these parameters.	Comments noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST31 - AFFORDABLE HOUSING			
REF142	Retford Branch Labour Party	<p>The Plan needs to recognise that the affordability of housing is critical to the success of housing growth. If it fails to do so, the Plan will not address local issues of housing affordability, and merely open Retford up as an extended suburb of larger cities, including London. Retfordians want houses for local people, with jobs which support the local economy. Residents across Bassetlaw are pressured by rising house prices unaffordable deposits for first time buyers and private rental rates which discourage saving. More than 11 million people in the UK rent from a private landlord and many of them are at the sharp end of the housing crisis. The Bassetlaw Local Plan is an opportunity to reverse this by bringing truly affordable homes to the District - and those which are affordable both to purchase and running. Running costs means insisting, through planning, on the highest environmental standards, future proofing homes with EV charging ready circuits, fibre broadband to the home, and of course affordable rental values. Would expect to see Bassetlaw District Council take a lead on this with a new social house building programme to meet the identified need of 3,500 homes over the life of the Plan, with council housing at its heart. By the end of the first 5 years, need to see an annual rate of at least 200 council and social homes, with at least half of these built by Bassetlaw District Council for social rent. Expect to see Bassetlaw District Council Plan design and build these homes in the district, using our Special Purpose Vehicle companies like Bersahill with funding and with backing from the national government. The current Plan figures appear to aim for the construction of less than 40 social rent dwellings per year - we expect a five-fold increase to match the projected needs set out in the Plan and also to change the bogus definition of 'affordable', set as high as 80% of market rents, and replace it with a definition linked to local incomes. Bassetlaw District Council must choose to adopt both the bogus and affordable metric in parallel to assess new homes in the area. Wants the Plan to help address the forced conversion of social rented homes to so-called 'affordable rent'. It may be necessary to look at the amount of housing debt the Council currently holds and give Councils the powers and funding to buy back homes from private landlords - this would be particularly impactful post COVID-19 where financial pressure on landlords will result in higher rent and/or lower quality of maintenance to tenants across our District. Would wish to see the Plan allow Tenants a stronger say in the management of their homes and stop social cleansing by making sure regeneration only goes ahead when it has the consent of residents, and that all residents are offered a new property on the same site and terms. Note the success of the first Decent Homes programme as a potential model for Retford and the District.</p> <p>Would expect the Plan to bring an end to the scandal of leasehold for the millions who have bought their home but do not feel like they own it. Ask Bassetlaw Council to include a specific note that they will seek to avoid all "new leasehold properties", abolish unfair fees and conditions, and give leaseholders the right to buy their freehold at a price they can afford. Suggested changes to the plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through local planning rules, insist in the Plan that developers always present an assessment of measures to reduce the long-term costs for home occupants. Suggest that Developers are always forced to assess the following measures, and Bassetlaw District Council be given provision to update the list of measures on an annual basis. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ The highest buildings and environmental standards, including solar panels, to minimise energy bills ◦ Provision for EV charging as a minimum through installing suitable electrical circuits (circuit breakers, high current circuits to the exterior of a property) ◦ Ground source heat pumps and district heating schemes. ◦ Fibre broadband to the home (not just the cabinet) • A new social housing programme of 3,600 homes across Bassetlaw, constructed to the highest standards and held to the highest planning rules. • Bassetlaw District Council adopts both the (bogus) national definition of affordable and also adopts a measure against local property values. • The affordability of rent looks to be getting more acute as the gap between rich/poor ever widens. The impacts of COVID-19 on landlord finances risks increasing rents and decreasing maintenance. Large numbers of rental homes may come to market as landlords seek capital to address income shortages. In response, the Bassetlaw District Plan should include an "assessment at District Council level of the ability to procure rented accommodation". If the law does not permit the Council to buy homes, we still insist the Council look at the commercial feasibility and social case for doing so. Bassetlaw residents need not enter a housing crisis of spiralling rent and falling standards. • Planning applications which include leasehold properties should always be looked on less favourably and the District Plan must explicitly say so. 	<p>The Local Plan is seeking the maximum amount of affordable housing possible based on the results of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. But delivering affordable housing is not the responsibility of the Local Plan alone. The Council and its partners will need to continue to identify other mechanisms for delivering affordable housing. Para 7.16.7 states how the Council will work in partnership with other agencies and partners to deliver affordable housing. This could include through Bersahill. The definition of affordable housing is set by the National Planning Policy Framework, this is a matter the Council has to incorporate in local policy.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST31 - AFFORDABLE HOUSING			
REF160	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>Wish to make comments on the level of affordable housing proposed in version 2 of the draft Local Plan. Realise that the authority faces an uphill task to meet the identified need of affordable housing units (AH) for reasons very much outside of their control. But for this plan , over four years in the making, to have identified only 688 out of the 10, 000 homes to be built is very disappointing; set aside the identified need of 3600 units it falls woefully short of something to be proud about.</p> <p>The Local Plan sets out a vision of what Bassetlaw should be like to live in by 2037. Without a substantial increase in AH the improvements in leisure, recreation and public space will not be enjoyed to the full by people who are having to live in more expensive accommodation than is comfortable with their income. Much is made of aspiring to create high paid jobs in the District. That is laudable, but not all jobs are going to be such. This week the Council proudly announced that Burger King are coming to town ; on a site next to ASDA, which the Council also lauded, whose 200 staff are mostly paid only slightly above the National Living Wage. The Council made much of the development at Symmetry Park but two years on the current jobs and those coming are again at or slightly above the NLW. The agent marketing the large warehouse development there listed as one of the sites benefits as being in a low wage area with a large supply of people looking for work. There are existing large employers in the area paying low wages already. Presumably these will continue to do so and continue to employ hundreds of local workers. The Plan at 7.18.16 says it has secured 688 AH units though gather the actual figure is 740. The 740 comprises 561 units from private builders, 54 from site HS6 and 125 from two council owned sites at HS 6 and 8. Note that the Plan recognises that the planning system is only one mechanism to deliver AH (7.18.17) and goes on to list other actions to secure AH. The evidence suggests, unfortunately, that most of these will only provide small numbers of AH.</p> <p>The first and second actions – finding council owned sites for development- is surely of limited value because otherwise they would have been identified as part of the call for sites. Moreover, in a recent cabinet paper the portfolio holder for Housing talked only of identifying former garage sites and other unused space on council estates. A useful initiative but not likely to generate many AH units. Related to site identification one has to address the capacity of the Council to project manage and fund such initiatives. Refer to the former Gateway site at Carlton. In 2015 local members and the parish council enthusiastically supported A1s proposal to build housing on the site; six years on and there is no development. The third action – fill empty housing. Fully support but in 19/20 just one house was filled and to date just two in 20/21. Action 4- no comment. Action 5 – purchase housing on the open market. The Cabinet lead tells me that we currently have a budget that would secure 3 or 4 houses per annum. Action 6 - neighbourhood plans to provide AH. Bassetlaw excels in its number of Neighbourhood Plans. How many AH units are provided for through this route? flicked through several Plans and have never seen this included as a policy. Therefore in my submission most of the means identified in 7.18.17 fail to address the problem in terms of scale and deliverability. Note that it is planned to produce a Position Paper for final inclusion into the submitted Plan. This is to be welcomed. Urge this to be in the style of an Action Plan and not a policy paper that expertly but pointlessly justifies our low delivery intention. Recommend the approach of Newark and Sherwood Council in their 2016 Council Housing Development Programme 5 year plan. Of course you may know of better styles to follow. The style we report in must include targets, means to deliver and a reporting system.</p> <p>Finish by making four specific suggestions. 1. I've heard it said that the Council is against AH units in the rural villages. This seems to be based on a poor experience some many years ago at Mattersey Thorpe and because tenants don't own cars. From my knowledge of MT the failure was more of an allocations policy rather than that of rural AH. Have more recent experience of AH at Gringley and now Beckingham to draw on. As for not owning cars, before accepting that argument we should examine the evidence of car ownership amongst the council waiting list. 2. If my argument is accepted that developing council sites in house or with partners is held back by a capacity issue then could we explore the possibility of sharing resource with other Councils. Legal, architect, project management skills are in short supply; sharing them across boundaries might improve the capacity to deliver. 3. in a strong position when discussing private development options. Have a very healthy land supply and nearly all our sites are built out within a reasonable timescale. Should apply this strength in the case of future sites. Instead of a blanket 10% or 20% AH quotient for all such sites, let's make it a minimum of 10 or 20, with the possibility of additional AH units on more profitable sites. Recently Harworth Estates found an extra £1 m in S106 payments when NCC objected to their ' final</p>	<p>The 688 only relates to the site allocations in the Local Plan. This is based on whole plan viability and the need to deliver a range of infrastructure to make development acceptable in planning terms. There are also affordable homes in the current supply; there are in excess of 3000 dwellings (housing commitments) yet to be built.</p> <p>1. Local Plan evidence identifies a need for affordable housing in Bassetlaw's villages. However, these are often difficult to deliver due to the size of development (the NPPF indicates that LPAs can only seek affordable housing on sites of 10 or more dwellings). Housing Associations also tend to resist taking on affordable homes in rural areas due to the fact that villages have less service provision e.g. schools, convenience shops etc. The cost of living tends to be higher for families living in rural areas due to the need to access transport. This can have an adverse effect on households on low incomes.</p> <p>2. and 3. and 4. The Council will need to continue to explore all opportunities for delivering affordable housing, including those methods suggested in this representation, many of which are already being undertaken.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST31 - AFFORDABLE HOUSING			
		<p>offer'. Likewise Keepmoat are now entertaining the possibility of providing AH through a RP on their Firbeck site when the S106 exempted them from such housing. Significantly both these schemes had been independently viability assessed as needing to be exempt from the contributions the developers agreed to. Assume sites HS 2 and 4 are County Council owned sites. To that end could not the proposed finically package reflect the need for AH and other socially beneficial units whilst at the same time proving types of housing that assist County and District to house the most needy and vulnerable in accommodation not normally provided by the market.</p>	
1669638	Norton Cuckney Parish Council	<p>More clarity is needed for options other than Registered providers to provide affordable housing. There is a desire in our Neighbourhood plan to have a small number and a range of affordable houses for local people. However, the present system appears to factor against this. Would it be possible to make this more flexible?</p>	<p>The Policy has now been amended and includes an opportunity to bring forward rural affordable housing exceptions sites. This will be subject to the criteria in the policy, which includes full engagement with Parish Councils and Neighbourhood Plan Groups.</p>
REF052	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Councillor	<p>Page 110, Policy ST31 Should a 'local connection' requirement be included so that affordable housing is available as a priority to those who have grown up in the village?</p>	<p>Bassetlaw has local connection criteria when it comes to the Council's housing waiting list. This list is also used to nominate applicants for Housing Associations, as most use the Council's choice based lettings to receive applicants and they also advertise through it. With regard to Discounted Market Sale and First Homes, the Council uses a local connection as part of the 106 agreement. It should be noted that local connection is Bassetlaw wide, not settlement specific. The Council has no control of this because it is a legal requirement. However, Housing associations do tend to give consideration to households from a specific village when it comes to allocating, and ultimately they have final say on who they put in their properties.</p>
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	<p>This proposal is generally acceptable. However, there has, for several years now, been a problem for some developers to obtain the interest of a social housing landlord and as such unless this has changed, and I do not have any evidence it has, then this exception needs to be included.</p> <p>In reality, the best social landlord would be the Council and the demise of Council housing stock is something we should all be ashamed of. A partnership between developer and the local authority could work and indeed should be investigated. It has worked well in the past and it can work well again.</p>	<p>The loss of stock through the Right to Buy scheme is out of the Council's control. There is very little funding available to replace Council owned properties that have been sold off.</p> <p>The Council does work with developers to ensure that the required level of affordable housing is delivered through the planning system. There is also work being undertaken by the Housing Strategy Team to bring forward 100% affordable housing schemes (such as the scheme of 120 dwellings at Radford Street, Worksop).</p>
REF195	Freeths on behalf of Hallam Land Management (Peaks Hill Farm)	<p>Affordable Housing is broadly supported but there are concerns that it lacks flexibility and to some extent misinterprets National Planning Policy in respect of affordable home ownership. Sub paragraphs B.1. and 2. set fixed provisions for affordable housing as a proportion of the dwellings to be provided on brown field and green field sites. It is considered that this should be expressed as a target figure to allow some flexibility where the viability of the sites is challenging. It is noted that para. ST31D makes reference to amendments to planning permissions resulting in a reduction in affordable housing from the original permission on the basis of viability and it is considered that this approach should be adopted in the consideration of the original planning application where viability is challenging. Sub-para. 2.2 to Policy ST31 identifies that a proportion of affordable housing will be for affordable home ownership. It is unclear whether the 20% figure for affordable housing and the reference to 10% of which being for affordable home ownership, is intended to be 10% of the affordable housing provision or 10% of the total site. Although para. 7.16.3 of the draft plan makes reference to National Policy in this regard it appears to misinterpret the provisions of para. 64 of the NPPF. This states that "where major development is proposed planning policies and decisions should expect at least 10% of the homes (our emphasis) to be available for affordable home ownership". The footnote to this paragraph confirms that this is to be part of the overall affordable housing contribution from the site. In our view, this should be properly interpreted as meaning that 10% of the total number of dwellings provided on a site should be provided as affordable home ownership and that this contributes towards the overall affordable housing</p>	<p>Paragraph 59 of the NPPF indicates: 'To support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, <u>that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed</u> and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay'.</p> <p>In order to address the needs of households requiring affordable housing, it is necessary to set a requirement figure. This will be tested through the Local Plan examination process. A target figure would not provide certainty that the number of affordable homes required would be met. This approach is supported by the results of the Bassetlaw Local Plan Whole Plan Viability Assessment.</p> <p>Paragraph 57 of the NPPF indicates: '<u>Where up-to-date policies have set out the contributions expected from development,</u></p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST31 - AFFORDABLE HOUSING			
		<p>requirement. In other words, if the requirement for affordable housing overall is 20% then half of that would be provided by way of affordable home ownership. We consider that Policy ST31 should be amended to clarify this and to bring it in line with National Planning Policy.</p>	<p>planning applications that comply with them should be assumed to be viable. It is up to the applicant to demonstrate whether particular circumstances justify the need for a viability assessment at the application stage. The weight to be given to a viability assessment is a matter for the decision maker, having regard to all the circumstances in the case, including whether the plan and the viability evidence underpinning it is up to date, and any change in site circumstances since the plan was brought into force. All viability assessments, including any undertaken at the plan-making stage, should reflect the recommended approach in national planning guidance, including standardised inputs, and should be made publicly available.'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. In all cases where affordable housing is provided it will be expected to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Make provision for a minimum of 10% of dwellings to be for affordable home ownership; 2. On brownfield sites: Make provision for 15% affordable housing. On greenfield sites: Make provision for 25% affordable housing.
REF208	P&DG on behalf of Welbeck Estate	<p>Draft Policy ST31 relates to the affordable housing provision for schemes of 10 or more residential units. Part B1 of the Policy should incorporate the broader definition of affordable housing outlined within Annex 2 of the Framework. The affordable housing should not be limited to affordable home ownership and affordable rent, it should also refer to all elements expressed in Annex 2 to make it compliant. In the January draft Plan, Bassetlaw District Council stated that the broader definition of affordable housing was in the glossary of the Plan, however we believe Policy 31 should reflect this broader definition of affordable housing by allowing provision outside home ownership or affordable rent categorisation, especially the role of community homes for rent within the policy which is especially relevant for homes in rural Bassetlaw under the jurisdiction of the Estate.</p>	<p>The policy has been amended to include a reference to national policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> B. In all cases where affordable housing is provided it will be expected to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Make provision for a minimum of 10% of dwellings to be for affordable home ownership; 4. On brownfield sites: Make provision for 15% affordable housing. On greenfield sites: Make provision for 25% affordable housing. <p>Of this, 25% will be for First Homes; a minimum of 25% will be for other types of affordable home ownership which accords with national planning policy; and any remaining percentage requirement will be social housing or affordable housing for rent;</p>
REF198-Bevercotes Colliery	Gladman Developments Ltd, promoting former Bevercotes Colliery site	<p>The above policy sets out that on major developments, housing sites of over 0.5 hectares and rural exceptions sites the affordable housing requirement will be 10% on brownfield sites of which all the provision should be for affordable home ownership, and 20% on greenfield sites of which 10% will be for affordable home ownership and the rest for affordable rent. Where the contribution of affordable housing provision is likely to have an adverse impact on viability the developer will be required to provide an Open Book Viability Assessment. Welcome the flexibility and proactive approach provided by this policy with regards to meeting the affordable housing needs of the District. Only through positively planning for significant housing growth can the Council realistically tackle market signals in a way which is advocated by the PPG and in doing so tackle the affordability issues prevalent in Bassetlaw. The latest iteration of the plan includes a new policy requirement which attempts to ensure that affordable home ownership dwellings are sold at a discount of at least 20% below local market value; and that eligibility is determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices. While reference is given to affordable housing discounts within the Bassetlaw District Council Whole Plan & Community Infrastructure Levy Viability Assessment (October 2019), no specific reference is given to aforementioned figure and the implications of applying such a discount for affordable housing is unclear. While this Gladman propose that this requirement must be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence</p>	<p>The Bassetlaw HEDNA (2020) has assessed the need for discount market sales and provides an indication of the percentage that should be applied. A minimum 20% discount accords with the recommendations of the Bassetlaw HEDNA (2020). The Council has taken into consideration the new requirements for First Homes through the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. The policy has been amended to include this requirement.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST31 - AFFORDABLE HOUSING			
		<p>which justifies its inclusion accounts for market signal. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment briefly considers the Government's consultation on Changes to the current planning system however proposes to change national policy such that policy compliant planning applications would be expected to deliver a minimum of 25% affordable housing as First Homes. This consultation states that the minimum discount for First Homes should be 30% from market price. It is our understanding that the Government will be responding to proposals on the mechanism to secure First Homes through developer contributions in the short term in the early part of 2021.</p> <p>Therefore, it is vital that the Council takes further consideration of this proposed changes and monitors any updates regarding this to ensure that a flexible approach is implemented.</p>	
1671323	William Davis	<p>The approach to affordable housing is broadly supported. Given the guidance in the NPPF/NPPG that it is for applicants to demonstrate what has changed since the plan wide viability assessment (NPPF para 57 and NPPG para 007 Reference ID: 10-007-20190509) any requirement should be robustly justified and flexible. Our previous comments identified that the Future Housing Standards have not been incorporated into the Viability Appraisal. While it is accepted that these are not yet part of the regulatory framework, any deviation from the policy should be due to exceptional circumstances; the Future Homes Standard will affect all new houses and may be introduced before adoption of the Local Plan. As such it is considered that it is appropriate to consider their potential impact up front to understand the potential impact on viability and the delivery of affordable housing in Bassetlaw.</p> <p>It is also noted that the response to our comments indicates that the viability assessment has been the subject of "discussions with stakeholders". However, the Viability Assessment provides no details of these discussions and is therefore not consistent with the NPPG (para 006 Reference ID: 10-006-20190509).</p>	<p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment has been updated and includes all relevant policy requirements. Land owners and agents of sites included as site allocations have been engaged in the Whole Viability Assessment process. This will be confirmed in the Statement of Common Ground for each site allocation.</p>
REF170	A&D Architecture	<p>5) Policy 31 (Policy ST31 in Text) should be modified to state that static caravans are recognised by the Council as legitimate affordable housing. A new subsection G should read: "G The Council values the role the park home sector plays in the housing market offering an affordable alternative to mainstream housing for many people, often over the age of fifty, in mainly rural and semi-rural locations and will support applications for the development of new Park Home static caravan sites."</p>	<p>Park Homes are not included in the definition of 'affordable housing' in the NPPF. As such, the Council does not propose to include Park Homes within the policy.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST32 - HOUSING MIX, TYPE AND DENSITY			
REF040	Misterton Parish Council	<p>Page 111, section 7.17 In Misterton, the District Council owns a pocket of land, which has been designated in the village's Neighbourhood Plan for housing. Bassetlaw DC should proceed at pace to develop such land with affordable housing, replacing that lost in the 'Right to Buy' scheme.</p> <p>Page 112, Policy 32 The Parish Council supports the view that housing must of the right mix, type, and density to sit comfortably within rural communities. Recent rural development has seen too many 4/5-bed dwellings, which are beyond the financial reach of the 'next generation'. This means that young people have to leave the village to find affordable housing and, all too often, incomers (the only ones that can afford such dwellings) play no part in village life. This turns communities into 'dormitory villages'.</p>	Comments noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST32 - HOUSING MIX, TYPE AND DENSITY			
REF128 (Comments also made under reference number 1669799) - Pictures attached	Resident	<p>Previously commented on Planning Application 17/00152/NMA for houses to be built on Harworth pit site to be known as Simpson Park. Those comments were not taken on board if indeed they were even considered. The above housing development is of massive proportions & will have a big impact on our existing village/town but it would appear that there is little regard given by the developers & planners to what the people of Harworth & Bircotes really need as has been happening consistently over previous years. Several years ago attended a presentation in the parish hall at which plans for around 1000 houses on the old pit site were unveiled. Of those 1000 or so houses there was not one single bungalow on the plans. This was pointed out at the time to Harworth Estates & Bassetlaw District Council probably, but there was no perceived uptake of the point at the time. Eight years on this development is now in progress with a proposed 996 houses to be built. There are no bungalows built to date & from enquiries it would appear there are still no proposals to include bungalows in the remaining number. The development off Bawtry road has several hundred houses to be built but no bungalows to date & none planned. There is a real shortage of bungalows in the village/town for the elderly & the infirm residents, both council & private. Others, of which I am one, would like to move into a bungalow before I fall into either one or both of the above categories. But I don't want to be cramped in a small 2 bedroom one, want one that reflects my needs, space & no stairs. There are of course those people who would simply prefer to live in a bungalow anyway, given the choice & availability. As these new estates are being built the ratio of bungalows to houses in Harworth is gradually reducing from an already low number & at the same time the number of the elderly & infirm is increasing. This is obviously reducing availability & choice to the ever increasing population. In this plan point 3.23 states that effectively Harworth & Bircotes will double in size over the coming years. It is therefore stark startlingly obvious that the number of available bungalows per head of population will half. What kind of council allows that? Bassetlaw does! Have some good small bungalows for pensioners in the village/town but they are in very short supply. With regard to private bungalows they are also very few & far between & there are no plans to build any. Surely out of 996 properties there ought to be a sensible & fair mixture of housing to suit all ages & needs not just 3 & 4 bedoomed houses because they generate maximum payback for the developers. The village/town is in desperate need for 2 & 3 (or even 4) bedoomed bungalows & both the town & district councils have an obligation on behalf of residents to insist on a good mix of quality properties to be built that reflects the needs of the community & so far they have failed miserably in that obligation. Apparently, by law, developers must provide a percentage of social housing but what about the elderly & infirm who struggle with or cannot manage stairs? I firmly believe that the people of Harworth & Bircotes have been badly let down by Bassetlaw council with their total lack of foresight with planning applications regardless of all their statements in previous Neighbourhood plans, see attachments, & the current proposed plan. Tommy Simpson, local hero & legend would be 83 years old today had he lived. With all the pulverising & punishing work his legs & body had done I doubt he would be able to manage stairs now & would probably be looking to purchase a nice, spacious, quality bungalow on the development bearing his name. Wouldn't he be disappointed? If Bassetlaw keeps making all the right noises about providing housing to meet the needs of the community perhaps one day they may actually listen & do exactly what they say & insist that developers build a certain percentage of good quality bungalows, of varying sizes, as a condition of planning being granted. The same applies to any future housing that Bassetlaw plans to undertake for themselves. Please stop this downward spiral of ever decreasing availability of bungalows that are drastically needed to meet the needs of our community.</p>	<p>Policy 31 Housing Mix requires a suitable mix of housing to be delivered on residential sites. The Council's evidence in relation to housing mix (Bassetlaw Housing and Economic Needs Assessment, 2020) has assessed the need for different types of housing in Bassetlaw. Whilst it provides recommendations regarding housing mix, it does also emphasise the need for a flexible approach because different areas of the district will have different needs.</p> <p>Bassetlaw District Council's Housing Strategy team work closely with the planning team to assess and consider housing mix on a case by case basis. Developers are also asked to consult with the public on larger scale proposals prior to submitting a planning application. This provides an opportunity for the community to engage with developers on design and housing need/mix.</p>
1671323	William Davis	<p>It is noted that the response to our previous comments refers to the 'Local Housing Need Assessment 2020'. However, this document does not form part of the evidence base for the Local Plan.</p>	<p>This is a typo it should say 'Housing and Economic Needs Assessment 2020' not 'Local Housing Needs Assessment'.</p>
REF101	East Markham Parish Council	<p><i>In reference to the January 2020 Draft Local Plan</i> East Markham Parish Council endorses this policy. However, it should be noted that recent developments have failed to reflect the character of the village and have not provided adequate starter homes or homes for elder residents. East Markham Parish Council also draws BDC attention to its Neighbourhood Plan policy NP2 that specifically states the following. 1. New housing developments should deliver a housing mix that reflects the demonstrable need for smaller dwellings. 2. Developers must show this local need has been taken into account in the different housing types and bedroom numbers proposed. It is our view that this policy has been ignored in recent planning submissions by BDC.</p>	<p>At present the adopted Core Strategy is considered to be out of date and has more limited weight when considering planning applications. An up to date Local Plan will have full weight in the planning process so the provisions of new policies should be seen in the district.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST32 - HOUSING MIX, TYPE AND DENSITY			
REF163	Pegasus Group on behalf of the Harworth Group	<p>Confirms that density within Bassetlaw Garden Village, Peaks Hill Farm and Ordsall South will deliver a range of densities informed by the site's masterplan framework. It would be appropriate for Cottam Power Station to also be included, as a proposed regeneration area allocation, to ensure that site density is informed by the masterplan framework, making efficient use of land whilst respecting the character of the area. Policy 32 should be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>Policy 32 3. d) – Suggested Amendment: 3. Ensuring density reflects place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The density on sites in and adjoining town centres and transport hubs should be maximised; b) Within the Main Towns of Worksop, Retford and Harworth & Bircotes development densities should be a minimum of 30 dwellings per hectare (net) unless it would result in an adverse effect on the character of the area, including the setting of a heritage asset; c) Within the Large and Small Rural Settlements densities should reflect the character of the settlement and local housing needs, unless otherwise promoted through a Neighbourhood Plan; d) The density of, Bassetlaw Garden Village, HS1: Peaks Hill Farm, HS13: Ordsall South and ST7: Cottam Power Station will be expected to deliver a range of housing densities across each site informed by the site's masterplan framework. 	<p>The former Cottam Power Station site is identified as a broad location for growth in the next plan period, and not as a site allocation. It is therefore not considered appropriate to include Cottam Power Station in this policy as the details of the site allocation including uses have not been agreed. Further evidence based work is required to determine the most appropriate/suitable mix of uses for the site.</p>
1669799	Resident	<p>(7.17.1, 7.17.2, & 7.17.3) Ensuring that the right mix of housing to meet the needs of local people is critical to health & wellbeing. Couldn't agree more but what has Bassetlaw been doing about that for the past 10 years at least. National policy states that local authorities should deliver a wide choice of high quality homes - well Bassetlaw has failed miserably there in Harworth & Bircotes, there may be some high quality homes but definitely not a wide choice in my opinion because bungalows do not come into the equation.</p> <p>(7.17.6) This is just a joke. Developers have either been allowed to do whatever they wish or Bassetlaw has told them not to consider bungalows in Harworth & Bircotes, what other explanation could there be? No such planning conditions have been used to ensure bungalows were built.</p> <p>(7.17.7) This is the crux of my argument. What does Bassetlaw expect from its residents? Wait until they can no longer manage in a house they have lived in for 20, 30 or more years before providing somewhere they can manage in but is not their choice. Surely if sufficient bungalows were available in Harworth & Bircotes residents would tend to migrate into those after their family grew up & got homes of their own freeing up family housing. It isn't all about age it's also about choice or preference.</p>	<p>At present the adopted Core Strategy is considered to be out of date and has more limited weight when considering planning applications. An up to date Local Plan will have full weight in the planning process so the provisions of new policies should be seen in the district.</p>
REF030	Resident	<p>Appreciate that houses need to be built and some on brownfield sites but hasn't this last year shown the value of good places and environments to live in. So whilst development needs to take place more emphasis needs to be placed on the effect on the existing residents and reducing the impact that such developments have. This isn't Nimbyism as appreciate development must take place and am thinking of the residents to come and the future residents of any new development. Some recent developments in Retford I have seen, have houses so large for the plot and the gardens so small that ALL the development really provides is just a house. This cannot be good for the long term mental state of the owner, and the effect of such large houses on the lives of the existing residents that surround the new development will also be detrimental. But the development obviously was allowed to happen.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Local Plan has a strong emphasis on promoting the health and wellbeing of communities. This includes an Amenity Policy which seeks to protect residential amenity. The Council is satisfied that policies in the Local Plan are sufficient to address this issue.</p>
REF052	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>Page 111, section 7.17 In the Misterton Ward (off the Grange estate, Misterton), the District Council owns a pocket of land, which has been designated in the village's Neighbourhood Plan for housing. Bassetlaw DC should proceed at pace to develop such land with affordable housing, replacing that lost in the 'Right to Buy' scheme. Page 112, Policy 32 The Parish Council supports the view that housing must of the right mix, type, and density to sit comfortably within rural communities. Recent rural development has seen too many 4/5-bed dwellings, which are beyond the financial reach of the 'next generation'. This means that young people have to leave the village to find affordable housing and, all too often, incomers (the only ones that can afford such dwellings) play no part in village life. This turns communities into 'dormitory villages'.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST32 - HOUSING MIX, TYPE AND DENSITY			
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	<p>Aimed at Councillors and relates to the provision of self build properties. This section of the market is now well established and usually promotes much better individual design over an estate of dwellings erected for the market. The bold statement at Part B of this policy that "The Council will support proposals for self build etc" has to be taken on board by Councillors. In a Planning Committee meeting approximately 2 years ago the majority of those Councillors present on that Committee stated, when considering a small development of 15 self build plots, that "self build does not generally produce dwellings, takes an eternity to build and finish off and appears to be a way round avoiding CIL". If the Council state that they support self build, as the government has and have instructed them to do so, then Councillors have to support such a method of providing new homes. It should not be in a document and not put into practice when making decisions.</p>	Comments noted.
REF181	Rural Solutions on behalf of Foljambe	<p>States that "within the Large and Small Rural Settlements densities should reflect the character of the settlement and local housing needs, unless otherwise promoted through a Neighbourhood Plan". It also requires an appropriate mix and type of market and affordable housing and specialist housing for older people. Note that the draft policy has changed since the January 2020 version of the Local Plan was issued for comment. In the previous version of this policy support was provided for new housing development which adequately addressed the housing needs of the District by making efficient use of land while respecting the character of the area and providing a mix of market and affordable housing and specialist housing for older people and disabled persons. The policy as it is worded now expects any needs to be met rather than providing support for meeting such needs. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) Update indicates that in 2015 21% of Bassetlaw residents were over 65, which is higher than the average for England. This is expected to rise by 43.1% over the plan period and of these, the population aged over 80 will rise significantly by over 83% (ONS 2019), one of the highest in the Housing Market Area. This indicates a demand for specialist accommodation, such as level access accommodation or accessible housing. It is our view that a developer should be incentivised through a carefully worded policy to meet local housing needs, where the profit margins may be lower. For example, to meet the needs of the elderly single storey accommodation may be beneficial to the District but they consume a larger area of land, at a substantial cost to the developer. The wording of Policy ST32 is unsound. We request that the policy wording is revised to provide more support again (as the January 2020 version of the Local Plan did) for proposals which meet identified local housing needs and that it is simply not a requirement of each proposal.</p>	The Bassetlaw Local Plan Whole Plan Viability Assessment has tested the policy requirements and concludes that the requirement for adaptable specialist housing is the viable and deliverable option for the Local Plan. As such, no amendments are proposed to the policy.
REF195-Peaks Hill Farm	Freeths on behalf of Hallam Land Management (Peaks Hill Farm)	<p>Makes reference to "an appropriate mix of dwellings" identifies a requirement in para.1 for flexible internal layouts to meet changing needs over a lifetime and reduce fuel poverty. It is unclear how this will be implemented and what is required by this Policy. There would seem to be some conflict with Policy 33: Specialist Housing which requires specific provision for particular groups with specialist needs. Given the requirement for 20% of Market Housing to be designed to meet requirements for accessible and acceptable dwellings in Policy 33 (see further comments below) there is no need for repetition of this in Policy 32 sub paragraph.1. Further, the reference to fuel poverty is not understood or explained in the plan. In terms of sub-para. 4. To Policy 32 it is considered that identifying an appropriate mix and type of market and affordable dwellings will need to be established through evidence of need and market demand. Para. 4 should therefore be amended to reflect this and to ensure that the Policy is compliant with para. 11 of the NPPF in being adaptable to rapid change.</p>	The policy is requiring developers to design properties that provide for the needs of occupiers over their lifetime. This approach accords with national policy and guidance – paragraph 127: 'Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development'. More detail will be provided through an update to the Design SPD. Reference to reducing fuel poverty has been removed. Evidence of housing need has already been established by the Bassetlaw Housing and Economic Needs Assessment, 2020. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment has tested the policy requirements to ensure that they are deliverable. The Council is satisfied that the policy accords with the NPPF.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST32 - HOUSING MIX, TYPE AND DENSITY			
REF099- Peaks Hill Farm	K Wallis, Trustees of H.S. Wallis	<p><i>These comments were made in reference to Policy ST27 "Housing Mix, Type and Density" in the January 2020 Draft Local Plan</i> The point was made in para. 37 above that there is little point in having a three tier settlement hierarchy if that split is to be ignored for evolution of more detailed policies. Draft Policy ST27 is yet another example of the disconnected approach. Draft Policy ST1 aligns the Main Towns and the LRS's - and that is a sound approach given the stated intended wider than normal role of these rural settlements. However, ST27-2 states that for housing densities in the towns it should be an average of 30 dwellings per hectare (in fact at 12 dwellings to the acre a lower figure than is likely to make the most effective use of the land) whilst in all other settlements "... densities should reflect the character of the settlement and local housing needs unless otherwise promoted through a Neighbourhood Plan.." As in ST2 a strict and limiting criteria is introduced (local housing needs) without indicating what "local" means and how that correlates with the broader aims of the Local Plan.</p> <p>What the Draft policy also seems to be stating is that the planning of all rural settlements, large or small, is to be done through Neighbourhood Plans.</p>	The Council is satisfied that the Housing Mix policy sufficiently addresses housing mix across the District. It provides a flexible approach to enable the Council to work with Developers on a case by case basis, whilst also providing an indication of housing mix requirements from evidence in the Housing and Economic Needs Assessment, 2020. The Local Plan provides the overarching strategic policy framework for development across the District, including the rural area. The Council encourages appropriate development within the rural area through the Local Plan, neighbourhood plans and other relevant channels.
REF208	P&DG on behalf of Welbeck Estate	<p>Policy ST32 refers to self and custom build housing, stating that the Council will support proposals for self and custom-built housing to help meet the need of those wishing to build their own home. Part C stipulates that allocations of more than 100 dwellings should provide a 2% proportion of plots for self-build projects, which would expire after 12 months of no interest. While it is accepted that schemes of self and custom build homes should be encouraged through the Local Plan process, it has been proven not to be a sound process in neighbouring and more recent Local Plan Examinations (Bolsover and Mansfield) to put forward a distinct percentage requirement in policy. Would instead recommend a policy which simply promotes self-building in larger developments, and also the role of custom and self-build homes as examples of limited forms of development that would be suitable in the countryside, as opposed to a percentage which may inhibit housing from coming forward.</p>	National guidance on Self Build has been updated since Bolsover, and Mansfield's Local Plans were examined. There is now a strong emphasis on the need to deliver self-build plots. It now states (Paragraph: 025 Reference ID: 57-025-20210508): 'Relevant authorities should consider how local planning policies may address identified requirements for self and custom housebuilding to ensure enough serviced plots with suitable permission come forward (for example, as a number of units required as part of certain allocated sites, or on certain types of site).' As such, no amendments are proposed to the policy.
REF198- Bevercotes Colliery	Gladman Developments promoting former Bevercotes Colliery site	<p>Gladman broadly support the suggested approach of Policy ST27 which seeks to provide a range of housing types to meet the ever-growing needs of the District. In particular, Gladman remain supportive of the fact that the above policy does not set out a prescriptive approach regarding the specific mix of properties. Gladman consider that reference to Neighbourhood Plans should not be referenced in the text of the policy. The approach advocated by the Council is better suited to dealing with housing mix, tenures, types and sizes. If a Neighbourhood Plan were to come forward and sought to impose specific requirements, then the flexibility proposed by Policy ST27 would be lost. The second element Policy ST27 outlines the Council's proposed policy approach towards self and custom build housing. Gladman are broadly supportive of this policy area, it is recommended that criterion C of the Policy ST27, which states on housing allocations of 100 dwellings or more 2% of the proportion of developable plots should be set aside for self build and custom housebuilding, should be deleted from the Plan.</p> <p>Welcome the flexibility provided by this policy which recognises that plots which do not sell within 12 months of initial promotion, are able to be developed for housing other than self-build homes.</p>	With regard to Neighbourhood Plans, there may be instances where a more localised approach would be appropriate, particularly regarding Conservation Areas. As such, no amendments are proposed to the policy. National guidance on Self Build has recently been updated. There is now a strong emphasis on the need to deliver self-build plots. It now states (Paragraph: 025 Reference ID: 57-025-20210508): 'Relevant authorities should consider how local planning policies may address identified requirements for self and custom housebuilding to ensure enough serviced plots with suitable permission come forward (for example, as a number of units required as part of certain allocated sites, or on certain types of site).' No amendments proposed to the self-build element of the policy.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST32 - HOUSING MIX, TYPE AND DENSITY			
REF180 Trinity Farm	Fisher German on behalf of Avant Homes	<p>Criterion A3 of Policy 32 which seeks to ensure that new developments in the more sustainable locations achieve an appropriate density, in excess of 30 dwellings per hectare, is supported. This accords with Chapter 11 of the Framework, which seeks to ensure an effective use of development land. Criterion C of Policy 32 which seeks the delivery of 2% of the developable plots to be set aside for self-build and custom housebuilding is not however supported nor considered sound. It is well established that such criteria are largely unworkable on modern housing developments and do not serve to provide additional units. In reality, such requirements may impede development unnecessarily, adding to developer burden without delivering the necessary housing units. Self-builders generally do not want to buy serviced plots within or adjacent to a modern housing estate. Our experience is that for the most part that they are instead looking for more bespoke rural opportunities. Yet to see evidence that this method of delivery has been successful. Just because individuals are registered on the self-build register does not mean that they will all build their own property, even if suitable land was available. The reality is the difficulty and skills required will mean only a small percentage of those on the register will ever develop a self-build property. It is also important to note that individuals can be on multiple self-build registers, which inflates the figures across a number of areas. This policy requirement will serve to frustrate and slow housing delivery, given special consideration would need to be given to the location of the plots and how they can be accessed safely and independently from the typical development parcels. The delivery of plots following unsuccessful marketing is also more complex than suggested within the Policy. The Policy assumes such plots could simply just be built out by the developer; the nature of the plots may not however lend themselves to being built by the developer and as such could leave undeveloped plots for significant period of time. Such requirements will also deter developers, given the increased complexity and lack of certainty of outcomes. There appears to be no reference to self-build or the provision of serviced plots within the viability study and as such the impacts of such policy requirements and the impacts on site viability across the Plan are not known. It is considered that such proposals are likely to negatively impact viability in both the costs of providing such plots and the reduced land values as developers seek to mitigate for potential risks. The Council should instead seek to ensure a positive policy environment exists where suitable self-build schemes, either of individual units or larger schemes providing serviced plots will be treated favourably. This encourages delivery in line with the Council's statutory duties, without compromising sites which make up a vital facet of the Council's overall proposed housing supply.</p>	<p>National guidance on Self Build has recently been updated. There is now a strong emphasis on the need to deliver self-build plots. It now states (Paragraph: 025 Reference ID: 57-025-20210508): 'Relevant authorities should consider how local planning policies may address identified requirements for self and custom housebuilding to ensure enough serviced plots with suitable permission come forward (for example, as a number of units required as part of certain allocated sites, or on certain types of site).' As such, no amendments are proposed. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment has recently been updated and now includes self build policy requirements.</p>
1671323	William Davis	<p>The approach to mix, density and type set out in Part A is broadly supported including the change to the wording in part 4 of the Policy. A pragmatic approach will need to be taken to reflect the likely post-Covid demand for larger houses with private garden space. However, the approach to Custom and Self Build set out in Part B is not supported. It is not considered necessary or practical to provide self-build on residential schemes. There are a number of practical issues related to the provision on market housing sites including health & safety, payment of developer contributions and phasing. Other similar policies (including that proposed by Mansfield District Council) have been found not to be sound and removed from emerging Local Plans due to these issues. It is considered that it would be more appropriate to include a policy that is supportive of self build subject to certain criteria. It may also be possible to include an element of self-build in the new settlements being proposed as suitable parcels can be more easily built into the masterplan.</p>	<p>National guidance on Self Build has recently been updated. There is now a strong emphasis on the need to deliver self-build plots. It now states (Paragraph: 025 Reference ID: 57-025-20210508): 'Relevant authorities should consider how local planning policies may address identified requirements for self and custom housebuilding to ensure enough serviced plots with suitable permission come forward (for example, as a number of units required as part of certain allocated sites, or on certain types of site).' As such, no amendments are proposed to the policy.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST32 - HOUSING MIX, TYPE AND DENSITY			
REF170	A&D Architecture	<p>The Local Plan does not allocate land for growth in the Park Home Sector static caravan sector to meet the needs of the group in the community aspiring to live in a static caravan. This response focuses on the unmet needs of the group in the community aspiring to live in a static caravan on a competently run Park Home site and the unmet needs for allocated land of the developers wishing to provide for this group but the comments made apply equally to the unmet needs of that group in the community aspiring to live in a houseboat. The failure of the DBLP to allocate land to meet the needs of this group in the community denies fair and equal treatment to this group and should be rectified to make the Local Plan legal and sound. The Evidence base does not capture the needs of this group and is therefore incomplete. This incompleteness in the evidence base leads to policies that are discriminatory. Consequently, the Equality Impact Assessment is incorrect to state: i) that the DBLP has a positive impact in regard to Age and Socio-Economics and Human Rights (including the right not to be subject to unlawful discrimination and the right not to be overlooked in the advancement of freedom of opportunity) because despite clear government mandates to the contrary the DBLP does not increase housing choice for a group in the community that includes older people who aspire to a Park Home lifestyle and ii) that the evidence base underpinning the DBLP lacks significant gaps because neither the Council nor the SHMA-OAN 2017 captures the needs of this group in the community or the needs of developers who want to provide for its needs and iii) no action need be taken to put matters right in the DBLP having been alerted to an issue of discrimination by this response.</p> <p>B) Solutions to the Problem</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The Council should supplement its Evidence Base by assessing the needs of the group in the community aspiring to living in a Park Home static caravan. The statement below in Subsection C offers both primary and secondary research data that the Council might use for this purpose without investing disproportionate resources. 2) Policy ST2 should be modified by adding new paragraph F as follows: f) No less than 60 pitches will be allocated for static caravan development 3) Policy ST2 should be similarly modified and include new sub -section F as follows: "F The Council values the role the park home sector plays in the housing market offering an affordable alternative to mainstream housing for many people, often over the age of fifty, in mainly rural and semi-rural locations and will support applications for the development of new Park Home static caravan sites." 4) Policy ST16 should be modified to include sites to be allocated for Park Home static caravan site development. Preferably these should be new sites to ensure competition and choice of location in the market. 5) Policy 31 (Policy ST31 in Text) should be modified to state that static caravans are recognised by the Council as legitimate affordable housing. A new sub - section G should read: "G The Council values the role the park home sector plays in the housing market offering an affordable alternative to mainstream housing for many people, often over the age of fifty, in mainly rural and semi-rural locations and will support applications for the development of new Park Home static caravan sites." 6) Policy 32 should be modified to promote Park Home static caravan sector growth by including a new subsection E as follows: E Park Home static caravan sites The Council recognises the need to provide fair and equal treatment to the group in the community aspiring to live in Park Home static caravan sites run by competent Site Operators and will support applications for the development of such sites and will grant licenses to Park Home Site Operators who can demonstrate viability." 7) Policy 33 should be modified to promote Park Home static caravan sector growth by including a new subsection E as follows: E Park Home static caravan sites The Council recognises the need to provide fair and equal treatment to the group in the community aspiring to live in Park Home static caravan sites run by competent Site Operators and will support applications for the development of such sites and will grant licenses to Park Home Site Operators who can demonstrate viability." 8) Policy ST37 should be modified to ensure that development managers do not discriminate against proposals for Park Home static caravan developments on spurious design grounds simply because static caravans are factory-built standardised products and site layouts do not necessarily conform to traditional urban design principles suited to traditional town plans and mainstream housing layouts. It is not possible to generate an inclusive form of words and therefore a specific sub-section 9 should be added as follows: "9 Park Home static caravan sites The Council recognises that Park Home static caravan sites are a unique and established modern form of development that meets the needs of a group in the community and depends for viability on flexible layouts populated by factory-built dwellings and that the 	<p>The Council is satisfied that the Housing Mix policy can sufficiently deliver the right type and mix of housing in Bassetlaw. It is based on robust evidence (Bassetlaw Housing and Economic Needs Assessment, 2020). It provides a level of flexibility that will enable developers to work with the Council to determine a suitable mix of housing. It is not considered necessary to separately assess the need for Park Homes. The Local Plan contains sufficient policies to address the needs of static caravan sites should an application be submitted. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (2020) assesses the need for market homes, affordable homes, and specialist homes. Park Homes is a type of housing product and would be covered by these categories. The approach taken supports all age groups, the HEDNA considers the needs of a range of households, including older and disabled people, families, single people, and younger people, taking into consideration the needs of people wanting to get on to the property ladder. It does not discriminate. Park homes are not considered to be a form of affordable housing as identified by the NPPF 2021.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST32 - HOUSING MIX, TYPE AND DENSITY			
		<p>character and design quality of Park Home static caravan site layouts of a single storey are uniquely and sufficiently controlled by model standards published by central government and local authority license conditions . Therefore, Council recognises that it would be inappropriate to seek to control the design of Park Home static caravans and/or their arrangement on Park Home static caravan sites by imposing design rules suited to mainstream housing design and mainstream housing layouts and derived from traditional urban and/or architectural models in SPG documents." 9) Policy ST41 should be modified to omit reference to buffer zones of specific dimension. Specific dimensions are a crude instrument of policy which might distort the relevance of material considerations like topography and planting and historic character. The paragraph "All new development within a 30m value of the corridor" should be deleted and replaced with: "All new development should respect the settings of major and minor green corridors and will be supported provided it conserves and enhances the function, setting, biodiversity, landscape and recreational value of the corridor;"10) Policy ST46 BS should be modified to safeguard the health and safety of pedestrians against inappropriate cycle speeds on multi-use footway/cycleways as follows: "B 5 "increasing opportunities for walking, cycling and encouraging more sustainable transport choices whilst safeguarding pedestrian users of multi-use footway/cycleways by the incorporation of barriers and other means to calm cyclist speeds." 11) Policies 50 and ST53 should be modified to prevent inappropriate development control of the layouts of Park Home static caravan site development proposals. Compliance by Park Home static caravan site operators with model standards published by central government and license conditions imposed by the Council sufficiently safeguard residential amenity inside Park Home static caravan sites. A new sub-section C (Policy 50) and D (policy ST53) should be added as follows: Policy 50: "C In the unique case of Park Home static caravan development proposals the Council will be satisfied that residential amenity inside the Park Home site itself is safeguarded if license conditions imposed by the Council state that the layout shall conform to model standards published by Central Government" Policy ST53: "D In the unique case of Park Home static caravan development proposals the Council will be satisfied that residential amenity inside the Park Home site itself is safeguarded if license conditions imposed by the Council state that the layout shall conform to model standards published by Central Government" 12) Policy ST56 and ST57 should be modified to safeguard pedestrians against inappropriate cyclist speeds on shared networks by modifying the text of subsection B1 (Policy ST56) and B7(Policy ST57) as follows:</p> <p>Policy ST56: "B 1 Measures to facilitate and encourage safe access by cycle and foot including measures to calm cycle speeds where these might otherwise endanger pedestrians" Policy ST57: "B 7 Measures to facilitate and encourage safe access by cycle and foot including measures to calm cycle speeds where these might otherwise endanger pedestrians" C) The Reasons the Problem Exists 1) The Council has a Duty to Provide for the Needs of People wishing to Adopt Static Caravan or Houseboat Lifestyles in the District and should allocate land in the Local Plan to serve these Groups in the Community and the Developers wishing to serve it. This duty is found in the Housing Act 1985 and the National Planning Policy Framework: refers to The Housing Act 1985 Section 2The Housing Act 1985 Section 2 imposes duties upon the Council which have recently been expanded by S 124 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016. There is no evidence in the SHMA-OAN update 2017 or the DBLP to indicate that the needs of people aspiring to live in static caravans or house-boats in the District or the need amongst developers for land to meet the needs of this group in the community have been studied and assessed and provided for. The duty extends to people resorting to the District. b) Refers to the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 Paragraph 60 and Paragraph 61. The SHM A-EON 2017 and the Local Plan fail to capture the needs of people aspiring to live in static caravans or on a houseboat despite the fact that the SHM A-OAN 2017 recognises that the former group exists and even recognises some of their key aspirations (for two bedroom accommodation and equity release from existing homes - 7.33 SHMA-OAN) and one of the characteristics of some sites offering the housing type (reservation for older people on some sites - 6.12 SH MA-OAN 2017). This shortcoming in the evidence is reflected in the Local Plan which makes no allocation of housing land to meet the needs of this group in the community (whether living inside the District now or resorting to it). The group who find an answer to their housing aspirations in Park Home sites living in static caravans is typically made up of older people with the following life-style aspirations: 1) To down-size to a smaller more easily managed single storey dwelling and 2) Release equity from their homes to spend on retirement leisure activities and 3) To live in a mutually-supportive community of</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST32 - HOUSING MIX, TYPE AND DENSITY			
		<p>people with the same lifestyle aspirations and 4) To live in a detached property with two bedrooms (occasionally more) so that relatives and friends can stay overnight and 5) To have access to a site manager/ care-taker and 6) To have a smaller more manageable garden 7) To have on-plot car parking. Many of the people in this group in the community fall within the group of older people that are expressly mentioned in paragraph 61 of the NPPF and deserve specific housing land allocation accordingly. The SHM A-OAN 2017 appears to consider only those older people who become ill and disabled and have design-related housing requirements and makes no specific recommendations for retired older people who do not have design-related needs in their housing. The SH MA-OAN 2017 likewise excludes this group from the category of people in need of an affordable home despite the fact that there is a clear link between their aspiration for equity release and the affordability of property they aspire to own (SHMA -OAN 2017 appears to understand "affordability" in terms only of entry level to the housing market instead of considering the question more broadly- as the PPG requires- and considering the needs of down-sizers; consequently it overlooks this group in the community whose needs are frustrated by the housing market but for the reason that demand is not balanced by supply : the price may or may not be right but the product is simply not available in sufficient quantity. However that failure in this part of the evidence base to capture the needs of this important minority group in the community does not mean it is justified or positive planning or consistent with national policy for the DBLP to make no provision for increased housing choice for this group in the community. People in this group do not necessarily wish to build their own homes or pay someone else to do it for them. They pick their homes from the market or more rarely choose a factory-built product for their plot with the agreement of the Site Owner. Simply because the SHMA-OAN 2017 overlooks this group in the community does not relieve the Council of its duty to support them by" significantly boosting the supply of homes" (Paragraph 59) that meet the needs of this group. By the phrase "including but not limited to" (our emphasis) Paragraph 61 orders the Council to provide for the needs of identifiable groups in the community and not just those groups that the SHM A-OAN identifies as having a monetised or design-related or DIV need for increased housing choice. Paragraph 61 mandates a broad and inclusive evidence base and policy response. By explicitly stating that a "wish to commission or build"(our emphasis) a home generates a valid need for housing land the Paragraph broadens the traditional concept of housing need and makes it clear that a Council duty to provide housing land exists wherever an identifiable group in the Community has a particular life-style aspiration that demands allocation of land to meet it. The lifestyle aspirations of people wishing to take advantage of the static caravan Park Home Lifestyle model are entirely valid and should be recorded, assessed and provided for in the Evidence Base but are not. Consequently, informed housing Policy in the DBLP should but does not significantly boost the supply of housing land for people aspiring to live in a static caravan or in a houseboat. The evidence base fails to capture the needs of this group. This makes the Local Plan defective on three counts - lack of justification, lack of positive planning and lack of conformity with national policy (Paragraph 35). The Local Plan is also of questionable legality because inadvertently it discriminates against a group in the community without justification. The lack of evidence of joint cross border working - especially in regard to the question of cross-boundary working to meet the needs of people resorting to static caravans in the District - casts doubt on the effectiveness of the DBLP to o. Therefore, the Local Plan should make provision for proportionate growth in the Static Caravan Sector and in the different Houseboat Sector. 2) Identifying the Group in the Community and its Needs SHMA-OAN 2017 - 9.1 asserts that it is a comprehensive and inclusive assessment of housing need that can inform policy: "This section sets out the draft conclusion of the SHMA-OAN. It addresses overall need for homes, the mix of homes needed - both market and affordable - and the needs of different groups within the population and needs evidence to inform policies regarding the types of homes delivered". But the SH MA -OAN 2017 update is not comprehensive and housing policy based on it will not provide fair and equal treatment for the group in the community aspiring to a Park Home static caravan or houseboat lifestyle. The SHMA-OAN 2017 hints in sections 6.12 and 7.33 that there is another group of people in the community in need of homes to meet its aspirations (elderly people wanting 2 bed accommodation that will permit both equity release and overnight stays by family and friends) and yet is completely silent about the needs of the group in the community aspiring to live in static caravans (or those other people aspiring to live in houseboats). For the Custom build housing aspirants the SHM A-OAN 2017 at least suggests that windfall sites should meet the need; but the Park Home aspirant is not a self-</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST32 - HOUSING MIX, TYPE AND DENSITY			
		<p>builder and the Park Home developer - who in our experience requires a site of accommodating at least 30 static caravans for the provision of essential care-taker services to be viable - will not serve the market on the basis of windfall sites accommodating less than 30 static caravans. Reliance on windfall is of course to abdicate control of outcomes. Instead of doing nothing or hoping that windfalls will solve the problem, the Council should formulate a positive and inclusive policy that captures the needs of groups in the community that are readily identifiable such as the group in question by making specific land allocation. Inevitably, therefore, as it currently stands, informed solely by the SHMA-OAN 2017, DBLP housing policy discriminates against an easily identified group in the community that aspires to live in a static caravan and this defect if carried forward would make the Local Plan illegal and unsound. The Council should therefore supplement its evidence base and make its own assessment of the needs of this group in the community. Some secondary evidence is readily available and primary evidence is also available with minimal investment of resources - to avoid violating PPG advice quoted as Paragraph 14 of PPG (2a-014) in SHMA-OAN 2017 5.2. The findings below are easily and quickly available to the researcher and are offered to the Council. i) National statistics reveal the existence and size of the group in the community who currently live in static caravans in Bassetlaw. The Council need undertake no primary research to identify the group. Table QS402EW Accommodation Type - Households on the Nomis Website contains the following information about this group across the SHMA in February 2020:</p> <p>Bassetlaw DC has 183 static caravans within 47,667 units of accommodation = 0.384% of the total (NB- using Council Tax data Table 10 of the SHM A-OAN 2017 identifies 51637 dwellings in the District) NED has 193 static caravans within 43,070 units of accommodation= 0.45% of the total Chesterfield BC has 93 static caravans within 46,796 units of accommodation = 0.198% of the total Bolsover DC has 28 static caravans within 32,801 units of accommodation = 0.08% of the total England has 80,964 static caravans within 22,063,368 units of accommodation= 0.367% of the total England and Wales have 84,966 static caravans within 23,366,044 units of accommodation = 0.363% of the total. These statistics indicate that the District includes an averaged sized group in the community of people living in static caravans.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST32 - HOUSING MIX, TYPE AND DENSITY			
REF170	A&D Architecture	<p>The evidence base does not make the claim that demand for the sector is in decline (the Nomis web site entry for October 2019 is no different to that cited above). The SHMA-OAN update 2017 states that the population of the District is likely to age over the life of the Local Plan and since Park Home Lifestyles are popular with older people it is likely that demand for static caravans will increase over the life of the Local Plan. There is no evidence therefore to support reducing the static caravan fraction of the District Housing Stock over the life of the Local Plan and yet, by providing for no growth in the sector and yet this is precisely the outcome DBLP Policy will unjustifiably deliver. The Local Plan should be "significantly boosting the supply of homes" in the static caravan sector. That duty is reinforced by the popularity of the type amongst older people who, as a group, is set to increase over the life of the Plan. To avoid a charge of "discrimination by ageism" the Council should not just provide land for static caravan sector growth that keeps pace with the average target for housing growth because that would unfairly reduce choice amongst a group in the community that is disproportionately increasing. Thus, a growth target of 35 static caravans (0.384% of 9087 dwellings) by 2037 would discriminate against older people. Since the number of people aged 65 and over is set to increase by 46% to 2107 one estimate of a fair and equal treatment of the sector would be to allow fractional growth of 46% i.e. that the static caravan fraction of the housing stock should grow from 0.384% to 0.56% (=0.384 x 1.46) . On that basis one estimate of a reasonable growth target in the sector without attempting primary research would be 51 static caravans (=0.56% of 9087 dwellings). The Council should therefore allocate land for at least 51 new Park Homes over the life of the Local Plan.</p> <p>ii) Primary Market Research. Some primary research is offered below to indicate the low investment in resource required to understand the facts about the Park Home sector in Bassetlaw. The following was ascertained in a 30 minute search of 2 bedroom detached single storey dwellings for sale in Bassetlaw on 17th February 2020. The search findings are below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two Bedroom Detached Bungalows - £210 to £350 K: 17 properties for sale Av. Price: £248,500 Two Bed Detached Park Home - £200K - 1 property for sale Av. Price £200K Two Bedroom Detached Bungalows - £130K to £200K: 12 properties for sale Av. Price : £171K Two Bedroom Park Homes - £63,350 - £125,995 : 7 Properties for Sale Av . Price: £92K <p>(NB Average sale price of two bedrooomed bungalows in Bassetlaw on 17th February 2020 over the 29 properties for sale is £145,743 which is far higher than the average £73000 sales price for cheaper two bedrooomed property in Bassetlaw cited in Table 53 p.59 of the SHMA-OAN 2017. Assuming the ordinary operation of market forces demand for single storey two bedroom traditional bungalows self-evidently far outstrips supply.) Clearly for a person wishing to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Sell a property at the average sales price of £135K (2016 as identified in the SHM A-OAN 2017) and release equity to enjoy extra money in retirement and 2) Live in single storey detached accommodation (Impossible in a two -bedroomed bungalow selling at the average price found on 17th February 2020 of £145,753 but certainly possible in a static caravan selling at an average price of £92K) and 3) Own a property with two bedrooms so that a couple can either sleep in separate bedrooms or entertain an overnight visitor and 4) Enjoy the "extra care "benefits of a mutually supportive community cited by BHHPA the bungalow option is ineffective because there is not only no equity release but a need to find extra money to complete the purchase. On the contrary, the Park Home option is much more attractive. On average there would have been £46K of equity release on 17th February 2020. <p>For a person aspirin-g to release equity and to release onto the market an under=-occupied dwelling the Park Home static caravan option is an opportunity that should not be denied by lack of housing supply. The Local Plan should significantly boost the housing supply in this sector accordingly. Allocating no land for growth to serve this sector and this group in the community is unjustified negative planning that is contrary to national policy and makes the Local Plan unsound.</p> <p>3) The Need of Park Home Static Caravan Site Developers for Allocated Land in the Bassetlaw Local Plan It is common knowledge amongst the Park Home Sector that developers of the type cannot compete in the market for land with developers of traditional homes. In its response dated 19th February 2015 to the National Planning Policy consultation on affordable housing definitions the British Holiday and Home Parks Association Ltd (BHHPA) stated that "Our members are rarely able to compete with mainstream housing developers for sites designated for housing within local plans " The message is clear. Land should be allocated for Park Home development in the Local Plan to guarantee fair and equal treatment to this group in the community and the developers seeking to serve their needs. Unless land is allocated for Park Home development in Local Plans any increase in numbers within the sector is limited to those few</p>	<p>The Council is satisfied that the Housing Mix policy can sufficiently deliver the right type and mix of housing in Bassetlaw. It is based on robust evidence (Bassetlaw Housing and Economic Needs Assessment, 2020). It provides a level of flexibility that will enable developers to work with the Council to determine a suitable mix of housing. It is not considered necessary to separately assess the need for Park Homes. The Local Plan contains sufficient policies to address the needs of static caravan sites should an application be submitted. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (2020) assesses the need for market homes, affordable homes, and specialist homes. Park Homes is a type of housing product and would be covered by these categories. The approach taken supports all age groups, the HEDNA considers the needs of a range of households, including older and disabled people, families, single people, and younger people, taking into consideration the needs of people wanting to get on to the property ladder. It does not discriminate. Park homes are not considered to be a form of affordable housing as identified by the NPPF 2021.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST32 - HOUSING MIX, TYPE AND DENSITY			
		<p>extra dwellings for which space within existing licensed sites can be found (if any!) and this unacceptably restricts customer choice of location and limits competition in the sector. The BHHPA submission sought breadth in the definition of affordable housing and this is a justifiable position; if the measure of affordability is whether the market frustrates satisfaction it can do this by imbalance in supply and demand in a number of ways; the group in question too commonly finds no provision for growth in this sector in Local Plans and therefore finds its choice progressively restricted by inadequate quantity of product. Far from recognising Park Homes as a form of affordable housing to be recorded and assessed and welcomed and supported and provided for the SHMA-OAN 2017 at 6.12 even goes so far as to urge caution in the interpretation of data related to assessment of the need for affordable homes in case such data captures information about single bedroom Park Homes! Far from this cautious aversion even to recording the housing type is Rt Hon Grant Shapps' written ministerial statement (cited in the BHHPA response) that "The Government values the role the park home sector plays in the housing market offering an affordable alternative to mainstream housing for many people, often over the age of fifty, in mainly rural, semi-rural and seaside locations". The BHHPA response cites another often overlooked benefit of the Park Home model viz. its value as low cost extra-care housing which the SHMA-OAN 2017 does indeed overlook: "(Park Home static caravans provide) affordable low cost market housing for older people in a caring and mutually supportive environment without making demands on local authority funding"(BHHPA response 2015). Again, the importance of meeting the needs of this group in the community alongside those of all other groups is expressly recognised in the ruling in Kings Lynn and West Norfolk vs SSCLG Elm Park Holdings Limited cited in SHMA-OAN 2017 at 5.40 p. 65 "...the needs for types and tenures of housing should be addressed. That includes the assessment of the need for affordable housing as well as different forms of housing required to meet the needs of all parts of the community" (our emphasis) . SHMA-OAN 2017 at 6.12 recognises the existence of the sector in question but does not analyse its needs or make recommendations: "It should be noted that some caution should be exercised when considering the one-bedroom figures due to relatively small number of homes for sale and also potential inclusion of park homes and retirement properties that may not be available to all cohorts of the population (i.e. there may be age restrictions)" Consequently SHMA-OAN 2017 is incomplete as a basis for housing policy in the Local Plan and exclusive reliance placed upon it by housing policy makers renders the DBLP illegal and unsound. The principal reason that Park Home static caravans occupy such a small place in the national housing stock is a lack of allocated land set aside for it. When the sale prices of 2 bed bungalows and 2 bed Park Homes in Bassetlaw as recorded on 17th February 2020 and cited above are compared: £145,743 for the 2 bed detached bungalows (x 80% = £116,594) and £92000 for 2 bed detached Park Home static caravans (well below 20% lower in price) the reason why the sector needs the Council to step in to help is patently clear! Park Home static caravan site developers need the Council to intervene in the housing market by allocating land for their product to enable them to meet the needs of this group in the community. Without such provision, the DBLP is unsound and illegal. Attachment - Copy of BHHPA Response to National Planning Policy Consultation 19-02-2015 The British Holiday & Home Parks Association is the national trade body representing developers and operators of holiday, caravan and chalet parks and residential home parks in the UK. The residential park homes' sector accounts for around 85,000 units of residential accommodation (around 150,000 residents) in England on 2,000 residential home parks1, sometimes known as 'Park Home Estates' or 'Mobile Home Parks'. BH&HPA members own and manage over 46,000 pitches for residential park homes in England. Residential mobile homes, more commonly referred to as park homes today, conform to the lawful definition of a caravan from the 1960 and 1968 Caravan Acts. They provide high quality sustainable homes, similar to bungalows, but at a much lower cost and market price. In providing single storey detached two bedroom homes with small manageable gardens at a low cost, they are popular with older people seeking to downsize and release capital from the sale of their former homes to provide a pension. A brief description of the sector is attached (appendix A). Park homes are therefore important in releasing larger houses for families, which in turn releases smaller starter homes. As such, our members are major users of the planning system in attempting to bring forward sustainable development for affordable low cost homes in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance. However, they are severely thwarted in this purpose by local</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST32 - HOUSING MIX, TYPE AND DENSITY			
		<p>planning policies and local interpretation of national planning policy. In particular, few local planning authorities recognise park homes as meeting the definition of affordable housing. 4. The Association therefore welcomes the Government's proposal to broaden the definition of affordable housing, provided it is clear that the definition extends to park homes. Park Homes as affordable and extra care housing for older people. In a Written Ministerial Statement, 14 July 2010, the then Minister for Housing and Local Government (The Rt Hon Grant Shapps) stated: "The Government values the role the park home sector plays in the housing market offering an affordable alternative to mainstream housing for many people, often over the age of fifty, in mainly rural, semi-rural and seaside locations." Minister's words "an affordable alternative to mainstream housing" make it clear that government sees park homes as lower cost dwellings with a valuable role within the nation's housing provision. Whilst much profile is given to the provision of affordable housing, the role of the park homes sector in providing such accommodation is too frequently overlooked. The current planning definition of affordable means that many local planning authorities fail to recognise the benefits that park home communities can deliver in providing affordable low cost market housing for older people in a caring and mutually supportive environment without making demands on local authority funding. For example, in an analysis undertaken in 2012 to inform a Site Allocations Development Plan Examination in Berkshire, evidence was given that a two bed park homes at a large popular home park were being let for an average £875 per month whilst the letting price of a two bed bungalow outside the park was £1,140. Two or three bed park homes for sale at the same park were available for between £178,950 and £290,000. Two to three bedroom home in the same (edge of town) area with a garden and garage were on the market for £300,000 to £650,000. It is clear that park homes are significantly cheaper than comparable bricks-and-mortar properties providing a garage and plot large enough for a proper garden in the same area. As single storey Park homes are able to provide most residents, if they so desire, with a home for the remainder of their life, regardless of the changes in their care needs. This can save social services departments the cost of housing elderly people in care homes until much later in their lives, if at all. Planning difficulty. As park homes do not meet the current planning definition of affordable housing, BH&HPA members find it extremely difficult to provide additional park homes to meet the demand from mainly older people for this type of accommodation. Our members are rarely able to compete with mainstream housing developers for sites designated for housing within local plans, as the low cost and low market price of the park home product, means that profit margins are lower and the price that can be offered for the land to secure a viable development fall below that that can be offered by the housing developer. This means that park home sites are traditionally found at the edge of settlements where the low intensity single storey nature provides an acceptable transition between town and country; benefiting from access to urban facilities, but within a generally peaceful rural environment. However, this means that existing park home sites, and any surrounding land to extend them onto, are almost always excluded from the settlement boundary and designated as being within the countryside (and Green Belt, if applicable), irrespective of the size of the existing residential community. This maybe for good planning reasons - to protect the park home estate from redevelopment for housing, however, it is a cause of major frustration that any application for new park homes is then treated as unsustainable development in the countryside, even though the council has implicitly accepted that park homes are already acceptable in the same location by excluding them from the settlement boundary! In rare cases where park home developers are able to obtain planning permission in principle, they are required to give away a large proportion of homes as 'affordable' homes within the planning definition which further undermines the viability of the park home proposal versus the bricks-and-mortar housing developer. It is a further source of frustration among our members that in providing affordable low-cost market housing, they are then asked to provide a proportion of that as affordable rented or shared ownership to a housing association. Even if they could bring such a scheme viably to the table, it is then almost impossible to persuade a housing association to take the homes, as the tenure and style of home does not fit with their normal business criteria. Responses to consultation questions. Q1. Do you have any comments or suggestions about the proposal to amend the definition of affordable housing in national planning policy to include a wider range of low cost homes? The Association notes that in paragraph 6 of the consultation that 'National planning policy requires local planning authorities to plan proactively to meet all housing needs in the area'. It is therefore frustrating to our members that their attempts to meet the needs of older people preferring park homes are resisted.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST32 - HOUSING MIX, TYPE AND DENSITY			
		<p>Our members have not come across any councils which actively plan for this type of accommodation, by designating sites specifically for new park home development. Many council planning policies actively resist any new park homes. Paragraph 6 states that the current definition of affordable housing (set out in Annex 2 to the National Planning Policy Framework) provides for 'eligible households whose needs are not met in the market'. Would argue that the current definition of affordable housing, combined with the way park homes are treated by the planning system (see 'The Planning Difficulty' above) prevents the market from addressing the needs of older households seeking affordable low cost single storey park homes. Agree with the statement in paragraph 7 that 'It is important that the definition of affordable housing for planning purposes supports present and future innovation by housing providers in meeting the needs of a wide range of households who are unable to access market housing'. Park homes are a long-standing innovation that has evolved to provide a very high standard of sustainable living accommodation, meeting or exceeding modern standards for new sustainable homes, that is proven as extremely attractive to older people seeking to downsize and relocate from larger more urban accommodation but who cannot afford normal bricks-and-mortar bungalows at the edge of our towns and cities. The Association also agrees with the statement in paragraph 8 that the current affordable housing definition limits the current availability of home ownership options for households whose needs are not met by the market, with park homes being a case in point. Production methods for the construction of caravans means that park homes are much more affordable than equivalent bricks-and-mortar bungalows; however, as most councils consider that they fall outside the current definition of affordable housing, they are prevented from achieving planning permission. As such the definition limits the ability of the market to address the needs of older people looking for affordable home ownership to live out the rest of their lives. By their nature, park homes remain as affordable low cost homes 'in perpetuity'. However, they are rarely accepted as affordable by most local planning authorities because they are available in the open market and are not restricted to 'eligible households' on the council waiting list. Nevertheless, the most common purchaser of a park home is a retired couple whose children have left home, selling to downsize into a park home in order to release some capital for a pension. In paragraph 9, the Government states that 'We propose to amend the national planning policy definition of affordable housing so that it encompasses a fuller range of products that can support people to access home ownership'. We would argue that this aspiration should be amended to include a fuller range of products that can support people to access 'and retain' home ownership. Again, at the end of this paragraph it is stated that the Government 'propose to make clearer in policy the requirement to plan for the housing needs of those who aspire to home ownership'. Request that 'or who wish to live independently in their own homes for as long as possible' should be added to this sentence. Paragraph 9 also states that it is proposed that the (amended) definition of affordable housing should 'include products that are analogous to low cost market housing or intermediate rent, such as discount market sales or innovative rent to buy housing'. Urge the Government to add 'or caravan based residential mobile homes' to this sentence. Agree that these products should not be subject to in perpetuity restrictions or recycled subsidy; as we have explained, park homes remain affordable low cost market homes in perpetuity by their very nature, so such formal restrictions are unnecessary to retain this product in meeting the needs of older people seeking low-cost home ownership. The Association supports the Government's proposals to improve the delivery of starter homes set out in paragraphs 10 and 11. However, our members urge the Government to recognize in these paragraphs the importance of promoting affordable low cost homes for older people as these park homes generally free-up existing family homes for new families which in turn free-up existing starter homes. In adapting the proposed definition for starter homes in the Planning and Housing Bill to affordable low-cost homes for older people, it would obviously be necessary to switch the age restriction to new homes (park homes as caravans do not meet the legal definition of a 'dwelling') for people over 50 years of age. Our members would have no difficulty in meeting a requirement to sell their homes for at least 20% less than the market value of equivalent bricks and-mortar bungalows, or similar sized homes, in the area. It is likely that the park home market would be even lower than this. Do you consider that national planning policy should set out that local planning authorities should put in place a specific positive local policy for assessing applications for development on small sites not allocated in the Local Plan? support the Government's proposal that local planning authorities should put in place a specific positive local policy for assessing applications for development on small sites not allocated in the Local Plan.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST32 - HOUSING MIX, TYPE AND DENSITY			
		<p>Many of our members submit applications for small infill proposals to site one or two park homes on the site of under-used garages, former maintenance yards, or otherwise under-used land within their existing park boundaries. However, these application are often refused as the proposed homes are simply considered unacceptable as the constitute development in the countryside, even though they are within an existing residential home park estate.</p>	
REF170	A&D Architecture	<p>Q17. Should rural exception sites be used to deliver starter homes in rural areas? If so, should local planning authorities have the flexibility to require local connection tests? 30. We have no specific comment to make on whether rural exception sites should be used to deliver starter homes in rural areas. However, our members feel extremely strongly that there should be specific national planning policy to support the provision of park homes as an exception to normal countryside policies in sustainable locations adjacent or close to sustainable settlement boundaries . 31. As we have said, most existing park home estates are already located in sustainable locations adjacent or close to settlement boundaries but are prevented from expansion to meet demand due to being excluded from the boundaries for such settlements. If they were included within the settlement boundary, then there would be a danger that the park home site could come under pressure to be redeveloped for housing. Therefore, the only way to develop additional park homes to address the demand for low cost single storey housing for older people is by acknowledging them as a form of affordable housing and allowing them as an exception to normal countryside constraint policies. 32. Our members would not be adverse to a local connection test in such circumstances, provided it allowed for new residents to relocate from within the same or adjoining Districts (there are often few opportunities to acquire park homes) and allowed for older residents from outside this area to move into the area to be closer to a younger relative who can assist with their care in older age. However , controls on subsequent sales by park home owners would be impractical given the law gives complete freedom to private owners to sell their home on the open market, without the involvement of the park owner. Q19. Should local communities have the opportunity to allocate sites for small scale Starter Home developments in their Green Belt through neighbourhood plans? 33. We have no specific comment to make on whether local communities should have the opportunity to allocate small scale Starter Home developments in the Green Belt through neighbourhood plans. However, we consider that a similar opportunity should be extended to proposals for small scale extensions to existing residential home parks in sustainable locations within the Green Belt. Our members have found that many local communities are supportive of small scale extensions to their parks to provide additional homes for older people, even though the main planning authority have felt unable to support the proposal as it lies in the Green Belt, just like the existing home park site. Q20 . Should planning policy be amended to allow redevelopment of brownfield sites for starter homes through a more flexible approach to assessing the impact on openness? 34. We have no specific comment to make on whether policy should be amended to allow the redevelopment of brownfield sites in the Green Belt for starter homes. However, our members feel a similar opportunity should be extended to proposals for the redevelopment of brownfield sites in the Green Belt for residential park homes in sustainable locations. 35. Often, single-storey park homes may be a more appropriate alternative in the Green Belt countryside (where many park homes are already located and therefore accepted within a</p>	<p>The affordable housing will now contain a section of exceptions sites which includes first homes exceptions sites for first time buyers. The NPPF 202 does not identify Park Homes as an affordable housing product.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST32 - HOUSING MIX, TYPE AND DENSITY			
		<p>Green Belt designation) compared to more 'urban' two-storey starter homes. The rural location may also be more popular with older people who are no longer at work, than with younger people seeking the jobs and night-life that come with urban living.</p> <p>36. We do not have any further comments to make in relation to other questions in the consultation although we sincerely hope that BH&HPA's representations will be taken into account. Please contact us if we can provide additional information; further, we would be pleased to arrange a visit to a residential park if this would be useful to the Department.</p> <p>APPENDIX A- Residential home parks- affordable homes for older people 37. Around 250,000 people in Britain choose to live in residential park homes, according to Government figures. Government research also shows that the demand for this popular form of housing outstrips supply, and that local authorities tend to overlook the importance of this sector as a provider of low cost, high quality accommodation . Park homes account for around 85 ,000 units of residential accommodation in England on around 2,000 residential home parks2. 38. Park homes are built to a British Standard (B83632) . This is now a very high standard with good insulation and low maintenance requirements. 39. Prices often compare extremely favourably with nearby bricks-and-mortar properties, normally half the price of an equivalent detached or semi-detached bungalow in the same market area. Accordingly, park homes have become very popular with the elderly and early retired who can release the capital from their existing bricks-and-mortar homes (freeing these for younger , larger families) to invest in a pension. 40. Moreover, these safe and friendly communities, where neighbours, and indeed park owners, look out for each other, allow older residents to stay in their homes longer relieving hard-pressed social services. Park homes are also attractive to key workers' families who cannot afford family sized homes in an area, but would prefer to live in a compact dwelling with a small garden area, rather than a flat. 41. Residential parks are largely located in attractive rural areas, and sustain closely bonded and mutually supportive communities - where residents can enjoy independence without the need of support from public funds. In order to meet growing demand for this quality affordable housing, the sector needs to be allowed to expand existing parks, and to create new residential park developments. SEE ATTACHED PHOTOS 42. Park homes are a unique form of housing tenure, recognised under dedicated legislation.</p> <p>Residential parks provide pitches for park homes, the main residence of their owners (who rent their pitch from the park). They have security of tenure (under the Mobile Homes Act 1983 (as amended) . Park homes are caravans as defined and regulated through the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960, the Caravan Sites Act 1968. Local authorities, usually environmental health departments, issue residential parks with caravan site licences, with conditions ; the site licence is written having regard to Model Standards issued by the Secretary of State.</p>	
REF170	A&D Architecture	<p>6) Policy 32 should be modified to promote Park Home static caravan sector growth by including a new subsection E as follows: "E Park Home static caravan sites The Council recognises the need to provide fair and equal treatment to the group in the community aspiring to live in Park Home static caravan sites run by competent Site Operators and will support applications for the development of such sites and will grant licenses to Park Home Site Operators who can demonstrate viability ."</p>	<p>The Council is satisfied that the Housing Mix policy can sufficiently deliver the right type and mix of housing in Bassetlaw. It is based on robust evidence (Bassetlaw Housing and Economic Needs Assessment, 2020). It provides a level of flexibility that will enable developers to work with the Council to determine a suitable mix of housing. It is not considered necessary to separately assess the need for Park Homes. The Local Plan contains sufficient policies to address the needs of static caravan sites should an application be submitted. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (2020) assesses the need for market homes, affordable homes, and specialist homes. Park Homes is a type of housing product and would be covered by these categories. The approach taken supports all age groups, the HEDNA considers the needs of a range of households, including older and disabled people, families, single people, and younger people, taking into consideration the needs of people wanting to get on to the property ladder. It does not</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST32 - HOUSING MIX, TYPE AND DENSITY			
			discriminate. Park homes are not considered to be a form of affordable housing as identified by the NPPF 2021.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 33 - SPECIALIST HOUSING			
REF040	Misterton Parish Council	Page 115, Policy 33 Spread specialist housing through the District so that older people can (where they wish to) retain local connections.	The Local Plan is seeking the maximum amount of specialist housing possible based on the results of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. But delivering specialist housing is not the responsibility of the Local Plan alone. The Council and its partners will need to continue to identify other mechanisms for delivering specialist housing. The Viability Assessments states that specialist housing to higher Building Regulations standards can only be achieved on sites of 50 or more units. There are fewer opportunities to deliver larger sites in rural areas due to the need to ensure development reflects local character. The Council's Housing Strategy team work in partnership with Nottinghamshire County Council's Social Care department and with Bassetlaw CCG to assess the need for older and disabled people's housing. They have produced a Housing Strategy which identifies how the Council will deliver this type of housing.
REF060	Notts County Council	Parking should be provided in accordance with current residential parking guidance unless it can be evidenced that the needs of residents would justify an alternative level of provision.	Policy ST37 ensures that all new development is designed to incorporate the relevant aspects of the Nottinghamshire Parking Standards.
REF128 (Comments also made under reference number 1669799) - Pictures attached	Resident	Previously commented on Planning Application 17/00152/NMA for houses to be built on Harworth pit site to be known as Simpson Park. Those comments were not taken on board if indeed they were even considered. The housing development is of massive proportions & will have a big impact on our existing village/town but it would appear that there is little regard given by the developers & planners to what the people of Harworth & Bircotes really need as has been happening consistently over previous years. Several years ago I attended a presentation in the parish hall at which plans for around 1000 houses on the old pit site were unveiled. Of those 1000 or so houses there was not one single bungalow on the plans. This was pointed out at the time by myself & several other people to the people giving the presentation, Harworth Estates & Bassetlaw District Council probably, but there was no perceived uptake of the point at the time. Eight years on this development is now in progress with a proposed 996 houses to be built. There are no bungalows built to date & from enquiries that I have made it would appear there are still no proposals to include bungalows in the remaining number. The development off Bawtry road has several hundred houses to be built but no bungalows to date & none planned. There is a real shortage of bungalows in the village/town for the elderly & the infirm residents, both council & private. Others, of which I am one, would like to move into a bungalow before I fall into either one or both of the above categories. But I don't want to be cramped in a small 2 bedroom one, I want one that reflects my needs, space & no stairs. There are of course those people who would simply prefer to live in a bungalow anyway, given the choice & availability. As these new estates are being built the ratio of bungalows to houses in Harworth is gradually reducing from an already low number & at the same time the number of the elderly & infirm is increasing. This is obviously reducing availability & choice to the ever	The Local Plan is seeking the maximum amount of specialist housing possible based on the results of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. The Viability Assessments states that specialist housing to higher Building Regulations standards can only be achieved on sites of 50 or more units. The Local Plan cannot require bungalows to be built in Harworth and Bircotes because there is no evidence to support this approach. But delivering specialist housing is not the responsibility of the Local Plan alone. Developers are also asked to consult with the public on larger scale proposals prior to submitting a planning application. This provides an opportunity for the community to engage with developers on design and housing need/mix. Where there is a Neighbourhood Plan in place, Neighbourhood Plan groups can also negotiate with developers regarding housing mix for a particular site if there is a site allocation policy in the Neighbourhood Plan.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 33 - SPECIALIST HOUSING			
		<p>increasing population. point 3.23 states that effectively Harworth & Bircotes will double in size over the coming years. It is therefore obvious that the number of available bungalows per head of population will half. What kind of council allows that? Bassetlaw does! Have some very good small bungalows for pensioners in the village/town but they are in very short supply. With regard to private bungalows they are also very few & far between & as far as I am aware there are no plans to build any. Surely out of 996 properties there ought to be a sensible & fair mixture of housing to suit all ages & needs not just 3 & 4 bedoomed houses because they generate maximum payback for the developers. In my opinion the village/town is in desperate need for 2 & 3 (or even 4) bedoomed bungalows & both the town & district councils have an obligation on behalf of residents to insist on a good mix of quality properties to be built that reflects the needs of the community & so far they have failed miserably in that obligation. Apparently, by law, developers must provide a percentage of social housing but what about the elderly & infirm who struggle with or cannot manage stairs? The people of Harworth & Bircotes have been badly let down by Bassetlaw council with their total lack of foresight with planning applications regardless of all their statements in previous Neighbourhood plans, see attachments, & the current proposed plan. Tommy Simpson, local hero & legend would be 83 years old today had he lived. With all the pulverising & punishing work his legs & body had done I doubt he would be able to manage stairs now & would probably be looking to purchase a nice, spacious, quality bungalow on the development bearing his name. Wouldn't he be so disappointed? If Bassetlaw keeps making all the right noises about providing housing to meet the needs of the community perhaps one day they may listen & do exactly what they say & insist that developers build a certain percentage of good quality bungalows, of varying sizes, as a condition of planning being granted. The same applies to any future housing that Bassetlaw plans to undertake for themselves. Please stop this downward spiral of ever decreasing availability of bungalows that are drastically needed to meet the needs of our community.</p>	
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Area Plan	Para 7.18, Specialist Housing, Page 113. Whilst the Policy is supported it is somewhat of a surprise that in 16 years time most (58%) of the population of Bassetlaw will be over 65 and require some sort of specialist provision. That appears to give the sense that Bassetlaw cannot hold on to its young and middle-aged people who will leave the District before retirement. A disappointment. Page 155, Para D, Residential Care Homes. It has to be noted that provision of these homes that are able to maintain this policy will be out of the reach of most Small Rural settlements as they do not have the infrastructure required in this policy.	Table 9 on page 18 of Bassetlaw HEDNA (2020) indicates that, by 2037, 29% of the population will be over 65. Not all people over 65 will require specialist provision. This broadly aligns with Nottinghamshire and the East Midlands. The policy supports care homes in appropriate locations. Developers are required to demonstrate that care homes can be accommodated in proposed locations. This will involve working with Bassetlaw CCG and Nottinghamshire County Council's social care department to ensure proposals are acceptable.
REF197	Resident	the text says that "47% of Bassetlaw people (12,000) will be aged 65+" – is this correct?	Table 9 on page 18 of Bassetlaw HEDNA (2020) indicates that, by 2037, 29% of Bassetlaw district's population will be over 65. This equates to 35,713 people.
1669799	Resident	(7.18.4) What is (Part M4 (2)? Bungalows are mentioned but Bassetlaw certainly hasn't ensured they were provided with new developments so I can only assume there are numerous get out clauses to enable them to get round that in Harworth & Bircotes. (7.18.6) Where does Harworth & Bircotes fall in relation to Policy ST33 of Part M4 (2)? I have no doubt this can be a complex & complicated issue but surely the lack of bungalow built on new developments should have been ringing alarm bells somewhere, but not Bassetlaw.	Part M4(2) is an optional building regulation requirement that can only be imposed through a planning condition linked to an evidenced policy in an up to date Local Plan. Unfortunately the development in Harworth & Bircotes has been consented under the Bassetlaw Core Strategy which does not contain the up to date policies that allow this condition to be sought. On adoption of the Local Plan dwellings within larger sites should be built to a higher accessibility standard so that buildings can be accessed more easily i.e. level floor or ramp access. Internal layouts should also enable ease of movement. Full details can be found on the Government's website: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/access-to-and-use-of-buildings-approved-document-m

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 33 - SPECIALIST HOUSING			
REF052	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Page 115, Policy 33 Spread specialist housing through the District so that older people can (where they wish to) retain local connections.	The Local Plan is seeking the maximum amount of specialist housing possible based on the results of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. But delivering specialist housing is not the responsibility of the Local Plan alone. The Council and its partners will need to continue to identify other mechanisms for delivering specialist housing. The Viability Assessments states that specialist housing to higher Building Regulations standards can only be achieved on sites of 50 or more units. There are fewer opportunities to deliver larger sites in rural areas due to the need to ensure development reflects local character. The Council's Housing Strategy team work in partnership with Nottinghamshire County Council's Social Care department and with Bassetlaw CCG to assess the need for older and disabled people's housing. They have produced a Housing Strategy which identifies how the Council will deliver this type of housing.
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	The provision of many more senior citizen dwellings in various forms has to be encouraged. The population is getting older. This aging population now has very different desires and requirements. Many people no longer retire at 60 or 65, some retire earlier, others carry on working. Senior citizens no longer sit at home in a rocking chair drinking tea, many are very active partaking in many forms of exercise, social activities, they involve themselves in the community with many actually leading the way. They need to have the accommodation fitting to such an active senior group. There is a misunderstanding that seniors rely more than younger people on services etc. Senior citizens do not pop to the shops every day, they do not do the school run and many do not go to work although many still work mostly locally or from home. They tend to make better use of home deliveries for their every day requirements, food, library books, medication etc and, as such, the location of this form of housing should be somewhat more relaxed with rural sites being made available. It is often the case that people at retirement age who live in a village and have done so for much of their lives have to vacate their home and seek single storey dwellings within a town or large village and thus leave their community. The provision in most of our village of some single storey accommodation would allow many to vacate the family home and continue to live in the village. This has the knock-on effect of providing younger families with accommodation in these villages at an affordable rate. We would not have to build as many new family homes in these villages or elsewhere. It would also have the major benefit of keeping communities together and once again aid wellbeing amongst the community and its occupants in general. This is something that our local authorities used to back in the 1960s, 1970s and early 1980s and there is clear evidence of Council bungalows in most of our villages, both large and small. A return to this form of rural development with a cap placed on land values such that a landowner could see a reasonable return on his unwanted parcel of land and with developers providing dwellings that have been designed and built to certain standards and values would achieve viable rural housing. The Council again may be able to partnership such schemes.	The Local Plan is seeking the maximum amount of specialist housing possible based on the results of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. The Viability Assessments states that specialist housing to higher Building Regulations standards can only be achieved on sites of 50 or more units. The Local Plan cannot require bungalows to be built because there is no evidence to support this approach. But delivering specialist housing is not the responsibility of the Local Plan alone. Developers are also asked to consult with the public on larger scale proposals prior to submitting a planning application. This provides an opportunity for the community to engage with developers on design and housing need/mix. Where there is a Neighbourhood Plan in place, Neighbourhood Plan groups can also negotiate with developers regarding housing mix for a particular site if there is a site allocation policy in the Neighbourhood Plan.
REF195- Peaks Hill Farm	Freeths on behalf of Hallam Land Management (Peaks Hill Farm)	Broadly supported although concern is expressed that para. C. sets an inflexible minimum requirement of 20% of market housing being designed to meet requirements for accessible and adaptable dwellings. There would appear to be no justification for the figure of 20% and greater flexibility is needed to ensure that the Policy is robust and adaptable to the circumstances at a particular point in time. Suggest that para. C is reworded to refer to the 20% figure as being a target with the actual figure to be determined at the time of planning applications and assessed on the need identified at that time.	The findings of the specialist housing needs assessment (on Page 115 of the Bassetlaw HEDNA (2020)) indicate that the Council would be justified in seeking 100% of homes to be to M4(2) standards subject to viability. The 20% requirement is based on the findings of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. This policy is necessary to address the housing needs of the community.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 33 - SPECIALIST HOUSING			
REF198	Gladman Developments promoting former Bevercotes Colliery site	<p>Policy ST33 sets out policy requirements for specialist housing including the provision of a minimum of 20% of homes to meet M4(2) Building Regulations on development proposals of 50 or more dwellings.</p> <p>In principle, acknowledge the importance of delivering housing to assist in meeting the needs for older people and those with mobility issues. However, it is important that policies of this nature are formulated on robust evidence to ensure that they represent a justified response to the needs of residents over the plan period. The NPPF allows local authorities to make use of optional technical standards for accessible and adaptable housing, where this would address evidenced need. Eric Pickles' Written Ministerial Statement (2015) further highlighted that optional new national technical standards should only be required through Local Plan policies if they address a clearly evidenced need and where viability has been considered. While the Local Plan highlights the growing elderly population within the district in paragraphs 7.18.1 to 7.18.3, this does not solely justify the implementation of the proposed policy requirement. Further reference is given to the Bassetlaw Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment Update, GL Hearn, 2020 which provides information relating to a projected increase in the number of people facing mobility issues by 2037. Yet this fails to account for the fact that existing homes can be modified to meet the needs of older and disabled people and that in many cases homes built to the mandatory M4(1) standard will appropriately meet their needs both now and in later life. While it is noted that a requirement for 20% M4(2) provision is the maximum that can be sought from a viable scheme and can only be sought from the market housing element of a proposal, it appears that the viability assessment has only tested viability against a 20% provision. This does not offer clearly evidenced need or viability. Suggest the policy is modified and flexibility added to the policy wording which provides 'support' for the provision of M4(2) but does not set a policy requirement which could impact development viability.</p>	The Policy is based on robust evidence of housing need and delivery. The findings of the specialist housing needs assessment (on Page 115 of the Bassetlaw HEDNA (2020)) indicate that the Council would be justified in seeking 100% of homes to be to M4(2) standards subject to viability. The 20% requirement is based on the findings of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. This policy is necessary to address the housing needs of the community.
1671323	William Davis	<p>It is noted that the response to our previous comments refers to the 'Local Housing Need Assessment 2020'. However, this document does not form part of the evidence base for the Local Plan.</p>	The response should have said 'Housing and Economic Needs Assessment'. Bassetlaw HEDNA forms an important part of the evidence base for Bassetlaw Local Plan.
REF170	A&D Architecture	<p>7) Policy 33 should be modified to promote Park Home static caravan sector growth by including a new subsection E as follows: "E Park Home static caravan sites The Council recognises the need to provide fair and equal treatment to the group in the community aspiring to live in Park Home static caravan sites run by competent Site Operators and will support applications for the development of such sites and will grant licenses to Park Home Site Operators who can demonstrate viability."</p>	No amendment required. The Council is satisfied that the Housing Mix policy can sufficiently deliver the right type and mix of housing in Bassetlaw. It is based on robust evidence (Bassetlaw Housing and Economic Needs Assessment, 2020). It provides a level of flexibility that will enable developers to work with the Council to determine a suitable mix of housing. It is not considered necessary to separately assess the need for Park Homes or to identify sites for park homes. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (2020) assesses the need for market homes, affordable homes, and specialist homes. Park Homes is a type of housing product and would be covered by these categories. The approach taken supports all age groups, the HEDNA considers the needs of a range of households, including older and disabled people, families, single people, and younger people, taking into consideration the needs of people wanting to get on to the property ladder. It does not discriminate.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST34 - SITES FOR GYPSIES AND TRAVELLERS			
1647946	Resident	The provision of an additional 17 pitches (up to 34 caravans / semi permanent homes is unacceptable placing an unacceptable increase in traffic on Smeath Lane & Tiln Lane towards Retford. Potentially at least 60 cars in addition to commercial vehicles. It should also be recognized that accommodation on the existing site already exceeds the maximum number permitted by the existing planning permission and includes many non permitted residences including buses, narrow-boat and some semi permanent buildings. If detailed examination took place it may be seen that the existing accommodation on site already covers the number of pitches required in future over and above the numbers already permitted.	There is a need for 40 pitches by 2037 to meet the needs of the gypsy and traveller community. Policy ST34 makes provision for new pitches to meet the identified need for the first 10 years of the plan (29 pitches). Any proposals would be extensions to an existing use. They would need to satisfy the criteria of the Policy in terms access to the highway network, and be well integrated and managed. Well-planned and designed sites that make effective use of previously developed land and/or that positively enhance the environment will be supported.
1666840	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	I note the comments relating to five additional pitches in Treswell. Although I do not support a further extension of the site I recognise the challenge of finding suitable new sites and can see the plans logic of increasing the number of pitches in established communities. Any further growth (above five) would be strongly opposed as the site would become too large in relation to the local villages (as per govt planning guidance).	Comments are noted.
REF213	Treswell with Cottam Parish Council	Policy ST34 sets out the need for sites for Gypsies and Travellers and identifies a site in Treswell for an additional 5 pitches. In September 2019 Treswell Park travellers' site increased its number of pitches to 22; that relates to 25% of homes in Treswell. From the site plan it would appear the site is full to capacity. Therefore, concerns were raised in relation to this further allocation in the village of Treswell- where are these 5 proposed pitches to be located?	Any proposals for increase in pitches would need to accord with the criteria set out in the Policy. Only well-planned and designed sites that make effective use of previously developed land and/or that positively enhance the environment will be supported.
REF214	Historic England	Policy ST34: Sites for Gypsies and Travellers - The reference to historic environment considerations in Section C-7 is welcomed.	Welcome support is noted

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 35 - HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPANCY			
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Area Plan	In general these do need to be strictly controlled through the Planning Approval Process, most HMO's are created by flouting such rules and laws. Whilst this policy appears specific to Town centres, there is a growing trend to convert the larger houses built many years ago in the Small Rural Settlements into either HMO's or Care Homes. This policy needs to be extended to cover such eventualities / applications.	Thank you for your comments. The Policy covers the whole of the District and ensures development is controlled as it requires developers to provide evidence of need in support of their application within the Local Plan area.
REF169	Resident	page 119 para A.3 Add provision for cycle storage; like other high-density accommodation, occupiers of HMOs are at least as likely to require this as car parking.	Criterion A1.3 ensures HMOs are supported by at least the minimum parking provision as required by the Nottinghamshire County Council Parking Standards. This includes appropriate cycle parking provision.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 36 – AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY WORKERS DWELLINGS			
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Area Plan	<p>Page 120, all paragraphs. It is welcomed that this section of Bassetlaw society should be protected, new dwellings should only be made where a) there is a need and b) it is an exception to the Local and Neighbourhood Plans. The release of existing properties should be offered to existing agricultural/forestry workers first. Must not be forced out of their homes.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The Policy ensures that the provision of rural workers dwellings will only be supported where it is essential to meet the needs of an agricultural or forestry business.</p>
REF194	P&DG on behalf of Woodward Schools (Nottinghamshire)	<p>Policy 36's wording of "Agricultural and Forestry Workers Dwelling" is restrictive in its title and should be amended to reflect a more comprehensive policy for "Development in the Countryside", similar to as tested on Examination in nearby Bolsover District only recently. The policy could include a more prescriptive set of circumstances in which development would be supported. For instance, the Bolsover Draft Local Plan, only adopted last year, cites one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involve a change of use or the re-use of vacant, derelict or previously developed land; • Are necessary for the efficient or viable operation of agriculture, horticulture, forestry and other appropriate land-based business, including the diversification of activities on an existing farm unit; • Are small scale employment uses related to farming, forestry recreation, or tourism; • Secure the retention and/or enhancement of a community facility; • Secure the retention and/or enhancement of a vacant or redundant building that makes a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the area and can be converted without complete or substantial reconstruction; • Are in accordance with a made Neighbourhood Development Plan; • The buildings of exceptional quality of innovative design; and • In all cases, where development is considered acceptable it will have to respect the form, scale and landscape character, through careful location, design and materials. <p>Notwithstanding our view that site specific policies should be included in the Plan for the two Worksop College sites, the resulting policy would result in forming a much more concise and methodical policy relating to all development in the countryside. Furthermore, the policy would complement others in the plan that support the rural economy, tourism related development and the visitor economy which seeks to bring underused or neglected heritage assets back into economic use, furthermore it would be compliant with paragraph 83 of the NPPF.</p>	<p>The Council is satisfied that the approach taken in the Local Plan to planning in the rural area is comprehensive and addresses all of the rural planning issues appropriately.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 36 – AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY WORKERS DWELLINGS			
REF208	P&DG on behalf of Welbeck Estate	<p>In the previous stage of consultation, P&DG raised concerns with the wording of Policy ST31 “Agricultural and Forestry Workers Dwellings” (now Policy 36), stating it is restrictive. We suggested amending the policy to “Development in the Countryside”, similar to the adopted policy in the Bolsover Local Plan, believing it would be a more comprehensive approach to development in rural Bassetlaw. Planning Policy Officer’s responded to this comment, stating that Policy ST2, ST11, ST12 and Policy 31 comprehensively address all matters relating to rural areas as identified by National Policy. P&DG disagree with this opinion. By merging Policy ST12 “Rural Economic Growth and Economic Growth Outside Employment Areas” and Policy 36 “Agricultural and Forestry Workers Dwelling”, it would create a comprehensive, concise, and methodical policy relating to all development in the countryside, including those in the smallest settlements in the hierarchy. It would promote modest growth within the rural economy, allowing limited housing and improvements to the local tourist offer, as desired by other policies in the plan. Furthermore, the new combined Policy would complement ST13, particularly part E which relates to tourism related development which seeks to bring underused or neglected heritage assets back into economic use, furthermore it would be compliant with paragraph 83 of the NPPF. Ideally, Policy 36’s wording of “Agricultural and Forestry Workers Dwelling” should be amended to reflect a more comprehensive policy for “Development in the Countryside”, as tested on Examination in nearby Bolsover District only recently. The policy could include a more prescriptive set of circumstances in which development would be supported. For instance, the Bolsover Draft Local Plan, only adopted last year, cites one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involve a change of use or the re-use of vacant, derelict or previously developed land; • Are necessary for the efficient or viable operation of agriculture, horticulture, forestry and other appropriate land-based business, including the diversification of activities on an existing farm unit; • Are small scale employment uses related to farming, forestry recreation, or tourism; • Secure the retention and/or enhancement of a community facility; • Secure the retention and/or enhancement of a vacant or redundant building that makes a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the area and can be converted without complete or substantial reconstruction; • Are in accordance with a made Neighbourhood Development Plan; • The buildings of exceptional quality of innovative design; • In all cases, where development is considered acceptable it will have to respect the form, scale and landscape character, through careful location, design and materials. <p>Notwithstanding our view that site specific policies should be included in the Plan for the Welbeck Estate, the resulting policy would result in forming a much more concise and methodical policy relating to all development in the countryside. Furthermore, the policy would complement others in the plan that support the rural economy, tourism related development and the visitor economy which seeks to bring underused or neglected heritage assets back into economic use, furthermore it would be compliant with paragraph 83 of the NPPF.</p>	The Agricultural and forestry workers dwellings policy is considered appropriate to address this issue.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST37 - DESIGN QUALITY			
REF040	Misterton Parish Council	Page 123, section 8 Misterton Parish Council supports the drive to high-quality design, which should reflect local character and use suitable materials.	Thank you for your comments, your support is welcome.
REF092	DHA Planning	Support the changes to Policy ST37 which overcome our previous concerns.	Thank you for your comments, your support is welcome.
REF101	East Markham Parish Council	<p>Have no faith in the District Council to preserve local character and distinctiveness. The District Council already have a Successful Places Supplementary Policy Document approved in 2013 with regard to design, plotsize and amenity space. In East Markham 5/6 bedroomed properties have been built on very small plots with amenity space much less than that outlined in Successful Places. Properties have also been allowed where living spaces are close to adjoining boundaries and overlooking adjoining residences. This has been repeatedly pointed out to BDC but they have still granted permissions. <i>The following was written in reference to the January 2020 DLP</i> East Markham Parish Council endorses this policy and asks for it to be enforced. Recent development in our village has failed to meet points 1a, 3a, b, c and 7 and has concerns about future enforcement.</p>	Policy ST37 requires new development to reflect local distinctiveness, architectural quality and materials. Once adopted the Council will have an up to date Local Plan, based on up to date national policy and local evidence. All new development will therefore need to be in accordance with the Local Plan including Policy ST37.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST37 - DESIGN QUALITY			
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Area Plan	Page 124 – In general this is welcomed in as much as it protects the existing character and build of rural settlements. Page 125, Para 8, Accessibility – This has to be welcomed in a world where 58% of the population will be aged 65+ by 2037.	Thank you for your comments, your support is welcome.
REF146	Elkesley Neighbourhood Plan Group	Throughout the document, reference is made to ‘new housing developments being of high quality, well designed, energy efficient and respectful of the setting’ (4.11, ST2, D2). Have no issue with this statement as this is what should have always been expected of any development but, ‘well-designed’ and the accompanying 3 criteria can be very subjective. Could there be a situation where modern, energy efficient homes would not be of a similar style to the locality that could then prevent their development? Would like to think that significant weighting should be applied to the eco-credentials during the planning process.	Policy ST37 4 refers to the use of design to tackle climate change. Furthermore, 1d supports individual and innovative design which responds to the positive features of the local area. The appropriateness of each application, including energy efficient homes will be judged on their own merits at the planning application stage.
REF153	Natural England	Welcome this Policy particularly the section on the environment (4) which aims to maximise opportunities to incorporate measures which enhance the biodiversity value of development and help the natural environment adapt to a changing climate. The wording could also particularly reference the incorporation of green wall/roofs/water gardens within development designs. These measures are included in the National Design Guide, which we note has been referenced within the Plan. Integrated water management (as mentioned above) could also be incorporated into designs for greater climate resilience.	See revised policy which includes reference to green walls/roofs and integrated water management.
REF182	Anglian Water	Policy ST37 – Design Quality (page 124) - SUPPORT Policy ST37 as drafted cross refers to the water efficiency requirements outlined in Policy ST52 of the Local Plan and is therefore supported.	Thank you for your comments, your support is noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST37 - DESIGN QUALITY			
REF201	Severn Trent	<p>Severn Trent are supportive of the approach to develop a design guide policy that directs new development to build high quality housing that meets the need of the local area. There are number of key design aspects that should be covered to ensure that are appropriately incorporated into new development. Recommend that Policy ST37 incorporates statements to cover SuDS, the drainage hierarchy and water efficiency. SuDS Major developments are required to incorporate SuDS, to maximise the benefits of SuDS for the developments that they part of, they must be designed from an early stage within the development process and are design to deliver against the 4 principles of SuDS design, Water Quantity, Water Quality, Amenity and Biodiversity. Recommend that the some wording to the effect of: All major developments shall ensure that Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) for the management of surface water run-off are put in place unless demonstrated to be inappropriate. All schemes for the inclusions of SuDS should demonstrate they have considered all four aspects of good SuDS design, Quantity, Quality, Amenity and Biodiversity, and the SuDS and development will fit into the existing landscape. The completed SuDS schemes should be accompanied by a maintenance schedule detailing maintenance boundaries, responsible parties and arrangements to ensure that the SuDS are maintained in perpetuity. Where possible, all non-major development should look to incorporate these same SuDS principles into their designs. Note that the LLFA should be consulted on the wording regarding SuDS, as we appreciate that they have the main responsibility to advising the LPA on surface water / SuDS design considerations. Drainage Hierarchy The drainage hierarchy is outlined within planning practice guidance paragraph 80 (Reference ID: 7-080-20150323). However, it is important that surface water is manage and disposed of sustainably back to the natural environment. By incorporating this into the design policy, it will be clearer to developers that these principles will need to be applied resulting in better site designs and layouts and preventing compromises or changes later. The following wording could be used to promote the use of the drainage hierarchy: All applications for new development shall demonstrate that all surface water discharges have been carried out in accordance with the principles laid out within the drainage hierarchy, in such that a discharge to the public sewerage systems are avoided, where possible. Water Efficiency Water is a vital resource need for life as such we really need to use it responsibly, by designing new development that is water efficient, we can minimise the impacts of new development on water consumption. This approach is more sustainable and will benefit both residents of existing and future properties. The impacts of climate change is likely to increase the scarcity of water and to mitigate these risks will need to start acting now. The use water efficient technology and design are both recommended within the Humber River Basin Catchment Management plan.</p> <p>We would recommend that wording to the effect of: "All development should be design in accordance with the optional water efficiency target of 110 l/p/d, as per Building Regulations Part G"</p>	Sustainable drainage is covered by the flood risk and drainage policy and water quality policy. Duty to Cooperate discussions with Severn Trent have confirmed that is considered appropriate to address this matter in the Local Plan.
REF203	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	<p>2. Architectural Quality and Materials The BREEAM /ecohomes criteria (2006 onwards) contain a long-standing section relating to Biodiversity and would expect measures to benefit biodiversity being automatically included in house building standards within the District. In particular, swift, house sparrow and bat boxes could be incorporated into new buildings, where appropriate. This has been achieved in the Barratts DWH development at Cotgrave, for instance, so this demonstrates it can be achieved elsewhere. Provisions for Hedgehog (gaps in fencing etc) and use of water from roofs etc should also be built into new schemes (the latter will of course help achieve the water saving targets. Please refer to BREEAM: the world's leading sustainability assessment method for masterplanning projects, infrastructure and buildings – BREEAM BCT's new book, called 'Designing for biodiversity: A technical guide for new and existing buildings' (RIBA Publishing 2013, 2nd edition) Proposed amendment: Include biodiversity elements to the housing standard.</p>	Policy ST37 4 d promotes the use of nationally recognised standards in accordance with Policy ST52. ST52 references BREEAM but no specific reference is provided for residential development. This is considered to provide flexibility over the plan period allowing the LPA to positively respond to changing government legislation and guidance.
REF214	Historic England	The requirements set out within this policy are welcomed in terms of the historic environment and associated placemaking links.	Thank you for your comments, your support is welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST37 - DESIGN QUALITY			
REF052	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Page 123, section 8 Support the drive to high-quality design, which should reflect local character and use suitable materials.	Thank you for your comments, your support is welcome.
REF058	Sport England	Reference to active Design to improve Design quality and healthy place making Supported.	Thank you for your comments, your support is welcome.
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	As indicated in paragraph 8.1.2 the National Design Guide expects good design to consider the qualities of the place not just the building. This principle needs considering greater when evaluating the worth of residential development next to a power station and in flood zones (Cottam) and next to our busiest trunk road and junction at Apleyhead. It should also be used in the evaluation of Bevercotes Colliery site which is a place that would lead to both good design and an exciting and innovative use of energy. The LPA should also be promoting their own design guides which can be more location specific rather than the broad parameters within Policy ST37 and the National Design Guide. Local Neighbourhood Plans can achieve so much more in this department if encouraged and helped to do so.	The National Model Design Code and future national planning policy is expected to require locally specific Design Codes that could provide further place specific guidance for new development. The Local Plan will support the use of design codes in the district, and will encourage neighbourhood planning groups to undertake design codes to inform their plans.
REF170	A&D Architecture	8) Policy ST37 should be modified to ensure that development managers do not discriminate against proposals for Park Home static caravan developments on spurious design grounds simply because static caravans are factory-built standardised products and site layouts do not necessarily conform to traditional urban design principles suited to traditional town plans and mainstream housing layouts. It is not possible to generate an inclusive form of words and therefore a specific sub-section 9 should be added as follows: "9 Park Home static caravan sites The Council recognises that Park Home static caravan sites are a unique and established modern form of development that meets the needs of a group in the community and depends for viability on flexible layouts populated by factory-built dwellings and that the character and design quality of Park Home static caravan site layouts of a single storey are uniquely and sufficiently controlled by model standards published by central government and local authority license conditions. Therefore, Council recognises that it would be inappropriate to seek to control the design of Park Home static caravans and/or their arrangement on Park Home static caravan sites by imposing design rules suited to mainstream housing design and mainstream housing layouts and derived from traditional urban and/or architectural models in SPG documents."	Policy ST37 applies equally to all forms of new development, and is suitably generic and flexible to ensure that proposals for a range of development including static caravan sites can be appropriately considered. Planning processes and licensing are separate procedures requiring compliance with different legislation and guidance. Gaining planning permission does not necessarily guarantee you a licence and vice versa. It is therefore appropriate for all new development including static caravan sites to address the criteria within Policy ST37.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 38 - SHOP FRONTS, SIGNAGE AND SECURITY			
REF214	Historic England	The requirements set out within this policy are welcomed in terms of the historic environment, enhancing the experience of the District's high streets and placemaking in general. It also offers opportunity to support strategic Policy ST14 - Town Centres, Local Centres, Local Shops and Security in a positive way.	Thank you for your comments, your support is welcomed.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST39 - LANDSCAPE CHARACTER			
REF040	Misterton Parish Council	Page 127, Figure 31 This is too small for most people to read the legend!	This Plan, and others where there are legibility issues will be replaced.
1665999	Resident	This section boasts how good are arable land is so why are you allowing this productive land for sale when brownfield land remains empty. this goes against the constitution.	There isn't enough suitable or available brownfield sites to accommodate the level of growth required through the Local Plan and therefore some greenfield land is being used. However, the suitable reuse of Brownfield land remains a priority for the Council in terms of delivering sustainable development in the future.
REF186	Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England	Welcome the additional criteria at B. (development at edge of settlement locations), which should go some way towards preventing a recurrence of the bad practice which has been all too common over recent years (e.g. hard edges of developments and no sympathetic relationship to adjacent areas).	Thank you for your comments.
REF203	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	B. Proposals for development in an edge of settlement location will be expected to: advocate amending the wording to stipulate that boundary landscaping for edge of settlement locations should use native species appropriate for the landscape character area and ideally, of local provenance.	A reference to the use of native species has been added to the Policy.
REF214	Historic England	The requirements set out within this policy are welcomed in terms of the historic environment, associated placemaking links and advocating the links between the built, historic and natural environments.	Thank you for your comments.
REF052	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Page 127, Figure 31 This is too small for most people to read the legend!	This Plan, and others where there are legibility issues will be replaced.
1671323	William Davis	The proposal to split the previous Policy ST34: Landscape Character with Part C (Green Gaps) becoming a separate policy is supported. The reworded Policy is broadly supported.	Thank you for your comments.
REF159	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Page 127 8.3.1 the sentence makes no sense and needs rewording.	This section has been reworded to provide a clearer explanation.
REF186	Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England	<p>Commented on the 2019 Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan (response dated 9th March 2019, submitted by email) and the January 2020 Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan (response dated 26th February 2020, submitted by email) and are making the comments below in light of these earlier responses.</p> <p>1. November 2020 Summary of consultation responses to the January 2020 Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan</p> <p>We first need to point out that there are two errors in the summary of the January 2020 consultation responses. The first error is that our comments on the January 2020 Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan Policy ST34 (on landscape character) have not been incorporated into the summary of the January 2020 consultation responses. Instead, comments we made in response to January 2020 Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan Policy ST 50 (on sustainable transport) have been copied in under Policy ST34 (and again under Policy ST50). Ask you to rectify this and take into account what we actually said in our consultation response regarding Policy ST34. Our comments on ST34 are reproduced in full below</p> <p>This policy significantly weakens landscape protection compared to Policy 17 in the 2019 Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan. The following clear guidance in Policy 17 has been deleted:</p> <p>"2. Development proposals that would have an unacceptable impact on landscape character, visual amenity and sensitivity will not be supported. 3. The provision of alternative, replacement or additional landscape features either within the development site, or in an appropriate alternative location, may be appropriate in circumstances where the impact is demonstrated to be necessary to facilitate an otherwise acceptable scheme. Proposals to offset any loss or damage will be subject to the agreement of an appropriate management scheme by the Council where necessary. 4. Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of or damage to the landscape, the prior condition of the landscape will be taken into account in the consideration of development proposals."</p> <p>Bassetlaw may well have (in their view at least) compelling reasons for this change. If so, we would be interested in hearing them.</p> <p>There is a risk that the weakened landscape policy will allow adverse consequences for local landscapes and amenity value, especially if the policy wording in relation to particular allocations is equally open-ended and general. Policy 15 : HS1 could be an example of this risk. The wording at C. is as follows :</p>	<p>Apologise for those errors and thank you for providing your response to us again.</p> <p>In terms of the changes to policies between the draft versions of the Plans, some of these references have either been moved to other, more relevant, policies such as those relating to development, or were considered overbearing or are covered by National Policy. We have changed a few points to help strengthen the Policy and added a separate point related to the unacceptable impact from development.</p> <p>We have considered your responses and made relevant changes to the policy where appropriate. Your comments relating to Policy HS1 have been added to that section and a response has also been provided.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST39 - LANDSCAPE CHARACTER			
		<p>"C. The masterplan framework will guide the creation of a sustainable and high quality living and working environment and will make provision for: 1. Good Quality Design and Local Character</p> <p>a) Landscape-led high quality design that integrates the new with the existing, that adds value to the local area and endures over time". In the absence of any specific criteria as to what would constitute 'high quality' or 'adding value', it is difficult to see what basis Bassetlaw would have for rejecting any masterplan, or even for asking applicants to make changes to a submitted masterplan. In relation to this example, we are also aware that local residents have in their comments on the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020 expressed concerns about Policy 15 : HS1, especially about the adverse impact on valued views if the western side of the proposed allocation is developed." Would still be interested in the arguments which led to Bassetlaw to decide not to incorporate the clearer guidance in the text from Policy 17 in the 2019 Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan into the January 2020 Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan The second error is that our comments on ST15 : HS1 in our response to the January 2020 Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan (see above) have not been incorporated into the section on this policy in the summary of the January 2020 Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan consultation responses. We ask you to take these into account too.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST40 - GREEN GAPS			
1638182	Resident	Support the proposal for Green Gap 7 - Retford South - Eaton. However, given how visible the land on the east side of Ollerton Road (adjacent to Lansdown Drive) is from London Road, suggest that the policy should state that there should be no built development in this location.	There are views of the open land from London Road with the (Lansdown Drive) housing behind it (See Appendix - Photo 1). However, the existing rectangular built edge to the settlement is dominant in the landscape. The form of the existing built up area and the need to achieve an efficient and effective use of infrastructure suggests, therefore, that development east of Ollerton Road/South of Lansdown Drive is possible without prejudicing landscape quality, whilst still enabling a viable and lasting Green Gap of an appropriate size, to be defined. A sensitive design and layout, respecting topography and utilising new open space and planting could achieve a satisfactory landscape relationship with the proposed GG7 to the South. As noted in previous reports, topography and the presence of the public right of way to the South, create an opportunity for a recognisable and robust edge to built development within the Green Gap
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Area Plan	Page 129 – This has to be a must and defines the spaces between settlements or builds. However, it is not currently present in (for example) Ranskill / Torworth where a development is being allowed directly on the border across the 2 villages.	In the Local Plan Scrooby is defined as a Small Rural Settlement with limited new dwelling requirements. The (Draft) Scrooby NP covers Scrooby and Scrooby Top and it defines a settlement boundary for the main village. Land outside that area is open countryside where the LP policies ST1 & ST2 would apply to new development and there are no proposed development sites. Ranskill is also identified as a Small Rural Settlement, with a new dwelling requirement of 30. This is being addressed through an emerging Neighbourhood Plan. The Draft NP includes "Significant Green Gaps to the north and south of the village" and it is

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST40 - GREEN GAPS			
			appropriate that this local matter is determined through the NP process rather than addressed in the higher-level Local Plan. Torworth, to the south of Ranskill, is regarded as being in the countryside in Policy ST1. Scrooby lies to the south east of the proposed GG1 Bircotes – Bawtry across the River Ryton, which is a long term and robust GG boundary.
REF142	Retford Branch Labour Party	<p>The Party acknowledges the determination of the Plan to preserve and improve the Green Spaces detailed at Section ST34 but wonder if it is time to flood GG6 and ST48. Both these areas are poor quality low lying historic flood plain areas, and perhaps now is the time to create managed Wetlands to help mitigate the flood risks already endured by adjacent properties. If we do not start the conversations about returning some lands to a more natural historic state as part of a managed flood plan, then we will be still mopping out the same houses in 2040 - unless they have been abandoned. Pockets of Green Space in urban areas should be considered for local environment management opportunities. There is good evidence to show that communities will look after their precious amenity areas if they are given a role in the management of it. The Labour Party believes increasingly, local authorities are working with community organisations to see if new models of managing these spaces can be developed, creating both efficiencies and added value services and activities as a result.</p> <p>Suggested changes to the plan. The Plan should make a declaration that the future Flood resilience of both our Town Centres - Worksop town floods more frequently than Retford town now - is a key objective of the Plan, and this 'will include restoring historic Flood Plains in the Idle Valley'. The Plan needs to make clear that there will be the opportunities for Community involvement in environmental protection and green spaces. The Plan should note remits of the proposed Retford Town Masterplan to include a specific environmental plan for the Town Centre.</p>	The suggestions relating to flood plains and washlands are reasonable as a way of addressing climate change. However, the comment does raise the question of longer-term management rather than the actual designation of Green Gaps with which the Local Plan is concerned. Policy ST41 (Green and Blue Infrastructure) and other Local Plan policies cover the comments on Worksop and Retford Town Centres.
REF135	Pegasus Group on behalf of land owner	<p>As discussed in our previous representations, it is considered that the Green Gap to the north of Langold should be amended to exclude the full area of the extended site proposals (as discussed below). This would not detrimentally impact on the openness, appearance and functionality of the landscape quality of the Green Gap and specifically the Green Gap would continue to deliver its primary purpose of preventing coalescence between Langold and Oldcotes. This would not then prevent the development proposals, along with their proposed landscape mitigation, from being able to deliver future sustainable development which was compliant with Policy ST34.</p>	<p>The context for Green Gaps is explained in the Local Plan and in the Introduction and Methodology section of the 2019 Report. The exercise was not intended to be a District Wide landscape analysis, a role which has been fulfilled by earlier studies. Rather, it is intended to be a targeted assessment of areas of land around towns and larger villages. The approach to the assessment of and proposals for a Garden Village and Priority Regeneration Areas (including greenfield locations and power station sites) is explained in the Economy (para. 3.22), Vision (Strategic Objectives 1, 4 & 5) and Spatial Strategy Sections of the Local Plan. The eastern edge of the built up area of Worksop (Kilton) and the western edge of Retford (Ordsall) are 6 miles (9.5km) apart. It is acknowledged that there are existing and proposed large scale warehouse buildings along the A57, west of Worksop but these sites are within landscaped settings and do not create an impression of or represent continuous development. The proposed Bassetlaw Garden Village is separated from these buildings by the A1 and several large woodlands including Apleyhead, Sharps Hill and Top Wood (which is to be retained around a proposed employment site). The proposed Garden Village Site is triangular, with the narrow apex to the east. That point is</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST40 - GREEN GAPS			
			still 1.25mls (2km) west of the edge of Retford and the majority of the site is some 2.5mls (4km) away. In addition, the western built up boundary of Retford is framed by the substantial proposed GG8. In Section 5.3 of the Local Plan, the principles of the proposed Garden Village and Policy ST3 require that at least 40% of the site area is given over to a green & blue infrastructure network that "...respects and enhances the landscape qualities of the area..." The site is well-contained by defensible boundaries which together with the green/blue infrastructure will further minimise any perception of continuous built development between Worksop and Retford. It is not, therefore considered justified or appropriate to consider wider Green Gap designations across the district or that the proposed Garden Village site should be considered as a Green Gap.
REF211	National Trust	<p>It is not clear how Green Gaps have been identified as the associated report only includes an assessment of the areas already suggested by the Council. Consequently, it is unclear why a Green Gap has not been considered between Worksop and the A1 (and on to Retford) where the risk of linear urban sprawl is clearly at its most marked. It is notable that while this area to the east of Worksop has not been assessed by the Green Gaps Report, the report specifically refers to 'settlements extending into the countryside with the potential for them to merge in the future... erosion of local landscape character between settlements some of which is locally valued and has historic value. Examples of this include... Worksop (E). The (commercial) development of Manton Wood with major HQs and warehouses; ... [and] The A1 junctions, services and associated development (Blyth, Morton...)’, p15. With a proposed Garden Village to be sited between Worksop and Retford, the Draft Local Plan is promoting an extended area of urban sprawl stretching from Worksop to within 2.5km of Retford, which conflicts with its own Green Gap Report. Suggest that the proposed Green Gaps ought to be revisited with additional areas being identified on the basis of how well they meet a range of criteria. Reviewed the Green Gaps Report Addendum October 2020 and were confused to note that our previous representation (much of which is replicated above) has been reported by paragraph 2.3 as 'Support in principle' for the policy, with no further consideration being given to the detailed comments. Clearly this does not adequately address our response in relation to Green Gaps.</p>	<p>The context for Green Gaps is explained in the Local Plan and in the Introduction and Methodology section of the 2019 Report. The exercise was not intended to be a District Wide landscape analysis, a role which has been fulfilled by earlier studies. Rather, it is intended to be a targeted assessment of areas of land around towns and larger villages.</p> <p>It is considered that the policy, whilst soundly based and realistic, is aspirational in that it introduces Green Gaps into Bassetlaw planning policy for the first time. This is part of a wider strategy to achieve sustainable development that will meet economic, environment and social needs.</p> <p>National and local landscape character assessments are considered in relation to several key aspect of the Local Plan. In addition to references to these in the Sites (Land Availability) Assessment and Green Gap reports, these studies/assessment either form or are referenced in other Local Plan background reports and evidence papers. However, a reference could be made in the explanation of Policy ST40 (Green Gaps) and it is recommended that para. 8.47 be amended to read: "Evidence, including information for national and local landscape character assessment, will need to..."</p> <p>There is detailed coverage of Sherwood Forest within Policy ST42 (Biodiversity and Geodiversity). The eight proposed Green Gaps include locations/areas outside Sherwood Forest consequently, reference to a single, are specific restoration project is not appropriate.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST40 - GREEN GAPS			
			<p>The approach to the assessment of and proposals for a Garden Village and Priority Regeneration Areas (including greenfield locations and power station sites) is explained in the Economy (para. 3.22), Vision (Strategic Objectives 1, 4 & 5) and Spatial Strategy Sections of the Local Plan.</p> <p>The proposed Bassetlaw Garden Village is separated from these buildings by the A1 and several large woodlands including Apleyhead, Sharps Hill and Top Wood (which is to be retained around a proposed employment site). The proposed Garden Village Site is triangular, with the narrow apex to the east. That point is still 1.25mls (2km) west of the edge of Retford and the majority of the site is some 2.5mls (4km) away. In addition, the western built up boundary of Retford is framed by the substantial proposed GG8.</p> <p>In Section 5.3 of the Local Plan, the principles of the proposed Garden Village and the Policy ST3 require that at least 40% of the site area is given over to a green & blue infrastructure network that "...respects and enhances the landscape qualities of the area..." The site is well-contained by defensible boundaries which together with the green/blue infrastructure will further minimise any perception of continuous built development between Worksop and Retford.</p> <p>It is not, therefore considered justified or appropriate to consider wider Green Gap designations across the district or that the proposed Garden Village site should be considered as a Green Gap.</p> <p>The report will be amended to reflect your comments.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST40 - GREEN GAPS			
REF223	Resident	<p>In our comments on the previous version of the draft Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020, expressed the hope that the Council would expand the proposed green gaps into the land areas immediately north and north-east of the settlement edge of Retford towards Tiln Lane and Clarborough, to maintain the separation of Retford and Tiln and of Retford and Clarborough (Reference 377 January 2020 Bassetlaw Local Plan). The officer response dismissed the proposal because of the significant landscape and heritage assets or existing designations that would limit and further manage development in this location. The green gaps report addendum October 2020 contains statements (p12 and 18-19) that apparently support the incorporation into a green gap of the above-mentioned land areas to the north and north east of Retford. The statements on page 12 quoted below refer to a current consultation on changes to the planning system: Planning for the Future (August 2020). Observed that the above-mentioned land areas played a crucial part in "health and well-being, in terms of exercise" and "recreation" during the national lockdowns imposed as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic. The footpaths in these land areas were extensively used by pedestrians and dog walkers, including children. A green gap north and north-east of Retford would support the intent to "ask for beauty and to be far more ambitious for the places we create, expecting new development to be beautiful, and to create 'net gain' not just 'no net harm', with greater focus on 'placemaking' and 'the creation of beautiful places' with the NPPF". Also the proposed green gap designation north and north east of Retford "could complement the intended (landscape and character led) masterplan approach that the new separate, green gap policy in the Bassetlaw Local Plan will require for development within or adjoining green gaps". The green gaps report addendum proposes that "the extent and role of any green gap may be reconsidered when the Local Plan (or a successor document) is reviewed" (p18). Strongly encourage a prompt review of whether the land identified above (north and north-east of Retford) be included in a green gap. The green gaps policy clearly applies in detail to the land refer to above (see statement on p18 and 19 of the addendum), in particular the design proposals and the need to consider "the sequential approach that there are no appropriate sites for a proposed development outside the green gap in question". Finally we expect that a green gap designation in the above-mentioned location would be helpful in encouraging development therein to include safe walking and cycling routes, as a natural choice for all shorter journey's or as part of a longer journey. Perhaps a green gap designation will facilitate access to future grant aid in the regard. There are at present no designated safe cycling routes in the potential green gap north and north-east of Retford to connect with the green lane routes in Hayton and Clarborough Parishes. Unsafe cycling routes include Smeath lane (a very busy Lorry route, sustrans advises caution) and the Chesterfield Canal towpath (too narrow for shared use by cyclists, walkers, dogs and fishermen). A green gap policy would encourage upgrading of footpath surfaces for all levels of walkers and cyclists with amenity tree planting, wildflower meadows, and vistas and viewpoints with seating provision.</p>	<p>The canal, forming the western boundary of GG5 (Clarborough – Welham), is a clear and permanent feature in the landscape. West and SSW of Clarborough the land is clearly open countryside across to Smeath Lane and beyond to Bolham Hall and Tiln Lane. To the north of Smeath Lane, the Idle Valley opens out and there is no settlement for 3 to 5 miles (5 to 8 km). New housing is being built west of Tiln Lane and south of Bolham Way, which extends the built-up area. In the north east quadrant of Retford there is an irregular and complex boundary to the built up area offering few opportunities to identify a long term robust boundary to a GG. In addition, the area is undistinguished in landscape terms. At present, therefore, it is not considered that there is justification to identify a new or extended Green Gap. In the meantime, countryside policies in the Local Plan, the protection of the footpath network and the green corridor designations of the Canal and the River Idle represent an adequate and appropriate means of managing development in this location.</p>
1670041	Globe Consultants Ltd	<p>This policy identifies Retford East as Green Gap 6 which includes derelict brown field land that desperately requires investment and development to deliver enhanced amenity to the locality along Blackstope Lane. By including such a site within the Green Gap policy, without sufficient acknowledgement that such investment will be supported where it delivers a net benefit to the amenities of the area, as opposed to securing its openness, the policy is likely to result in the perverse and counter-productive result of disqualifying the necessary investment.</p>	<p>There is a (demolished) former factory site off Blackstope Lane within the Green Gap. However, it adjoins a wet woodland (of habitat and landscape value (within Flood Zone 3) which runs across to the canal. Housing, further west along Blackstope Lane is outside the Green Gap. It is acknowledged that two other commercial premises (a stonemason and a lawnmower repairer) and a cleared site off Grove Road are not in the Green Gap. However, they form a contiguous unit and directly adjoin the built up area. It is appropriate, therefore, to use Blackstope Lane, the railway line and Grove Road as the Green Gap boundary in this location. To the south, the contribution that the open land in the Idle valley (west of the railway) makes to the landscape setting of Retford is significant. To the north of Blackstope Lane the canal (a major green corridor in the Local Plan) is a clear and permanent feature in the landscape so acts as a defensible</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST40 - GREEN GAPS			
			boundary for the Green Gap. The features referred to above are shown in photos 2, 3 & 4 in the appendix. The policy wording allows for essential development within Green Gaps and for development to have a positive impact on the "...openness, character, appearance and functionality of the landscape characteristics of the relevant Green Gap." where specified criteria can be met. Therefore, it will be possible for the existing businesses to invest in their sites and premises. However, it will be necessary for such development to take account of the landscape and habitat value of brownfield land, which may be naturally regenerating so that the integrity of the Green Gap remains intact.
REF110	Resident	ST40 Page 129 Clarification or more detailed information is required on Green Gap 7 Retford South -Eaton to enable comment in the future	The 2019 report and the 2020 addendum cover GG7 in detail and the comments above on Ref. 163 explain why some well planned development may be appropriate adjoining the existing built up area.
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	Green Gap 7: Retford South – Eaton has much to commend it but there is a segment at its northern end adjacent to Whitehouses Road that is an intensive horticultural operation with the associated polytunnels, storage building, car parking and the adjacent football pitch and changing building. The Green Gap line should be relocated towards the south boundary of this operation.	The presence of this business and the playing field is recognised, and it is acknowledged that there are several associated small buildings/structures and greenhouses, albeit that the majority are temporary. Noting that Green Belt principles can be applied to Green Gaps, buildings for agriculture or forestry and facilities for outdoor recreation are considered appropriate. If the boundary of the Green Gap were to be moved south to remove these uses/structures, it would be difficult to establish a recognisable and defensible long term boundary. Whitehouses Road/Goosemoor Lane is a recognisable, robust and defensible boundary for the Green Gap. The Appendix, photo 5 shows how the horticultural uses sit satisfactorily within with Green Gap. On the Local Plan Policies Map, the southern boundary of the Retford East Green Gap (GG6) runs along the north east side of the East Coast main line. However, it is acknowledged that it includes part of The Brambles residential development to the north. The boundary should be amended to exclude the development. The (2019) Green Gaps report and Policies Map will be revised accordingly.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST40 - GREEN GAPS			
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	<p>Land to the south of Whitehouses Road. This is shown overlaid with the key for locally important open space, green gaps and playing field and outdoor sports facility. The latter is the local football pitch and changing facilities. However, the remainder of this larger location is an intensive horticultural operation with structures and car parking provision. All of the land on both the north and south side of Whitehouses Road has always been horticultural land, the majority of it owned and used by the Barker family who owned and worked Fairy Grove Nurseries, now a housing estate. The identification of a locally important space is incorrect and the idea that it is a green gap is wrong due to the intensive use and buildings. On the same plan and immediately to the west of the above land is the new housing development known as The Brambles and is located on the former Norman Nurseries. On this same inset plan it is hatched over as a green gap and underwashed with the Committed housing layer. It cannot be both. The green gap allocation should be redrawn.</p>	<p>Agreed. The Green Gap has been amended to exclude the developments at the Brambles and Kenilworth Nurseries.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST40 - GREEN GAPS			
REF195-Peaks Hill Farm	Freeths on behalf of Hallam Land Management (Peaks Hill Farm)	<p>Policy ST40: Green Gaps does not appear to recognise that there may be circumstances where, for example, strategic transport links or other development infrastructure is required. Whilst it may be considered that sub-para.B.1. addresses this point, it would be helpful if the supporting text to this Policy acknowledge that certain forms of infrastructure that are considered necessary would be acceptable in regard to sub-para.B.1.</p>	<p>The consideration of an appropriate northern boundary of the proposed Peaks Hill Farm (large scale) housing site allocation led to the proposed Green Gap being moved southwards from that originally considered in the 2019 Green Gaps report. This decision recognised the clear landscape connection between the farmland either side of Red Lane. BDC noted that, by including new woodland and open spaces in the design of the new housing, a satisfactory relationship could be created at the same time as providing a clear long term boundary for the Green Gap. However, it is acknowledged that in making those changes, the extent of the existing employment operations off the B6045, at Carlton Forest, south of the junction with Red Lane is not properly recognised by the Green Gap boundary as currently drafted.</p> <p>A reference is now made within the policy for the allowance of critical infrastructure within a green gap.</p> <p>It is considered that the boundary be redrawn in part using the curtilages of existing buildings, parking and servicing areas, as follows. South from Hundred Acre Lane to the rear of Sherwood Caravan storage, residential properties and the Milton Equestrian Centre. West along Red Lane, turning south along the rear of the Hollings and Wright Engineering sites, a residential property and the telecoms mast up to the boundary of Eddis Transport. The area outside the Green Gap would include the recently permitted B1/B2/B8 development (18/01093/OUT). West (as currently drawn) around the edge of the existing employment site denoted in the Local Plan. These changes would not prejudice the integrity or landscape value of the Green Gap. There is, however, no justification in landscape terms or in relation to habitat connectivity for the adjacent former quarry area, including the previously restored mound to be excluded from the Green Gap. These features are shown in photos 6 & 7 in the Appendix. It is understood that, although the planning history of the quarry is long and complex, there is a condition requiring restoration to a heathland habitat. This landscape/habitat focus supports the inclusion of the site in the Green Gap. The suggested boundary changes would negate some of the concerns about the application of the Green Gap policy. However, the landscape and habitat value of the restored minerals site (when restoration is completed in accordance with the planning conditions), indicate that the landscape led approach to deciding upon what type and extent of development may</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST40 - GREEN GAPS			
			be appropriate to a Green Gap is reasonable and justified. The boundary changes suggested above recognise current and committed employment uses but also consider the intention to secure the restoration of minerals sites to open habitats. The latter uses are entirely appropriate for inclusion in a Green Gap.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST40 - GREEN GAPS			
REF117 Ordsall South	Barton Wilmore on behalf of land owners	<p>Policy ST40 is not justified and should be deleted. There is no need for this in the Local Plan as it is an unnecessary level of policy restriction. The purposes of the Green Gaps are not set out clearly in the draft Local Plan or in the background Green Gap document. Reference is made in the supporting texts to Policy ST40, to "Green Belt" policy and the 2009 Landscape Character Assessment as justification, as well as to ecology, recreation, access, settlement character and separation reasons. The rationale and justification for the Policy is unclear. Noting this, there is also no criteria used for defining specific areas or why Green Gaps 1-8 are justified. The Policy areas selected are therefore unjustified. The document states that Green Gaps do not preclude development (paragraph 8.4.6). Yet Part B introduces strict development control tests that would prevent pretty much most forms of development. Reference is made to demonstrating a 'positive impact on openness'. As the Council is aware, Green Belt policy in NPPF refers to the tests of openness and permanence. It is unclear how the Council envisages a positive impact on openness could be achieved through development? It is unclear what the Green Gaps policy may achieve that would not be achieved by other policies at a national and local level and by good practice. It appears to be an attempt to introduce a Green Belt policy in all but name.</p>	<p>The approach to defining Green Gaps was intended to be broadly based, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Using an existing evidence base (e.g. relevant NCAs and the 2009 Study). - Recognising recent commitments and potential Local Plan allocations. - Taking account of Neighbourhood Plans. - Information from recent site visits. <p>The 2009 assessment remains pertinent in conjunction with the NE National Character Areas. Green Gaps have been defined based on the emerging policy context, recognising existing commitments and emerging allocations for new housing and employment around settlements.</p> <p>The context for Green Gaps is explained in the Local Plan and in the Introduction and Methodology section of the 2019 Report. The exercise was not intended to be a District Wide landscape analysis, a role which has been fulfilled by earlier studies. Rather, it is intended to be a targeted assessment of areas of land around towns and larger villages.</p> <p>There is a clear justification for Green Gap policies, based on planning practice and national guidance. Examples are drawn from Local and Neighbourhood Plans (see Section 3 in the 2019 Addendum report and this report).</p> <p>It is incorrect to state that Green Gaps are a backdoor way of introducing Green Belt into Bassetlaw. The analysis within this and other Green Gap reports is explicit on this point, but a clearer statement that it is not the intention to replicate Green Belt policy will be included in the explanation for Policy ST40.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST40 - GREEN GAPS			
REF177	Axisped on behalf of FCC Environment	<p>Axis previously objected to the inclusion of their site within the Green Gap under Policy 34, Landscape Character. The Council have not prepared a response to these comments within their Summary of comments document. Our representations previously made are still relevant. FCC strongly disagree with the inclusion of their site within the Green Gap. FCC's 8-hectare site is of low landscape value. Whilst, it is acknowledged that Green Gaps do not prevent development from taking place, clearly the subjective policy tests within the emerging policy text would place additional restrictions on the proposed employment uses which would be contrary to the permitted uses on the east of the site. FCC's site is not included within the assessment area of Green Gap 3 (Carlton in Lindrick – Worksop North) set out within the Bassetlaw Green Gaps Report (November 2019). As such, we previously queried whether the inclusion of FCC's site was an error. The Green Gap Addendum Report (October 2020) notes at paragraph 2.6 that a comment concerned the extent of Green Gap 3, between Carlton in Lindrick and Worksop, where it adjoins committed new housing north of Worksop. It is assumed that this relates to FCC's previous comments. The response states: "There are no drafting issues; the comment aims to maximise development by reducing the Green Gap. This is not justified in landscape terms, given the scale of recent/ committed development." The Green Gap Report (November 2019) describes the boundary as running along Red Lane which is located to the north of the site. FCC's site and the land surrounding it has therefore not been assessed as part of this report and as such it is considered unsound to designate this additional land without fully assessing its landscape value. Given that the site was not included within this assessment area and that the Council have granted employment development on part of the site, it is clear that the Council do not consider the landscape in this area to be overly sensitive. Development within the western half of the site would be within the quarry base and as such visual impacts would be less when compared to the existing approved scheme within the east of the site. This Policy has been revised to include additional restrictive policy tests at paragraph B which states that development of undeveloped land and intensification of developed land will only be supported subject to meeting two criteria. The first, B1 states that the development must be essential in that location, and that there are no suitable sites outside of a Green Gap that could meet the needs of the development. FCC strongly object to this sequential based policy criteria, which would require FCC to demonstrate that there were no other suitable sites outside of the Green Gap before their site at Carlton Forest would be considered to accord with policy. FCC's site is undoubtedly appropriate for development, as has been demonstrated by the existing permission. It comprises a sustainable, under-utilised site where development should be encouraged. The second criterion requires a Landscape Statement to be submitted to demonstrate that any proposal will have a positive impact on the openness, character, appearance and functionality of the landscape characteristics of the relevant Green Gap. This is an unnecessary and onerous required to apply to FCC's site given that the site is previously worked for sand extraction and part of the site has planning permission for employment uses. Part of the site has planning permission for employment uses and given that the Council has granted employment development in this area, without the submission of a Landscape Statement, it would appear that the Council do not consider the landscape within this area to be particularly sensitive. The land within the western half of FCC's site is no different in landscape value terms to the part of the site with planning permission. The Council's approach to designating this site as Green Gap clearly contradicts the permission for employment development. As written, it is considered there are significant failings with Policy ST40 given that the policy proposes to designate land as Green Gap without undertaking an assessment of this land. The approach is clearly unjustified and therefore unsound.</p>	<p>The consideration of an appropriate northern boundary of the proposed Peaks Hill Farm (large scale) housing site allocation led to the proposed Green Gap being moved southwards from that originally considered in the 2019 Green Gaps report. This decision recognised the clear landscape connection between the farmland either side of Red Lane. BDC noted that, by including new woodland and open spaces in the design of the new housing, a satisfactory relationship could be created at the same time as providing a clear long term boundary for the Green Gap. However, it is acknowledged that in making those changes, the extent of the existing employment operations off the B6045, at Carlton Forest, south of the junction with Red Lane is not properly recognised by the Green Gap boundary as currently drafted. It is considered that the boundary be redrawn in part using the curtilages of existing buildings, parking and servicing areas, as follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - South from Hundred Acre Lane to the rear of Sherwood Caravan storage, residential properties and the Milton Equestrian Centre. - West along Red Lane, turning south along the rear of the Hollings and Wright Engineering sites, a residential property and the telecoms mast up to the boundary of Elddis Transport. The area outside the Green Gap would include the recently permitted B1/B2/B8 development (18/01093/OUT). - West (as currently drawn) around the edge of the existing employment site denoted in the Local Plan. <p>These changes would not prejudice the integrity or landscape value of the Green Gap.</p> <p>There is, however, no justification in landscapes terms or in relation to habitat connectivity for the adjacent former quarry area, including the previously restored mound to be excluded from the Green Gap. These features are shown in photos 6 & 7 in the Appendix. It is understood that, although the planning history of the quarry is long and complex, there is a condition requiring restoration to a heathland habitat. This landscape/habitat focus supports the inclusion of the site in the Green Gap.</p> <p>The suggested boundary changes would negate some of the concerns about the application of the Green Gap policy. However, the landscape and habitat value of the restored</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST40 - GREEN GAPS			
			<p>minerals site (when restoration is completed in accordance with the planning conditions), indicate that the landscape led approach to deciding upon what type and extent of development may be appropriate to a Green Gap is reasonable and justified. The policy stance is reasonable for land included in a Green Gap.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST40 - GREEN GAPS			
1671323	William Davis	<p>There remain significant objections to Policy ST40: Green Gap in terms of the principle of the policy in relation to GG4 and the supporting evidence used to prepare it. The policy wording requires development of undeveloped land or intensification of developed land (which would cover most development) to only be supported if it is essential and no alternatives exist outside the Green Gap; this would appear to be an attempt to introduce a 'green belt' style policy. It is considered that the purpose of the policy is confused. Part A of the policy refers to areas being designated for their "landscape quality and character of the land" rather than keeping settlements separated; indeed it is noted that no areas elsewhere are being protected for their landscape quality. While the Green Gaps Report Addendum (Oct 2020) refers to examples elsewhere, notably Adur (Policy 14) and Charnwood (CS11), these policies are focussed solely on preventing coalescence rather than the landscape. If this is the aim of the policy it should be reworded to follow the wording used in Adur and Charnwood:</p> <p>Extract from Adur Policy 14: Local green Gaps – "Within these areas any development permitted must be consistent with other policies of this plan, and must not (individually or cumulatively) lead to the coalescence of settlements." Extract from Charnwood Policy CS11: Landscape and Countryside – "We will protect the predominantly open and undeveloped character of Areas of Local Separation unless new development clearly maintains the separation between the built-up areas of these settlements."</p> <p>If Policy ST40 is intended to protect locally valued landscapes as is indicated in Part A of the policy, then it is considered essential that the methodology used to identify areas is based on a robust and recognised methodology. It is noted that the response to our previous comments confirmed that the methodology has not used the Guidelines for Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment Edition 3 (GLVIA3); as such it is considered that the Policy fails to meet the tests of soundness as it is not justified by proportionate evidence. It is also noted that in other Green Gaps (especially GG3: Carlton in Lindrick- Worksop North) the boundary of the designated area has been drawn to take account of the proposed Peak Hills Farm. This does not appear to have been a consideration for GG4 despite the potential for LAA206 to create a more defensible long-term boundary than the current footpath Our original objections remain as follows:</p> <p>Site Allocations: Landscape Study (November 2019):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not a landscape character assessment and does not meet evidence required by the NPPF • lack of methodology • document does not identify the author(s) nor their qualifications • weak descriptions and incorrect statements in the findings table • the Views and Landscape Features map for 14H, do not identify the locations of the photographs making it difficult to locate the viewpoints on the ground. • We are not told what lens or camera is used so the images do not meet GLVIA3 guidance. <p>Green Gap Report (November 2019):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No reference is made to the land around St Anne's Drive or Manor Lodge • Requires boundaries to be clear, long term and defensible but then uses a path in an open field which is not clear, defensible or recognisable other than on a map • The description and assessment at page 26, fails to set out the value of the landscape and simply lists observations and document-based findings and does not analyse, test and score them as required by the GLVIA3 (Box 5.1) • The Notable Views statement does not draw upon nor matches the Landscape Study findings • fails to draw upon all relevant assessments and recommendations especially the 2009 LCA 	<p>There is a clear justification for Green Gap policies in principle, based on planning practice and guidance. Examples can be drawn from Local and Neighbourhood Plans. In relation to this comment, the matter is, therefore not one of principle, but more about policy wording and the validity of Green Gap 4 (Worksop West – Shireoaks and Rhodesia). In terms of the policy wording, it is incorrect to state that Green Gaps are an attempt to introduce a Green Belt style policy. The analysis within this report and the previous Green Gap reports is explicit on this point. However, a clearer statement that it is not the intention to replicate Green Belt policy will be included in the Policy explanation to reinforce this. The policy cross references in the 2019 addendum report concerned the principle of Green Gaps and it was not intended that policies bespoke to other areas should be cut and pasted into Bassetlaw. This comment is, as was the case with earlier comments, overstated. It is not prescribed that GLVIA3 is used in all studies. Indeed, the approach to defining Green Gaps was intended to be broadly based, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use of existing evidence (e.g. the relevant NCAs and the 2009 Study). - Recognising recent commitments and potential Local Plan allocations. - Taking account of Neighbourhood Plans. - Information from recent site visits. <p>With reference to the NPPF, it is not necessary that a landscape which is designated in some way (e.g., as a Green Gap) must be "valued." The extent to which the approach to Green Gaps reflects National Guidance and good practice is, therefore, a matter of opinion. There is no compelling argument that not using a methodology such as GLVIA3 renders the proposed policy unsound. This is a PROW, well used, long established and clearly visible on the ground. There is a connection onto Ashwood Road, and it is signed from the north/south track leading from Manor Lodge Farm to Mansfield Road, as shown in the photos 8 & 9 in the appendix. See above comments on the applicability of GLVIA3. These are in fact detailed in the main 2019 report.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST41 - GREEN AND BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE			
REF003	Canal & River Trust	Welcome the specific reference given to 'Blue Infrastructure' in this section, which would make it clearer to decision makers that this section refers to watercourses and canals as well as other areas of green space. Welcome Policy ST41, which should help to ensure that future development takes account of the unique biodiversity and function of waterway corridors in the district.	Thank you for your comments, your support is welcome.
REF040	Misterton Parish Council	Misterton is bisected by the Chesterfield Canal, so it is an important feature of the village. The Parish Council supports the protection of the Canal for connectivity, biodiversity, and amenity value. The Parish Council agrees with keeping development at a distance from green corridors.	Thank you for your comments, your support is welcome.
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Area Plan	Discussion of both Green (land) and Blue (water) infrastructures together is welcomed accepting the heavy mix of the two in the rural settlements areas.	Thank you for your comments, your support is welcome.
REF146	Elkesley Neighbourhood Plan Group	The garden village could have a significant impact on Elkesley and would appreciate it if there could be some direct consultation with the villagers to help decide how the communities could support each other and not leave Elkesley as a remote satellite village: There are a number of policies and items listed in the Local Plan that support this need: Policy ST41, 6 linking walking and cycling routes, bridleways and public rights of way to and through development, where appropriate;	Consultation will continue with the directly affected parish councils and communities to further ensure the Garden Village and existing communities are mutually supportive of each other such as through Policy ST41 6. Which promotes links via walking/cycling, bridleways and public rights of way to and through new development.
REF201	Severn Trent	Severn Trent are supportive of the approach to incorporate green and blue infrastructure within development. These corridors can provide space for the incorporation of SuDS, facilitating good SuDS design principles. Supportive of the approach outlined within bullet point 9 to protect watercourses, as existing watercourse provide a vital link within the natural water cycle and sustainable outfalls for surface water drainage.	Thank you for your comments, your support is welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST42 - BIODIVERSITY AND GEODIVERSITY			
REF003	Canal & River Trust	The Chesterfield Canal does benefit from a designation as an SSSI within the District. Welcome consideration given towards the protection of SSSI habitats within policy ST42, which should help ensure that consideration is given towards the protection of such habitats. Opportunities exist for new development to provide for net improvements to biodiversity in line with the aims of paragraph 170 (part d) of the NPPF, and believe that part E of policy ST42 could assist in ensuring these aims are met.	Welcome support is noted

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST42 - BIODIVERSITY AND GEODIVERSITY			
REF011	Fred Walter & Son Ltd	<p>Importantly, submitted comments to the last round of consultation in early 2020 and have not received any direct response from the Council. Reviewed the Policies Map (November 2020) and note that there remain proposals to extend the Local Wildlife Site ('LWS') designation, covered by Policy ST42 'Biodiversity and Geodiversity', onto our land. As previously stated, have not been directly consulted about this proposal and, whilst we do not disagree with the general principle of the LWS designation, can find no clear justification or evidence as to why it is deemed necessary to extend it onto our land. Our efforts have included a review of the Sustainability Appraisal (January 2020), where we can find no mention of the proposed extension. It is our view that the proposed extension is somewhat arbitrary given the status of the land it affects. To demonstrate the areas of land referring to; Appendix 1 to this letter shows an extract from the adopted 2011 map adjacent to an extract from the January 2020 draft map and the November 2020 draft map. Have annotated the 2020 extracts to show where our land is affected by the LWS extension. These 'Areas' are ringed in orange and are numbered 1-4. Note that Area 3 has now been removed from the extended LWS area, which we strongly support; however, the remaining Areas are still within the extended LWS.</p> <p>Importantly, none of the areas are considered to have a degree of ecological value that justifies the LWS designation. Some specific comments on each of the Areas (1, 2 and 4) are provided below and overleaf:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area 1 – known as 'Silt Ponds' – this was a silt settling area, which are proposing to return to arable rotation in approximately two years. The nature of the rotation and commercial use of the land means that ecological value is somewhat diminished. • Area 2 – this is a small park and fishing lake in front of my home, which is regularly used by my family. The size of the park and nature of the fishing lake means that we do not see why any significant ecological value has been attributed and why is included in the LWS. • Area 4 – this land is currently in arable rotation and is intensively farmed. The nature of the farming operation means that ecological value is limited. Consider that the extension of the LWS onto the above areas could adversely affect the future commercial productivity of land that forms a valuable part of our farming operation. Appreciate an explanation and a direct discussion with officers regarding the removal of the extended LWS from our land. Respectfully request that the proposed boundaries on the latest November 2020 draft map are amended to remove the additional pieces of land, reinstating the boundaries established by the 2011 map. 	The boundary has been changed to reflect the representation made. Area 1- the area of improved grassland has been removed from the boundary. Areas 2 and 3 - removed. Area 4 - This is a lake and part of 5/3470 Tiln North and Conservation Lake designated for bird interest. It does not include any arable land as shown on OS Master map and recent aerial photos
REF040	Misterton Parish Council	Pages 132-133, sections 8.6.3 and 8.6.6 Would it be helpful to list these designated sites to assist developers in the future?	Those that fall within Bassetlaw are shown on the Policies Map

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST42 - BIODIVERSITY AND GEODIVERSITY			
REF116	id Planning on behalf of Lidl (Great Britain)	<p>The Draft Plan sets out the purpose of Policy ST42 'Biodiversity & Geodiversity' which seeks, amongst other things, to achieve biodiversity net gain that will leave the District's biodiversity assets in a better state than currently exists. The policy seeks to reflect what is still emerging legislation and not law in the draft Environment Bill 2019. It is noted paragraph 8.6.17 acknowledges that it is expected that biodiversity net gain can be achieved through good design of new development with features such as sustainable drainage or tree planting. Criterion E of the policy relates to 'Biodiversity Net Gain' specifically and states: "All new development should make provision for at least 10% new biodiversity gain on site, or where it can be demonstrated that for design reasons this is not practicable, off site through a financial contribution. A commuted sum equivalent to 30 year maintenance will be sought to manage the biodiversity assets in the long term." Support the general thrust of Policy ST42 in seeking to provide protection to designated biodiversity and geodiversity sites and recognise the important role that biodiversity and geodiversity play in delivering sustainable development. Object to criterion (E) of the emerging policy on a number of grounds. Seeks to apply biodiversity net gain of 10% to all new development. This could not only reduce developable area to an extent it affects viability of a site, but could result in a further cost to development also affecting viability, particularly if the site was previously developed land with contamination issues. The added cost providing biodiversity net gain over and above the cost of regenerating a site could well affect delivery of development in the future and indeed could be a factor that would discourage development of more costly sites from coming forward. It is recognised the Draft Environment Bill (2019) proposes the mandatory requirement for net biodiversity gain in development, whilst the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) also references biodiversity net gain, with paragraph 174 noting plans should protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity by pursuing opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity.</p> <p>Current policy in the NPPF (2019) does not necessitate a percentage requirement for net biodiversity gain and therefore the proposal to do so under the emerging Draft Local Plan appears to be at odds with the NPPF in setting such a figure and with no flexibility in recognition of where this may not be unachievable on certain sites. The Draft Plan also sets out that this requirement has been considered as part of the Bassetlaw Whole Plan Viability Assessment, however a review of the Assessment it is unclear where the requirement for 10% net biodiversity gain has been factored into development costs. This is particularly relevant in the context of the concern raised above where redevelopment of previously developed vacant land is marginal in viability terms. The NPPF (2019) requires that local plans are aspirational but 'deliverable' (paragraph 16) and that in order to be 'sound' they are effective and justified, providing an appropriate strategy which is based on proportionate evidence (paragraph 35). It remains unclear whether Policy ST42 is justified or viable and are of the view that it proposes an onerous and arbitrary approach which offers little flexibility for consideration of site characteristics or viability, whereas the provision of an element of net gain would still be in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2019). As policy currently stands in terms of national guidance, are not of the view that Policy ST42 is deliverable, particularly given viability considerations for many new development proposals. Consider reference to a 10% net biodiversity requirement should be removed from Policy ST42 which should be amended to reflect the wording of the NPPF (2019) in order to provide flexibility to ensure that development is deliverable. With the exclusion of the 10%, the wording could still apply to 'all new development' as its aspiration subject to whether such provision if practicable and viable. This would be addressed on a case by case basis. Object to the proposed policy on the basis of the addition in the policy wording to the need for a commuted sum equivalent to 30 years maintenance to manage the biodiversity assets in the long term. This would be a further cost to the developer, raising further viability concerns over new developments coming forward. In the event that a financial contribution is agreed as being necessary for off-site enhancements rather than on site provision, a financial contribution should not be provided incorporating a separate commuted maintenance sum as well. It is not clear how maintenance would be factored in to any off-site contribution and should not be factored in. In those circumstances any off site contribution should be a single one off payment. In addition, if</p>	<p>The Chancellors' 2019 spring statement indicated it will be mandatory for all development in England to deliver a 'Biodiversity Net Gain'. A more recent government statement (23 July 2019) outlines further details about how the Biodiversity Net Gain requirement will be defined, as well as exemptions, protections for 'irreplaceable habitats', and how net gain will be administered.</p> <p>Paragraph: 022 Reference ID: 8-022-20190721 of the PPG: The National Planning Policy Framework encourages net gains for biodiversity to be sought through planning policies and decisions. Biodiversity net gain delivers measurable improvements for biodiversity by creating or enhancing habitats in association with development. Biodiversity net gain can be achieved on-site, off-site or through a combination of on-site and off-site measures. It may help local authorities to meet their duty under Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006.</p> <p>Paragraph: 021 Reference ID: 8-021-20190721: Plans, and particularly those containing strategic policies, can be used to set out a suitable approach to both biodiversity and wider environmental net gain, how it will be achieved, and which areas present the best opportunities to deliver gains. Such areas could include those identified in: natural capital plans; local biodiversity opportunity or ecological network maps; local green infrastructure strategies; strategic flood risk assessments; water cycle studies; air quality management plans; river basin management plans; and strategic protected species licensing areas. Consideration may also be given to local sites including where communities could benefit from improved access to nature.</p> <p>Policy ST42 is in line with the latest update to the forthcoming Environment Bill expected to receive Royal Assent in autumn 2021, which requires development to deliver a mandatory 10% net gain in biodiversity. It is expected that the bill will become legislation before the Local Plan is adopted. However, it is expected that the regime will not be implemented until 2023. The Plan will reflect that position. So that the Local Plan is not out of date Policy ST36 will continue to include the requirement. The policy requirements have been taken into account in the viability assessment but as measures can be incorporated through good design and other Local Plan requirements it is not considered that this will add such a significant cost to development to adversely affect viability.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST42 - BIODIVERSITY AND GEODIVERSITY			
		<p>provision is made on site to address biodiversity net gain, this should not then also include a contribution towards future maintenance. As highlighted at paragraph 8.6.17 of the supporting text, the Council clearly envisage that "In general, it is expected that biodiversity net gain can be achieved through good design of new development.....so their use should not create additional costs to new development". The requirement, in all cases, for a commuted sum equivalent to 30 years maintenance to be provided is not justified, it would add cost to a development and in many cases effectively duplicate on site maintenance carried out by a site owner / developer / landlord or tenant. For example, if the biodiversity net gain was achieved through a 'green roof', that would be maintained in the future by the occupier or owner/landlord of the building. A 30 year maintenance contribution should not be provided. It is often the case that biodiversity enhancements can be achieved through careful selection of planting species within a soft landscape scheme. Maintenance of the landscaping would be carried out by the operator of the site and is an on-going maintenance cost which the occupier or owner of the site would incur in any event. It is not the case that those parts of a site often used to achieve biodiversity enhancement would then be adopted by the Council and the cost of management of that space would fall on the public purse in the same way as would occur for some public open space provision on housing developments that may be adopted by a Council. As drafted, the policy would result in a further development cost added to the overall site development cost and one which would in any event often be duplicated by the site owner in managing the site and maintaining elements such as soft landscaping. A 30 year commuted sum for maintenance is not justified and should be removed from the policy wording. As worded the plan is not positively prepared or justified and therefore is not 'sound'. Suggest the following wording: "All new development should seek to promote opportunities for securing net biodiversity gains preferably on site, or where it can be demonstrated that for design reasons this is not practicable, off site through a financial contribution".</p>	<p>A maintenance contribution is expected to be a requirement through the Environment Bill. This will be carefully managed in accordance with the provisions of the new legislation. But the Council will ensure the necessary measures are put in place to avoid double counting.</p> <p>In light of the above the proposed amendment to the Policy is not considered to be in accordance with national planning guidance.</p>
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Area Plan	Page 136 – Protection of these is welcomed and vitally important to the small rural areas of Bassetlaw.	Welcome support noted
REF153	Natural England	<p>Pleased to note that many of the comments that we made in relation to this topic both within the explanatory text and the policy wording have now been incorporated into this draft. 8.6.3. In this paragraph advise that the distance of the Birklands & Bilhaugh SAC from the boundary of Bassetlaw Borough is approximately 3km. 8.6.7 Support the preparation of the Recreational Impact Assessment which is currently being undertaken which will provide strategic evidence of the potential recreational impact on the Clumber Park SSSI, Birklands & Bilhaugh SAC and the Sherwood NNR. This will provide valuable guidance on how to best to mitigate for any impacts on the sensitive habitats and species within these designations. Whilst we welcome the section on Nature Recovery Networks, suggest that the national approach to the Nature Recovery Network (which was recently launched), stemming from the Government's 25 Year Environment Plan, should be mentioned to put the initiative in context. Here is a link for further information: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nature-recovery-network</p> <p>8.6.16 note that the wording regarding Biodiversity Net Gain has been updated to explain that it is relevant to all development, which is welcome. Policy ST36: Natural England welcomes point 3 of the Policy wording that requires management and mitigation measures to address recreational impacts on Clumber Park SSSI, Birklands & Bilhaugh SAC, and Sherwood Forest ppSPA as identified in the strategic Recreational Impact Assessment (RIA) which is currently being undertaken. Natural England will continue to work with the Council and the RSPB as the RIA proceeds to ensure that, a satisfactory level of evidence is gathered so that appropriate management and mitigation measures can be included into future iterations of the Local Plan and HRA. Pleased to see that mitigation hierarchy is fully set out at point 5 and the connection made to the Nature Recovery Network.</p> <p>Welcome section E on Biodiversity Net Gain and that it will apply to all development.</p>	<p>Comments made in relation to the supporting text and Policy are noted</p> <p>The distance from Birklands & Bilhaugh SAC from the boundary of Bassetlaw has been amended in the text.</p> <p>National approach to the Nature Recovery Network has been added.</p>
REF182	Anglian Water	SUPPORT welcomes the reference to development proposals providing biodiversity net gain having followed the mitigation hierarchy.	Welcome support noted

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST42 - BIODIVERSITY AND GEODIVERSITY			
REF203	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Biodiversity Net Gain Section E States: 'All new development should make provision for at least 10% net biodiversity gain on site, or where it can be demonstrated that for design reasons this is not practicable, off site through a financial contribution. A commuted sum equivalent to 30 years maintenance will be sought to manage the biodiversity assets in the long term'. Welcome the fact that BDC are leading by example by requiring that all new development should make provision for at least 10% net biodiversity gain on site. Wish to see BDC establish an even more ambitious target of 20% in order to deliver greater habitat creation and climate change resilience in the face of a climate and biodiversity crisis. Perhaps developments that intend to provide biodiversity net gain above the minimum requirement could be favoured.	Noted. Current government guidance supports 10% net biodiversity gain. Forthcoming Environment Bill expected to receive Royal Assent in autumn 2021, requires development to deliver a mandatory 10% net gain in biodiversity so the Local plan is consistent with emerging legislation. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment shows that 10% can be achieved but any additionality could not be secured as part of a viable development.
REF211	National Trust	National Trust generally supports policy ST42. In Part 2 of the policy (national designations) there is a drafting error and that the words 'will be refused' should be substituted for 'will be protected'. Welcome the commitment in Part 3 to mitigation for recreational impacts on Clumber Park SSSI, the precise meaning of 'appropriate management, mitigation and monitoring on site' and how this will be monitored and enforced by the Council is somewhat unclear and would welcome further information.	Will be refused is considered to be the correct wording. In relation to Mitigation measures to address recreational impacts on Clumber Park SSSI and Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC, and Sherwood Forest ppSPA more detail is provided in the explanatory text in para. 5.3.19 and 8.6.7. Work on the Recreational Impact Assessment being undertaken in partnership with neighbouring authorities, Natural England, the National Trust and the RSPB is at an advanced stage. It will determine the potential recreational impact of the Bassetlaw Garden Village on the above designated sites individually, and cumulatively with other planned housing development within and outside the District. It will identify any potential management, mitigation and avoidance measures. This will inform policy development.
REF052	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Pages 132-133, sections 8.6.3 and 8.6.6 Would it be helpful to list these designated sites to assist developers in the future?	Those that fall within Bassetlaw are shown on the Policies Map
REF198 Bevercotes	Gladman Developments	Support the amendments to policy ST42 which now aligns with the Government's proposals within the Environment Bill 2019-21 which imposes a mandatory requirement for development to achieve a 10% net gain in biodiversity.	Support noted

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST42 - BIODIVERSITY AND GEODIVERSITY			
REF177	Axis PED Ltd on behalf of FCC Environment	<p>Policy ST42 seeks to protect and enhance the biodiversity and geodiversity of Bassetlaw. Paragraph 4 confirms that proposals have a direct or indirect adverse effect on a Local Wildlife Site (LWS) will only be supported where there are no reasonable alternatives and the case for development clearly outweighs the need to safeguard the ecological value of the site. The Policies Map extract below confirms the majority of the site is designated as a LWS. The full extent of the LWS is shown within the Policies Map extract below. The entire LWS is in the ownership of FCC, however development is not proposed within the central part of the LWS. A Phase 2 Botanical Survey was undertaken in 2017 to support the planning application for employment uses on the east of the site. This confirmed the LWS did just about qualify as the required six acid grassland indicators were recorded across the site, however the LWS is generally of low quality and ecological value. The survey demonstrated that the proposed employment development would not detrimentally affect the overall integrity of the local ecology subject to the imposition of conditions. With regards to the remainder of FCC's site, the survey found that none of the areas within the proposed development area meet the criteria to be designated as an LWS. Development is currently proposed within the area formerly used as a quarry. An aerial image of the site from 2020 is shown below. The aerial image clearly shows that the majority of the western part of the site where future development is proposed is sand with limited vegetation around the periphery of the site. Development could be undertaken without impacting the ecology of the site. Planning permission has already been granted for development within the east of the site and given that the majority of the western part is sand, the site can no longer qualify under the LWS criteria and should therefore be removed from this designation. FCC can offer improvements, as required, to areas of the LWS not proposed to be developed within their wider landholding. The policy wording should also be amended to provide further clarity with regards to 'reasonable alternatives'. It should be the case that if development can come forward without detrimentally impacting the ecological integrity of the site then this should be acceptable without needing to look for reasonable alternatives.</p>	<p>The site being promoted for employment use forms part of the designated Carlton Forest Sandpit Local Wildlife Site. Local Wildlife Sites are part of the Government's overall strategy for biodiversity conservation, and are recognised as having a significant role to play in meeting national biodiversity targets. The NPPF also places emphasis on protecting, restoring and recreating priority habitats, and networks. The protection of LWSs contributes significantly towards this aim. The Local Sites Panel is a technical subgroup made up of local experts. The primary purpose of the Local Sites Panel is to produce criteria for the selection of LWSs in Nottinghamshire. Once agreed, these LWS criteria are applied by the Nottinghamshire Ecological and Geological Data Partnership (NEGDP) who undertake to identify and notify Membership of the Local Sites Panel which consists of a range of organisations including local authorities, nature conservation NGOs, and the private sector. The specific tasks of the Local Sites Panel are to produce draft criteria for the selection of LWSs, in relation to habitats, species groups and geology, for ratification by the NEGDP. Criteria for the selection of LWSs is based on habitats and a species. These criteria are intended to cover the full range and distribution of habitats of nature. It allows for the designation of sites that support rare species, or are threatened. It identifies sites of nature conservation value in a rigorous, and defensible method and which also includes public consultation. The Local Plan identifies the Local Wildlife Sites as submitted by the NEGDP. As such the Council is unable to change a designation. It must be changed by NEGDP following assessment.</p>
1671323	William Davis	<p>It is noted that part E of the Policy in relation to biodiversity net gain has been updated to apply to all development in line with the Environment Bill. In relation to the Viability Appraisal paragraphs 4.25 to 4.29 set out the assumptions on policy costs; these do not make reference to biodiversity net gain and it is unclear what figure has been used. Indeed paragraph 4.27 refers to costs being based on contributions over the preceding five years; these costs would not factor in Biodiversity Net Gain or the proposed management costs.</p>	<p>The assumptions on policy costs are set out in page 8 of the 2019 Whole Plan Viability Assessment. It provides a cost allowance for Site Specific Biodiversity surveys, mitigation and enhancement. It shows that 10% net gain can be achievable as part of a deliverable scheme.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST43 - TREES, WOODLANDS AND HEDGEROWS			
REF060	Notts County Council	Hedgerows isolated from or inaccessible from development frontages should be subject to a management plan where abutting public highway or proposed public highway.	Criterion 4 of Part B of the Policy requires an application to be accompanied by a detailed management plan providing details of maintenance arrangements for trees and hedgerows.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST43 - TREES, WOODLANDS AND HEDGEROWS			
REF068	Ranskill Parish Council	Policy ST43 details how BDC will “protect existing trees, woodland and hedgerows and secure additional planting that increase canopy cover in the interests of biodiversity, amenity and climate change adaptation”. While this is welcomed the reality of the situation is that Bassetlaw District Council fails to enforce existing planning conditions designed to provide such protection. Unless BDC commits to providing the resource to ensure enforcement and prosecution of developers who destroy such habitats this policy is no more than a box ticking exercise.	Policy protects trees, woodland and hedgerows from loss. The Council has the power to take enforcement action where necessary.
REF153	Natural England	Note that at paragraph 8.7.7 of the explanatory text that Policy ST43 sets out the District's contribution to the national tree planting target, however this does not seem to have been included in the policy wording	Bassetlaw's contribution to the national tree planting target has been added to the Policy.
REF211	National Trust	National Trust supports Policy ST43.	Support noted

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST44 - THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT			
REF003	Canal & River	Due to its age, and the presence of historic structures such as locks, bridges and lock houses, and its relationship with past industrial development in Worksop and Retford, the Chesterfield Canal does constitute a heritage asset, which contributes toward the character and setting of the district. Welcome the inclusion of the canal and its associated structures within paragraph 8.8.2, which should make it clear to decision makers that the canal should be considered as a heritage asset. Welcome the general principles of Policy ST37, which should help make the Local Plan effective in meeting the aspirations set out in section 15 of the NPPF.	Support welcome and noted.
REF040	Misterton Parish Council	Page 137, para 8.8.2 With a Grade 1 listed parish church, Misterton Parish Council feels that the bullet points should include and make reference to all the ancient churches in the District.	<i>“numerous grade I & II* listed churches and”</i> added to this paragraph
REF060	Notts County Council	This Policy is very much welcomed and commended for the thorough reach of the policy, including the positive approach to dealing with heritage assets ‘at risk’. Worth considering reference to systematic evidence gathering as part of the monitoring of the historic environment to identify heritage that is ‘at risk’, this is a necessary resource commitment to enable ST44. 7 to be delivered on. It might also be worth including wording that references the ‘celebration and enjoyment’ of the local historic environment, as a natural extension to the positive policy statements of ST44, possibly as part of point 6. Important to include reference to the continued support for, and use of, the Nottinghamshire Historic Environment Record as the appropriate repository of information about the historic environment of the district.	Support welcome and noted. Reference to enjoyment of the historic environment is covered by point 10. Celebration will be added for completeness. Reference to the Historic Environment Record has been highlighted in the supporting and directly in Policy ST44. Covered in paragraph 8.8.11.
REF127	Lincolnshire County Council, Archaeological Planning Advice	Section 8.8 lays out the Council's approach to the Historic Environment, culminating in Policies 44 and 45. This recognises the diverse and important cultural heritage of the District and its contribution to the quality of life, to the character of places/spaces and the important role it plays in community value, culture, identity and well-being. Both policies are consistent with national and local guidance and ensure that the finite archaeological and heritage resources within the District will be conserved/protected in accordance with their significance. It allows for this significance to be assessed appropriately through the planning process and for a regular review of the District's heritage assets to be undertaken (such as conservation area appraisals). It also makes provision for community access and engagement. Both Policies read well, however there is a slight tendency to treat archaeological remains as something different to the historic environment, whereas hope that all heritage assets are seen as a part of a wider continuum, the legacy of which is our historic environment today in its entirety. Welcome the inclusion of this section and policies in the Draft Local Plan.	Support noted. The approach will be clarified to ensure that archaeology is recognised as part of the historic environment not as a different element.
REF211	National Trust	National Trust supports Policy ST44.	Support welcome and noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST44 - THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT			
REF214	Historic England	Paragraph 8.8.3 refers to Cresswell Crags in a landscape context with other heritage assets, but would it be better places in paragraph 8.8.2 where 'the most important aspects' are set out? Suggest that The Dukeries are referred to here for context since these have influenced the landscape including former deer parkland areas and the rural villages and farmsteads. Paragraph 8.8.8 - recommended that the first sentence of this paragraph be deleted or reworded. It is also recommended that any use of 'preserve' is reworded to conserve in line with NPPF terminology. The provisions of strategic Policy ST44: The Historic Environment are welcomed.	The first sentence of para 8.8.8 has been deleted and for consistency with national policy reference will be made to conserve, rather than preserve assets. Paragraph 8.8.2 and 8.8.3 amended appropriately.
REF052	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Page 137, para 8.8.2 With a Grade 1 listed parish church in Misterton, and a Grade 2 listed parish church in West Stockwith, the bullet points should include and make reference to all the ancient churches in the District.	Paragraph 8.8.2 amended
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	In order for applicants, developers and agents to assess proposals correctly, particularly with conservation areas then the Council's Conservation Area Appraisals have to be up to date and correct in their understanding of the historical importance of the area. Conservation Area Appraisals require updating frequently as new developments obviously alter the character and setting, input from agents and the private sector for these appraisals should be encouraged.	Comments noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 45 - HERITAGE ASSETS			
REF060	Notts County Council	Thorough response to the requirements of the NPPF section 16, however it would be appropriate for point D to include reference to the four tests required by NPPF paragraph 195 to justify substantial harm to a designated heritage asset, otherwise this point is likely to provide inadequate weight to the issue.	Reference to national policy is made in paragraph 8.8.8 of the supporting text. For completeness, reference to national policy provisions will be made in part D but it is not considered appropriate or necessary to repeat national policy in the Local Plan.
REF127	Lincolnshire County Council, Archaeological Planning Advice	Section 8.8 lays out the Council's approach to the Historic Environment, culminating in Policies 44 and 45. This recognises the diverse and important cultural heritage of the District and its contribution to the quality of life, to the character of places/spaces and the important role it plays in community value, culture, identity and well-being. Both policies are entirely consistent with national and local guidance and ensure that the finite archaeological and heritage resources within the District will be conserved/protected in accordance with their significance. It allows for this significance to be assessed appropriately through the planning process and for a regular review of the District's heritage assets to be undertaken (such as conservation area appraisals). It also makes provision for community access and engagement. Both Policies read well, however there is a slight tendency to treat archaeological remains as something different to the historic environment, would hope that all heritage assets are seen as a part of a wider continuum, the legacy of which is our historic environment today in its entirety. Welcome the inclusion of this section and policies in the Draft Local Plan.	Support noted. The approach will be clarified to ensure that archaeology is recognised as part of the historic environment not as a different element.
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Plan Area	Care must be taken to protect also the historic areas of Bassetlaw where over time they have lost their physical historical buildings or assets. For example: Scrooby is steeped in historical significance but the buildings (Manor House, etc.) have long since been lost. These areas should be treated in Policy ST45 in the same way as those with remaining physical assets.	These areas are within the Conservation Area, a Scheduled Ancient Monument and in the setting of Listed Buildings so are covered by the contents of these policies. The open space element of the policy, as amended, will also help.
REF211	National Trust	National Trust supports Policy ST45. There may be some minor drafting errors that need to be corrected.	Support welcome. Drafting errors will be addressed

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 45 - HERITAGE ASSETS			
REF214	Historic England	<p>Section B relates to enabling development in respect of heritage at risk. Recommended that this section be removed from the policy since it implies a) that such development will be supported and, b) that such development relates to heritage at risk only. The supporting text makes reference to enabling development and it is suggested that that would be sufficient and that any proposals relating to such development could be dealt with through the general heritage asset policy text. Alternatively, a separate part to the policy could be included after the 'archaeological sites' part. Happy to discuss alternative wording if that approach is taken forward.</p> <p>Section D does not differentiate between exceptional and wholly exceptional circumstances set out in the NPPF. Recommended that this section be reworded to reflect the requirements of the NPPF.</p>	Proposed changes have been reflected in Policy 45.
REF197	Resident	<p>i. Worksop – the Railway Hotel appears to have been excluded from the Worksop Plan area – not sure why – this is a part of the view relating to the listed railway station – other buildings in front of the station do not greatly enhance the "Gateway to Worksop" that the railway station provides. The approach to the town centre from the station along Carlton Road could be considered an important part of the future of the town. ii. Retford – there are two properties that appear to be vacant opposite the railway station – one is referred to in Policy 28 – HS12 – there is the opportunity to take a strategic view of the first thing travellers will see of Retford when leaving the station and possibly enhance the practical aspects of traffic approaching the station and turning around and possibly additional car (for electric)/bike parking spaces etc.</p>	<p>Town centre regeneration and environmental enhancement is a key objective of the Local Plan,</p> <p>Key improvements will involve avoiding conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicular traffic and making improvements to the environment, physical infrastructure within the town centres. These will be identified through the Worksop Central DPD, the Retford Business Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Policies aim to improve the vitality and viability of town centres by supporting redevelopment and diversification of use.</p> <p>This will be helped by the recent changes to the use classes order and making it easier to change the use of commercial buildings to residential.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST46 - PROMOTING HEALTHY, ACTIVE LIFESTYLES			
REF003	Canal & River Trust	<p>Our towpaths provide public access to the Green Infrastructure network, which can promote active lifestyles and benefits to wellbeing. As explained above, the Trust believe that access to our waterways can provide multiple economic, social and environmental benefits to local communities, which has been supported by the findings by our towpath surveys (Kanter TNS, 2017). Welcome the aspirations of the Local Plan, set out in paragraph 9.1.4 to ensure that facilities and infrastructure exist to give everyone the opportunity to live in a healthy place. This would include access to the blue infrastructure network of the Chesterfield Canal. Welcome the consideration in parts B.2. and B.5. of the policy, to increase opportunities for access to leisure facilities and for walking and cycling. Our network can play an important part in ensuring that future (and existing) residents can benefit from access to such facilities, which could assist in promoting healthy lifestyles. Welcome the inclusion of towpaths within part B.5. the policy text, which makes it explicit that our network forms part of the wider network of spaces for active leisure, including walking and cycling. Wish to highlight that significant new developments in the vicinity of the canal network place extra liabilities and burdens upon the waterway infrastructure and it is therefore essential that appropriate contributions are secured from developers, where necessary, in order to mitigate the impact of new development on the Trust's assets. Examples could include the need for towpath improvements to accommodate the needs of new development to prevent excessive erosion of the path, that could otherwise render it impassable to users. Welcome additional reference within the supporting text to the potential need for contributions to support improvements to existing leisure resources to accommodate any future demands.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Developer contributions are detailed in the Local Plan ST60 Delivering Infrastructure. Moving forward, the Council will continue to work collaboratively with the Canal and River Trust on the production of the Developer Contributions SPD.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST46 - PROMOTING HEALTHY, ACTIVE LIFESTYLES			
1656935	Resident	The current leisure centre in Harworth and Bircotes is simply not fit for purpose. A town of this size deserves a facility that should accommodate the growing population, as well as neighbouring villages. Investment is needed to completely regenerate or provide a new facility as the town continues to grow. Infrastructure is needed to provide more cycle friendly routes on the back of the increases in participation seen in cycling throughout 2020.	Thank you for your comments. Infrastructure provision in the Local Plan can only be sought from site allocations. However, relevant Local Plan policies ensure that other development will make the necessary contributions to improving infrastructure in the district, including Harworth & Bircotes. This could include leisure facilities.
1660972	The British Horse Society	Riding, driving and looking after horses have a considerable physical and mental health benefits to equestrians (Favoli and Milton, 2010; Sung et al, 2015), particularly as a high proportion are mature women who would not otherwise have outdoor activity (Church, 2010). Horse riding and carriage driving should be included in the sustainable travel described in the policy along with cycling and walking. The Active travel agenda includes equestrians. Jesse Norman MP, Parliamentary Under – Secretary of State for Transport in a House of Commons debate on Road Safety, 5 November 2018 (1) stated: "We should be clear that the cycling and walking strategy may have that name but is absolutely targeted at vulnerable road users, including horse-riders.....Horse riders are vulnerable road users—there is no doubt about that, and there never has been—and they have been included in the work we are doing." New development plans provide opportunities to improve and extend the bridleway and byway network for enjoyment of equestrians, cyclists and pedestrians. Safe surfaces and dimensions should be provided for and the BHS has detailed guidance on these crucial matters to ensure all users are included and developers meet requirements of the Equality Act 2010 and associated legislation.	Thank you for your comments. Horse riding has been included in section B5 of the Policy and is also referenced by the Local Plan Sustainable Travel policy ST57.
REF068	Ranskill Parish Council	Parish Council members attended the launch of the Plan at the Rural Conference where it was clear that there was a large amount of enthusiasm at Bassetlaw District Council for the proposed Garden Village. While it is recognised that this may be a solution to the increase in housing required in the District it would have been nice to see a similar level of enthusiasm for how the District Council intends to implement policy ST46 to ensure that Bassetlaw's existing rural villages are future proof, green, vibrant, and viable in the long term. The more cynical members of our community view the Garden Village as a vanity project likely to divert money and resources which could be spent elsewhere in the District.	Thank you for your comments. Policy ST46 applies district-wide so would therefore apply to all new development including in the rural area, and Ranskill. The inclusion of a strategic policy about healthy lifestyles will ensure that residents of new development, irrespective of location, are able to have healthy, active lifestyles.
1658674	D2N2	9.1 Healthy and Active Lifestyle para 9.1.6 in agreement that development should be future-proofed. Covid-19 has exposed both the significant potential to drive up productivity through adoption of digital services and the development of digital skills, but also the potential risks of digital exclusion if infrastructure to enable digital working and learning is not in place.	Thank you for your comments, your support is noted.
REF101	East Markham Parish Council	The local cycle network is far from adequate for a number of reasons. It is neither joined up, extensive or maintained. In Retford alone, most of the cycle lanes are taken by residential parking. This endangers cyclists further when having to overtake parked cars. The cycle path from Retford to Markham Moor is far too narrow and poorly maintained. Riding a cycle with a child trailer, three wheeler cycle, or anything wider than a normal cycle is incredibly difficult due to the width of the path available. With a little further civils, paths could be widened to accommodate cyclists and pedestrians safely coexisting. In an age where use of the motor vehicle should be discouraged, practical alternatives should be provisioned. A strong and maintained network of cycle paths, connecting the key residential areas of Blyth, Carlton in Lindrick, Langold, Misterton and Tuxford, to the main three towns of Retford, Worksop and Harworth should be a major priority for any progressive and green strategic plan. 56% of all car trips in England are less than 5 miles and in a relatively flat region, many of these could be converted to cycle journeys, reducing pollution, congestion and improving general health. A stronger cycle network green infrastructure would encourage people to work and live in the area, as many people are moving away from long commutes. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/729521/national-travel-survey-2017.pdf Some disused railways lines and canal paths could be enhanced or repurposed as commuting and leisure routes, improving the lifestyle and health of local people as	Thank you for comments. The Local Plan ensures that new development is supported by appropriate infrastructure, this includes infrastructure for walking/cycling. The Council will continue to work with organisations such as Sustrans to improve cycling and walking networks across the District.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST46 - PROMOTING HEALTHY, ACTIVE LIFESTYLES			
		<p>well as tourism to the area. NCN 647 (National Cycle Network route) is fragmented and not fit for purpose. The route is not direct and has not been invested in. As a result, it takes in some narrow roads that have 60mph speed limits, as well as some unfinished sections of grass/mud track. (e.g. the route from Tuxford to Fledborough). NCN 6 (National Cycle Network route) is a pretty and quiet route for summer recreational riding and hardened mountain bikers, but is not suitable for normal commuter type cycles, in many places it is muddy and not well maintained. The points 3.27 to 3.31 are little more than a reference to the issue with few real proposals. Shifting to transportation methods such as cycling and walking require adequate infrastructure, such as foot paths and cycle paths. Where developments are planned, adequate off street parking must be provisioned, far too much parking on pavements discourages walking and endangers local residents who are often forced to walk in the roads.</p>	
REF146	Elkesley Neighbourhood Plan Group	Policy ST46,5 creating high-quality, inclusive environments that incorporate Active Design that increase opportunities for safe walking, cycling and sustainable movement through a network of well-connected sustainable travel routes, public rights of way	Thank you for your comments, your support is noted.
REF169	Resident	page 144, para C Great idea to require an RHIAM for all schemes of 50+ dwellings.	Thank you for your comments, your support is noted.
REF172	Elkesley Parish Council	Policy ST46,5 creating high-quality, inclusive environments that incorporate Active Design that increase opportunities for safe walking, cycling and sustainable movement through a network of well-connected sustainable travel routes, public rights of way.	Thank you for your comments, your support is noted.
REF058	Sport England	Health Lifestyle and Policy ST46 – supported	Thank you for your comments, your support is noted.
REF189	NHS Bassetlaw CCG	<p>As a healthcare provider and commissioner of services welcome the inclusion of the areas identified in the Healthy Communities section of the plan to optimise healthy living opportunities. The plan refers to “working in partnership with the health authorities to maintain and where practicable improve access to the full range of health services for residents” – it is likely that this extent of development would impact on primary, community and secondary care services. For secondary care this will have an impact particularly on the Bassetlaw Hospital site where we are already seeing increases in urgent and emergency care attendance levels. There is also already an increasing pressure on estates for delivery of primary care services. Encourage the view that we need to collaborate more as local public sector organisations to make best use of our collective estate and promote improved access to appropriate services.</p>	Thank you for your comments. The Council will continue to work with NHS Bassetlaw CCG to ensure that development appropriately contributes to adverse impacts on primary, community and secondary care services.
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	This is an important aspect of all our lives and probably one reason why the population is now living longer and enjoying better health into old age. This policy is a major positive aspect when considering the old colliery site at Bevercotes for residential use as opposed to the residential allocations at Cottam and Apleyhead. Bevercotes scores massively on many fronts but of this particular aspect it is hard to envisage a better location.	Thank you for your comments, your support is noted. Bevercotes Colliery has planning permission for employment use. Significant environmental constraints exist which mean it is considered inappropriate for a residential allocation. Apleyhead is proposed as an employment allocation not residential, and Cottam is earmarked for regeneration after 2037, as a mixed use development.
1671323	William Davis	The clarification that developments of 50 or more units should use the Rapid Health Impact Assessment Matrix is welcomed.	Thank you for your comments, your support is noted.
REF170	A&D Architecture	10) Policy ST46 BS should be modified to safeguard the health and safety of pedestrians against inappropriate cycle speeds on multi-use footway/cycleways as follows: "B 5 "increasing opportunities for walking, cycling and encouraging more sustainable transport choices whilst safeguarding pedestrian users of multi-use footway/cycleways by the incorporation of barriers and other means to calm cyclist speeds."	The technical specification of all new multi-use paths is agreed with the Local Highways Authority. This includes ensuring that the speed is appropriate. This is a detailed matter and will form part of the proposals considered at planning application stage.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST48 - DELIVERING QUALITY, ACCESSIBLE OPEN SPACE			
REF089	Resident	The Spatial Strategy for Retford shows where new housing and employment is to be located but does not show where new parks and extensive tree planting should be located even though they may require planning permission. My suggestion in Retford is for a linear riverside park extending from Ordsall in the south to Kings Park and the town centre and northwards to the Idle Valley Nature Reserve. It would include extensive tree planting as well as paths and cycleway links to adjacent housing areas, schools, the station and the town centre. This would deliver many of the visions and objectives for active travel, healthy life styles, green and blue infrastructure and biodiversity listed in section 4 of the Plan (references listed below). Can this proposal be included in the Local Plan?	New development in Retford will provide for extensive new open space, including a country park and additional open space at Ordsall and new open space at Trinity Farm near Idle Valley which will help provide the north-south green corridor. Both will include tree planting, foot and cyclepaths.
REF173	Resident	Appreciate the re-evaluation of the village in the settlement hierarchy to be separate to that of Worksop; however have a query relating to the Policies Map in relation to the proposed Green Gap at Shireoaks Colliery/Woodlands. Why the colliery pit (excluding open areas fronting Marina Drive) are designated as Green Gap but not 'locally important open space' under the jurisdiction of Policy ST48. They are both. The policy position of a Green Gap here is supported, but wish to ask how this will interrelate in policy with harnessing biodiversity net gain and S106/CIL receipts offset from other development sites. This is after all, not just during the times of COVID, a site that is used by many residents outside of Shireoaks including people of new housing developments locally. The recognition of this site as a locally important open space, as well as a Green Gap, would help target and support the long term future and maintenance of the site as more people increasingly benefit from it.	Areas defined as 'Green Gap' have been designated due to their landscape value and so this differs from an 'open space designation', as they largely refer to their recreational value. The Council's Open Space Assessment is periodically reviewed. The Council will take this comment into consideration and will analyse the space accordingly, to judge whether it merits an open space designation. Biodiversity net gain is covered in Policy ST42 Biodiversity and Geodiversity.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST49 - PROMOTING SPORT AND RECREATION			
REF058	Sport England	A previously advised - the recently completed Playing Pitch strategy will enable an understanding of sports pitch needs across the district and if new development should be provided with new facilities on-site or contribute to the improvement of existing facilities off-site. The Playing Pitch demand calculator can help to understand the demands generated by new development and how it can be met. It is important to keep the PPS up to date with regular reviews to check the action plan and priorities. Does there need to be a similar policy to ST48 for the delivery of sports facilities and playing fields to meet the demands from development. Using the playing pitch demand calculator, Sports facilities calculator and other mechanisms for sports facilities. Based on the evidence in the PPS and Built Sports Facilities Strategy? It is noted that the Hub sites referenced in policy ST49 B1 are indicated on the policies map does this need to be addressed in the policy. Does there need to be a description of what is intended at the HUB sites? What does a hub site mean? Both are Rugby with other sports? Does there also need to be a link to development to secure investment into these sites. Work is underway to develop the Built Sports Facilities Strategy – Will there be a mechanism to feed in contribution requirements from development to meet need as the report is not yet finalised. How will any indications of new, additional or replacement facility requirements be covered particularly if this requires a land allocation.	The Playing Pitch Strategy and Built Facilities Study will be monitored annually and updated when necessary, possibly alongside a review to the Local Plan. Where there is a need to deliver new facilities as part of a development, then this will form part of the site allocation policy and be included within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which is linked to developer contributions.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST49 - PROMOTING SPORT AND RECREATION			
REF139	Resident	<p>On the subject of amenities, at the meeting it was mentioned that the Bassetlaw area sadly lacks a number of the leisure facilities that kids look to do, therefore you have to travel outside the area to allow your children to participate. Talking about things like Climbing walls, roller blading / skating rink, skiing facilities (think Xscape at Castleford), trampoline park etc. Mentioned at the meeting, you have Centre Parcs who have their headquarters in Nottinghamshire. They have the expertise in building and running multi-functional leisure facilities under one roof. Tapping into their knowledge and expertise may be invaluable for the development of the amenities. At the moment the Bassetlaw area uses the school sports hall for out of school badminton, short tennis, table tennis etc. But this is not conducive if parents are not participating in the sport as there is nowhere to sit whilst their child plays the sport. Centre Parcs provide the whole environment under one roof – badminton, short tennis, table tennis, climbing wall, roller rink, cafes and places for parents to sit and watch in a comfortable environment.</p>	Thank you for your comments.
REF194	P&DG on behalf of Woodward Schools (Nottinghamshire)	<p>While there is merit in Policy ST49 including school and college sites in the hierarchy of locations to secure and maintain pitches and sports facilities, have concerns with the soundness of designating Policy ST49 across all of the College and ancillary buildings where they cease to apply for the purpose of the protection of sports pitches. The policy should apply to the pitches themselves, and ancillary facilities that may relate to those pitches, and justified by evidence as to their viable use. If they are not used for such purposes, then they should not be allocated as such in the Local Plan. There is a concern that such a designation is too restrictive and prejudices the flexibility of the rest of the site to be considered for other uses in the future.</p>	<p>The Policy reference has been amended to only include those relevant areas of land and buildings that are associated for sport and recreation. The Policies Map has also been amended to reflect the consented use of the land within the College's ownership.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 50 - PROTECTING AMENITY			
REF071	Minerals and Waste, NCC	<p>Policy 50 seeks to protect private amenity and part b of the policy outlines that for proposals adjacent to 'bad neighbours', which includes incinerators and waste sites, that an applicant will need to show the proposed development does not compromise the neighbouring site and any future occupiers of the new development will not have an unacceptable loss of private amenity. As outlined in Policy WSC10 and its supporting text within the Waste Core Strategy, waste facilities are an important part of our infrastructure and so existing and potential future waste sites need to be safeguarded from other types of development, such as housing, which could restrict the facility and potentially sterilise the site. Policy WSC10 though does not seek to restrict development but to take a flexible approach so to accommodate development. For example, taking consideration of any nearby waste management facilities in a site plan layout, which could include using parking or landscaping as a buffer zone from any existing or potential waste use. As per paragraph 182 of the NPPF, it is the applicant (or agent of change) who should be required to provide suitable mitigation as the existing businesses and facilities should not have unreasonable restrictions placed on them as a result of development permitted after they were established. A reference to the agent of change principle could be included within Policy 50 which would help to safeguard waste facilities and amenity and compliment Policy WCS10.</p>	<p>Policy amended under additional criteria to clarify that where the operation of an existing business or use could have effects on new development the applicant is required to provide suitable mitigation.</p>
REF182	Anglian Water	<p>Supportive of the requirement for new development proposals to demonstrate that they don't have an impact on the on-going use of existing operational sites managed by Anglian Water. This is relevant to our existing water treatment works in the district which are operated on a continuous basis to supply water to our customers.</p>	Support noted

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 50 - PROTECTING AMENITY			
REF170	A&D Architecture	11) Policies 50 and ST53 should be modified to prevent inappropriate development control of the layouts of Park Home static caravan site development proposals. Compliance by Park Home static caravan site operators with model standards published by central government and license conditions imposed by the Council sufficiently safeguard residential amenity inside Park Home static caravan sites. A new sub-section C (Policy 50) and D (policy ST53) should be added as follows: Policy 50: "C In the unique case of Park Home static caravan development proposals the Council will be satisfied that residential amenity inside the Park Home site itself is safeguarded if license conditions imposed by the Council state that the layout shall conform to model standards published by Central Government"	It is considered that Policy 50 as well as other policies in the Plan including design provide sufficient protection to safeguard the residential amenity including that for caravan park development.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 51 - CONTAMINATED AND UNSTABLE LAND			
REF003	Canal & River Trust	Welcome consideration given to the need for development to address land at risk of contamination or being unstable. Development upon contaminated or unstable land in proximity to our waterways could subject them to contamination or structural damage, which could threaten the ability of our network to provide a resource for the local community. Account for these hazards in the Local Policy would help protect our network, and help make the Local Plan more effective in meeting the aims of paragraph 180 from the NPPF.	Reference to likely adverse effect upon the waterways has been included in the Policy.
1664136	The Coal Authority	Support the inclusion of this policy which requires the risks posed by unstable land to be addressed.	Support noted

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST52- REDUCING CARBON EMISSIONS, CLIMATE CHANGE MITIGATION AND ADAPTATION			
REF106	Water Management Consortium	<p>The Boards are primarily concerned with the rate of flow and volume of water to our network of maintained watercourses, therefore the Boards support the preference for sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) and recommends that SUDS are incorporated into all developments where feasible. SUDS should be designed to mimic the pre development 'greenfield' surface water regime and must be agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority. The Boards recommend including in this section that drainage design needs to take into account climate change by allowing for an expected increase in the volume of rainfall, when assessing the storage and conveyance requirements for potential development sites. Bassetlaw District is served by two Internal Drainage Boards. Below is information regarding Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board and Isle of Axholme & North Nottinghamshire Water Level Management Board's operations and responsibilities which may be useful to include as an overview of the Boards' activities.</p> <p>Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board (TVIDB) covers an area of low-lying land from the west of Gainsborough, straddling the River Trent and its tributaries, down to the south of Nottingham, a total of 44,093ha. The Board maintains 778km of watercourse and operates 18 pumping stations to ensure that people are safe, and the risk of flooding is greatly reduced. The Isle of Axholme and North Nottinghamshire Water Level Management Board covers an area of 28,737ha running from the Ouse following the west bank of the Trent moving south west down to Markham Moor. The Board maintains 450km of watercourse and operate 20 pumping stations to ensure that people are safe, and the risk of flooding is greatly reduced. Responsibilities of both Internal Drainage Boards. The Boards have permissive powers under the Land Drainage Act 1991 to exercise general supervision over all matters relating to the drainage of land within the Boards' district. The Boards also have such other powers to perform such other duties as conferred or imposed on internal drainage boards by this act. The Boards' Byelaws and the Land Drainage Act 1991 allow the Board to take action to ensure that the free flow of water is not restricted. Board maintained watercourses are cleaned out annually and it is important that access is preserved for machinery to enable this work to be undertaken. The Boards' Byelaws prevent the erection of any building, structure (whether temporary or permanent) or planting of trees/shrubs etc. within nine metres either side of a Board maintained watercourse. Responsibility for maintaining all other watercourses generally falls upon the riparian owner(s) unless it is a main river, which is the responsibility of the Environment Agency.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The requirement for drainage design to take into account climate change by allowing for an expected increase in the volume of rainfall has been added to part 3 of the policy criteria.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST52- REDUCING CARBON EMISSIONS, CLIMATE CHANGE MITIGATION AND ADAPTATION			
REF116	id Planning, Lidl (Great Britain)	<p>Policy ST52 sets out a range of criteria seeking to ensure that consideration is given to how new developments will reduce carbon emissions, and mitigate against and adapt to the impacts of climate change through design by demonstrating they have considered a number of broad aspects. Recognises the need to ensure development is sustainable and adaptable and therefore supports the general thrust of Policy ST52 which accords with the aspirations of the NPPF (2019) in meeting the challenges of climate change. Welcomes amendments made to the previous wording of the policy (was Policy ST45) and criterion (d) which required that all commercial developments made provision for at least 25% of their available spaces for visitor and commercial parking to be fully fitted with electric charging points. This requirement has been removed from the policy wording in the latest Draft Plan. In this context Policy ST52 no longer requires a specific percentage (%) to be provided but that all new developments include the provision for electric charging capability, including the provision for electric vehicle charging infrastructure on new developments (criterion 1(d)). This ensures the matter is given consideration and some provision is made. Lidl include EV charging space provision on all their new development sites and therefore support the principle of what the policy seeks to achieve. However still has concerns with regard to what is now criterion (c) within part (1) of Policy ST52 (formerly criterion 1[f] of Policy ST45). The policy still seeks as follows:</p> <p>1. (c) Requiring non-residential development of 1,000sqm or more to meet BREEAM very good-excellent standards....</p> <p>Criterion (1)(f) of Policy ST52 continues to provide little flexibility in the application of BREEAM and the potential to adopt other measures demonstrating that sustainable development can be achieved. For example, a number of new office and employment buildings are often designed to be EPC 'A' rated. That and other measures are available in the construction sector to ensure that sustainable buildings are constructed. BREEAM provides an arbitrary checklist approach which is not always successful in achieving a sustainable development outcome and which can sometimes inadvertently set unachievable standards for development sites of varying characteristics. For example, sites with little in the way of existing ecology or indeed a site which was cleared for a variety of reasons prior to development being promoted, may be unable to score points associated with an area such as ecological mitigation and subsequently cannot meet the required BREEAM standards. As highlighted above there are other measures that can be used to ensure a sustainable building is constructed with the climate change agenda taken into account. Consider Policy ST52 (1)(c) is too prescriptive in its mandatory requirement for BREEAM without consideration of any possible sustainable design alternatives such as EPC ratings or other design measures which equally will secure sustainable design and development. The policy does not provide any flexibility in criterion (1)(c) for scenarios where delivery of BREEAM or other sustainable design standards are not viable. The policy does not go far enough to ensure that development is deliverable under its application. Requests that greater flexibility is incorporated into Policy SP52 to allow for consideration of other alternative sustainable design measures to be provided by development and to ensure that the plan is successful in allowing development to be deliverable. As previously, we suggest that criterion (1)(c) is amended as below: "Requiring non-residential development of 1,000sqm or more to meet BREEAM very good-excellent standards or equivalent". The proposed amendments to Policy SP52 criteria (1)(c) would ensure consistency with the NPPF (2019) by adopting a sustainable but deliverable approach (paragraph 16) which is effective (paragraph 35) in ensuring the delivery of development.</p>	Policy ST52 1(c) has been amended to include "or equivalent" after BREEAM very good-excellent standards to take into account any update or change in legislation through the Plan period.
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Area Plan	Page 157, Para 2. B), i. - 5 trees per new dwelling built is welcomed	Thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST52- REDUCING CARBON EMISSIONS, CLIMATE CHANGE MITIGATION AND ADAPTATION			
REF142	Retford Branch Labour Party	<p>The Plan does not appear to make a firm requirement that all future developments over a certain number MUST be of dwellings that of the highest standards of environmentally friendly construction and are designed to make full use of low carbon energy sources. If the UK Govt is serious about Carbon neutral targets, then our houses for future generations must be constructed and fitted out in such a way. Being Carbon Neutral is the future and this is a Local Plan for the Future.</p> <p>Section 14 of the NPPF 2019 (p 44) advises this: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change148.</p> <p>"The planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate, taking full account of flood risk and coastal change. It should help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience; encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings; and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure." The NPPF goes on to say - To help increase the use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy and heat, plans should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) provide a positive strategy for energy from these sources, that maximises the potential for suitable development, while ensuring that adverse impacts are addressed satisfactorily (including cumulative landscape and visual impacts). b) consider identifying suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy sources, and supporting infrastructure, where this would help secure their development; and c) identify opportunities for development to draw its energy supply from decentralised, renewable, or low carbon energy supply systems and for co-locating potential heat customers and suppliers Local planning authorities should support community-led initiatives for renewable and low carbon energy, including developments outside areas identified in local plans or other strategic policies that are being taken forward through neighbourhood planning. The only known about low carbon energy is that it gets cheaper and cheaper each years. New analysis from Bloomberg New Energy Finance suggests that from 2022, the cost of electric cars will start to drop below that of internal combustion engine (ICE) vehicles. Government policy commits us to a low emission vehicle future, but the local plan fails to address provision of EV charging at domestic or community level. Another example is solar power. The material cost of a solar array on a new home is less than £2,000 (with costs falling by 20% each year). Solar presents a limited cost difference to developers but can reduce a domestic electricity bill by up to 50% and over 25 years - reducing energy poverty and carbon emissions across the District. The lowest cost time to install solar is on new homes is when they are being built as labour and scaffolding are provided. The Plan must be ready for these technologies. Even if we debate whether low carbon measures are good investments today, we know they will be valuable in the life of the Plan. The Plan must force developers, looking to save a few quid today, to at least look at new technology and present evidence of their merit to planners. Suggested changes to the plan request the following alterations: - Bassetlaw District Council explicitly recognise in the Plan that "low carbon technologies including solar, heat pumps and electric vehicles are expected to proliferate during the life of this Plan and the Council shall take all reasonable measures in planning and standards to ensure these technologies are available to all local resident - Although we recognise that the Council may not be able to mandate low carbon technology all homes, in accordance with NPPF Section 14 they can request that: - In planning applications, developers must provide evidence of their consideration of installing the decarbonised heat, EV charging and solar panel on their homes. This must include their analysis of the marginal costs of installing the technology .Our contract with Veolia for recycling evokes feelings of frustration and disdain amongst residents. The lack of viable recycling for residents is evidenced by Bassetlaw having some of the lowest recycling rates in the country. Houses in multiple occupation presently have poor or no recycling facilities. Residents at the Mill Bridge Close Development in Retford have raised concerns for a number of years that no recycling is provided. The Veolia contract has failed to provide meaningful recycling with inadequate or unclear information given to residents. Recently just one recycling bin for the development of over 40 houses was provided and not clearly identified for recycling. The Veolia contract has failed Bassetlaw. 	<p>Policy ST52 and Policy ST53 are intrinsically linked to the most up to date Government standards and guidance on renewable energy, energy standards and on mitigating and adapting to climate change. The Plan supports the use of appropriate low carbon and renewable technologies within developments. There is a cross-over between what planning policy can deliver and the required building control standards. The Local Plan proposes a transition towards low carbon technology and renewable energy generation through the inclusion of government standards, but also by allocating a large site for those uses at the Former High Marnham Power Station site. New larger developments such as the Bassetlaw Garden Village is proposing higher than usual urban design standards that take into account of the latest sustainable planning principles, at the time of construction. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates the type of measures that can be accommodated within the District as part of a viable scheme. The Plan also requires new developments to provide the necessary connection infrastructure so all properties have the capability of charging an electric vehicle. Waste recycling and their standards are dealt with by Nottinghamshire County Council and via their Minerals and Waste Local Plan.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST52- REDUCING CARBON EMISSIONS, CLIMATE CHANGE MITIGATION AND ADAPTATION			
		The Local Plan makes little mention of recycling provision. It must set targets and/or aspirations for recycling which we can hold our present and future suppliers to.	
REF153	Natural England	Welcome this paragraph which explains that tree planting should be carried out and managed in a coordinated way to complement and positively contribute to the Nature Recovery Network. Would emphasise that tree planting projects should consider the "right trees in the right places", i.e. that appropriate native tree species need to be selected that enhance existing habitats. Pleased to note that integrated water management has been mentioned in this paragraph and draw attention to the guidance recently issued by CIRIA (link above). Natural England welcomes point 2f which aims to mitigate against the impacts of Climate Change by reducing the impact of climate change on biodiversity and the natural environment by providing space for habitats and species to move through the landscape and for the operation of natural processes. Add that Nature-Based Solutions would be some of the most beneficial methods to achieve energy efficiency and climate change adaptation, for example shade from street trees can deliver cooling and surface water management; green walls can contribute to temperature control. Suggest that all opportunities should be taken to encourage natural techniques over traditional hard engineering/infrastructure solutions (i.e. greening the grey).	References to native trees have been added to the supporting text and Policy ST52. References to urban greening methods have been added to the supporting text and policy ST52. This will include issues like nature based solutions and green walls and roofs. A reference to 'natural based solutions' has been included within the supporting text to Policy ST52.
REF175	Resident	Hopefully all the new estates will have the necessary infrastructure to enable the charging of electric vehicles and alternative fuel/smart technologies which is not mentioned in the Ordsall South policy. People will need to be able to charge their low emission vehicles in the evenings and off-peak times which will be cheaper and more convenient.	Where appropriate, all new development (residential and commercial) will be required to provide the necessary infrastructure to support the use of electric vehicle charging through Policy ST52.
REF182	Anglian Water	Policy ST52 refers to developments being required to minimise water consumption by meeting the optional requirement of 110 litres/per person/per day. Anglian Water, the Environment Agency and Natural England has issued advice to local planning authorities (copy attached) stating that there is evidence to demonstrate a need for optional water efficiency standard to be applied in the Anglian Water supply area. Fully support the inclusion of this standard in the policy. Opportunities for a more holistic and integrated approach to water management should form part of the plan, to encourage multi-functional water management assets which support other community objectives. This approach combines different elements of water management (e.g. combining SuDS with a water re-use system to both manage runoff and provide an alternative non-potable water supply) together with town planning and design (e.g. integrating the planted SuDS features throughout a development to contribute to 'greener' streetscapes). Fully support the reference made to development proposals using integrated water management to manage (surface water) run off and provide a non- potable water supply as this will help to reduce demand on existing water supply.	Thank you for your comments.
REF197	Resident	There is little mention of bringing existing housing stock up to the standards outlined – e.g. insulation, solar power, permeable driveways etc – incentives and support to promote awareness etc of UK government funding etc may be beneficial. Does there need to be a bolder approach with charging points in public car parks – the more charging available the more the fear of electric may subside. Should there be initiatives to promote the use of smaller cars in town centres (e.g. differential parking charges, special car parks for smaller cars etc) – rather than trying to promote multi-passenger journeys - every year the cars seem to get bigger taking up more space on the roads and in the car parks. There does not appear to be anything about plastic use, deposits on bottles, aluminium cans etc etc. Many items which are defined as "widely recyclable" are not accepted in the blue bin recycling scheme at the moment – will there be a wider inclusion in the future? Water efficiency – is there a need for some joined-up actions? – on the one hand, Bassetlaw is at risk of drought, on the other, it is at risk of flooding. Would a reservoir or two be the answer?	The Local Plan supports the appropriate use of renewable energy technologies on new and within existing developments. Existing properties will need to adapt and reduce their carbon emissions if the UK is to achieve its overall ambition to reduce carbon emissions to net zero. Proposals for all renewable energy schemes large or small will be considered alongside relevant national and local planning policies. Water efficiency is covered by Policy ST52.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST52- REDUCING CARBON EMISSIONS, CLIMATE CHANGE MITIGATION AND ADAPTATION			
REF201	Severn Trent	Severn Trent are supportive of the principles outlined within Policy ST52 to incorporate: • water efficiency measures within development that meet with the 110 l/h/d or BREEAM for non residential development; • Green spaces and infrastructure to mitigate the impacts of climate change; • Surface water management systems that help to mitigate increases in flood risk. Would recommend highlighting these approaches both strategically so that they will be applied to all development not just the allocation, but also detailed within specific development policies to ensure that developers are aware of the need to meet these requirements.	Thank you for your comments.
REF211	National Trust	National Trust supports Policy ST52.	Thank you for your comments.
1670869	Resident	it is disappointing to see that Para A under this policy uses the word 'considers' - as a society, nation and district we must be more ambitious than this, and require all and any new developments to minimise carbon foot print, mitigate for and adapt to climate change...	The word 'consider' has been replaced with 'demonstrate'.
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	This is to be welcomed and should be a major consideration when sites for major development are considered such as Cottam and Apleyhead allocations. Vehicles and Electric Charging Points This is to be welcomed but government directives and market forces are already changing the type of private vehicles on our roads. In 2020 total car registrations to date and in operation are:- 903,961 petrol engine cars 261,772 diesel engine cars 357,126 hybrid engine cars 108,205 fully electric cars Within the above new car registrations were:- 58,494 petrol engine cars 15,813 diesel engine cars 36,461 hybrid engine cars 21,914 fully electric cars The above figures are from the SMMT website and it is clear that the percentage of electric and hybrid cars purchased, registered and used is now over 43% of total car sales for the year 2020. This fact in itself is a clear indication that the reliance upon the motor vehicle in the future will not be looked on as unsustainable. Pollution from the private car will be a thing of the past and zero carbon vehicles will become the norm. More and more electricity is being generated in sustainable ways. All new homes now are to be fitted with charging points or at least the infrastructure to accommodate one, charging points are becoming easier and less costly to install and electric vehicles are becoming more affordable, user friendly and so much better designed. This move forward by others will mean local authorities should be able to consider better locations for us all to live as opposed to directing us to existing towns or sites adjacent to major highways and railways and adjacent to working power stations with all the associated pylons, cables, transformers etc.	Thank you for your comments. The requirement to provide infrastructure to enable connectivity for electric vehicles is identified by Policy ST52.
REF208	P&DG on behalf of Welbeck Estate	Suggest that for all of the above policies consideration must be given throughout the policy wording to the specific conditions and limitations presented within rural Bassetlaw to deliver the means of the policy requirements via conventional means. Heritage and landscape constraints are just two of the potential reasons. It is suggested that all three policies must be written subject to the proof that they can be viably and practically delivered in the specific context of the proposals concerned. There must be an ability in the policy wording for the applicant to demonstrate if such conditions are unsuitable to deliver the policy aspirations (in part or full).	Policy ST52 requires that applicants demonstrate that they have considered the criteria in the policy. Therefore should the applicant consider that the provisions of the policy are not practical or economically viable an alternative approach can be considered. This would include for heritage or landscape reasons.
REF198 Bevercotes	Gladman Developments	Support the principles set out in the above policies and highlight the benefits regeneration of Bevercotes Colliery as a circular economy, green enterprise zone could deliver within Bassetlaw. Further information is provided within the Vision Document at Appendix 1. Furthermore, the historic colliery use of the site presents an opportunity to restore economic value to the area alongside provision of a scheme which provides renewable and low carbon energy creation benefitting both the site and the wider area. Indeed, the proposed scheme will create a circular economy where all applicable forms of renewable energy will be utilised on site while delivering a wider, green economy and infrastructure supporting sustainable modes of travel.	Thank you for your comments. Bevercotes Colliery has planning permission for employment development. Proposals consistent with that permission will be acceptable.
1671323	William Davis	The policy is broadly supported. Policy 1 d requires that all new developments make provision for electric charging capability with paragraph 10.1.12 setting out that this means providing the ability to connect charging infrastructure in the future. This approach is supported as it will allow residents to choose the charging equipment which suits their vehicle.	Thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST53 - RENEWABLE AND LOW CARBON ENERGY GENERATION			
REF040	Misterton Parish Council	With its interest in 'green' issues, Misterton Parish Council feels that there should be an imperative for developers to use solar roof tiles, or solar panels at the very least. And that buildings should be orientated so that they maximise the opportunity to use solar power.	The use of renewable energy technology within new buildings or the retrofitting of existing buildings will be supported where it complies with other relevant planning policies. The Local Plan also supports the development of appropriate community renewable energy schemes.
REF146	Elkesley Neighbourhood Plan Group	Under Policy ST53 is there the potential to use solar panels as sound barriers alongside Elkesley and other communities that run alongside the A1 – as is often seen in European countries.	The use of renewable energy technology will be supported where it complies with other relevant policies within local and national planning policy.
REF172	Elkesley Parish Council	Under Policy ST53 we would like to see the potential to use solar panels as sound barriers alongside Elkesley and other communities that run alongside the A1 utilised as is often seen in European countries	The use of renewable energy technology will be supported where it complies with other relevant policies within local and national planning policy.
REF211	National Trust	National Trust supports Policy ST53.	Thank you for your comments.
REF024	Resident	With regards to West Burton surely the best solution would be a desulphurisation plant that burns household waste to generate electricity. This would stop a percentage of waste going to landfill, be good for the environment, keep people in work and keep the site in use to generate electricity for which it was built for.	Thank you for your comments.
REF044	Resident	Could the District / County become a carbon neutral, 0 immersions area by Committing to some creative solutions to reduce our carbon footprint? 'Yes We Can' by taking charge of our energy needs for now and in the future. A better use of the site would be to create Renewable energy generation and energy storage. Wind – low profile wind turbines Qr6 Vertical axis wind turbines and Vortex bladeless wind energy. Bio mass, Geothermal,Hydroelectric power including tidal energy generation in the Trent and other rivers in the district by using new types of Water rotor turbines designed to work on slow moving currents and shallow water. Energy Storage – Battery systems similar to the 49mw energy storage at West Burton only bigger. Creating 'Trent Valley energy generation' or Bassetlaw Renewables. Local Sustainable Micro Energy Generation. incorporating former and current power station. High Marnham Coal Fired Power Station, Cottam Coal fired Power station, and when it closes West Burton coal fired Power Station. When they were first built this part of the Trent was known as 'Megawatt valley' With its build in infrastructure each site has the capacity to continue to supply the grid, the local community and Bassetlaw as it has done for the last 50 years. At the same time Bassetlaw becomes the champion of renewable energy with a realistic carbon neutral target and becoming self-sufficient in energy, future proofing the districts energy needs. It has been predicted our energy demands will triple over the next 50 years. By going into joint ventures with like minded enlightened partners, and with the local community figuratively and literally buying into the project our district could realistically achieve its ambition, in line with government targets, of 0 emissions in a very sort time.	Planning will play its part in helping the Country become net zero by 2050. The Local Plan allocates a Green Energy Hub at the former High Marnham Power Station. This site has the opportunity to produce renewable energy and provide a circular economy for businesses on the site and beyond. In addition, new development is encouraged to incorporate appropriate renewable energy technologies within schemes to reduce carbon emissions and create a more sustainable development. This includes the use of more sustainable construction materials and the reduction of water use.
REF052	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	With my interest in 'green' issues, I feel that there should be an imperative for developers to use solar roof tiles, or solar panels at the very least. And that buildings should be orientated so that they maximise the opportunity to use solar power.	The use of renewable energy technology within new buildings or the retrofitting of existing buildings will be supported where it complies with other relevant planning policies. The Local Plan also supports the development of appropriate community renewable energy schemes. In addition, developers are encouraged to use sustainable and low carbon construction materials within the developments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST53 - RENEWABLE AND LOW CARBON ENERGY GENERATION			
REF162	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Seems to me everyone's looking at the housing side to this local plan, when we get more housing it will create more household waste. So could we please look at the West Burton power station site maybe to work with the energy producers and have a state of the art waste incinerator put on the site. Advantages are incinerating general waste, production of electricity directly into the national grid. Direct rail and road links already in place. Creating energy from household waste produced in Bassetlaw. Creating jobs for local residents. This is one way to invest in Bassetlaw for the future. It's a site fit for purpose.	The site has not been considered within this Local Plan as it is not considered available for development. However, if the site becomes available in the future, then this can be considered for regeneration within a review of this Local Plan.
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	This is a very technical area and it is hoped that the Council has experts that can guide and assist and of course consider proposals brought forward. Within Bassetlaw we have examples of wind and solar energy generation, together with at least 2 AD Plants, these latter 2 operations utilising energy crops and also vegetable and fruit waste, products that would otherwise either not be grown or sent to landfill.	Thank you for your comments.
REF224	Sheffield City Region	The Draft Plan sets out ambitious proposals for growth in both housing and employment for Bassetlaw which will complement those of South Yorkshire. In particular, the MCA and LEP welcome the Draft Plan's emphasis on new and developing opportunities such as renewable energies and low carbon technologies, reflecting themes in the new South Yorkshire SEP. Proposals for a new Garden Village in the Draft Plan as well as the Renewable Energy Hub are also supported. These are exactly the type of innovation needed to help close the divide between north and south and level up our areas.	Support for the spatial strategy and the emphasis on developing renewable energies and low carbon technologies, including at the Garden Village are welcome.
REF208	P&DG on behalf of Welbeck Estate	P&DG suggest that for all of the above policies consideration must be given throughout the policy wording to the specific conditions and limitations presented within rural Bassetlaw to deliver the means of the policy requirements via conventional means. Heritage and landscape constraints are just two of the potential reasons. It is suggested that all three policies must be written subject to the proof that they can be viably and practically delivered in the specific context of the proposals concerned. There must be an ability in the policy wording for the applicant to demonstrate if such conditions are unsuitable to deliver the policy aspirations (in part or full).	Any proposal for renewable energy technology will be subject to other relevant planning policies but the Plan does not require renewable energy to be provided as part of new development. Point 3 ensures adverse impacts including for heritage or landscape reasons should be taken into account.
REF198 Bevercotes	Gladman Developments	Support the principles set out in the above policies and highlight the benefits regeneration of Bevercotes Colliery as a circular economy, green enterprise zone could deliver within Bassetlaw. Further information is provided within the Vision Document at Appendix 1. Furthermore, the historic colliery use of the site presents an opportunity to restore economic value to the area alongside provision of a scheme which provides renewable and low carbon energy creation benefitting both the site and the wider area. Indeed, the proposed scheme will create a circular economy where all applicable forms of renewable energy will be utilised on site while delivering a wider, green economy and infrastructure supporting sustainable modes of travel.	Thank you for your comments.
REF170	A&D Architecture	Policies 50 and ST53 should be modified to prevent inappropriate development control of the layouts of Park Home static caravan site development proposals. Compliance by Park Home static caravan site operators with model standards published by central government and license conditions imposed by the Council sufficiently safeguard residential amenity inside Park Home static caravan sites. A new subsection C (Policy 50) and D (policy ST53) should be added as follows: Policy ST53: "D In the unique case of Park Home static caravan development proposals the Council will be satisfied that residential amenity inside the Park Home site itself is safeguarded if license conditions imposed by the Council state that the layout shall conform to model standards published by Central Government".	It is considered that Policy 50 as well as other policies in the Plan including design provide sufficient protection to safeguard the residential amenity including that for caravan park development.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST54 - FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE		<p>live in East Markham and I grew up here as a child.</p> <p>I am dismayed at the state of property and infrastructure development in our village. During 2020 we have had:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • raw sewage flowing across multiple streets (Askham Road, High Street, Low Street). This is caused by inadequate combined sewage and highway drainage which fail several times per year • raw sewage erupting in multiple private gardens, by forcing up residential manhole covers in Low Street • persistent foul drain smells around High Street/ Askham Road. This is caused by pumping raw sewage up from Markham Moor into the combined sewage and highway drainage pipes • repeated flooding of business premises on Askham Road – three times year to date • immediate sewage/ drainage problems being reported with new build homes on High Street (the Pinfold Development) • the ongoing closure of Priestgate, meaning that Askham Road and Beckland Hill represent the only 2-way vehicular access to the village • extensive building works on Askham Road causing traffic chaos and safety issues opposite the primary school • extensive building works on Beckland Hill causing gridlock on this street. Gridlock was previously unheard of in our village • blocking of pavements/ destruction of grass verges and road surface on Farm Lane and Church Street caused by construction vehicles seeking off street parking • innumerate blocked drains (Lincoln Road, Church Street, York Street, Beckland Hill) caused by the extensive building work in the village and absence of proper clearance by Bassetlaw/ Notts CC/ Severn Trent • repeated road closures across the village – Church Street, Farm Lane, Beckland Hill, Hall Lane • residential properties flooding in Great Lane and Low Street • residential gardens flooding – Great Lane, Low Street, Lincoln Road, Beckland Hill • standing water on multiple roads- High Street, York Street, Great Lane <p>About 100 additional houses are under construction/ have planning consent. We do not even know how much they will worsen the already fragile situation. Our community cannot understand why more and more residential consents continue to be granted when so much is going wrong in this village already. Bassetlaw is giving no effective consideration as to what the cumulative effect of all this construction work is. Put frankly, our roads, drains and sewers cannot cope. Concreting over green spaces and placing ever more demands on the inadequate drainage system is a recipe for disaster.</p> <p>Bassetlaw's action on increasing the housing stock and inaction regarding the inadequate infrastructure is directly worsening all of the above. I ask that no further building consents are granted until the above matters are properly attended to.</p>	<p>The prevention of flooding is an important issue. Where development contributes towards the risk of flooding or drainage issues within communities across Bassetlaw. However, the Bassetlaw Local Plan doesn't allocated development sites within East Markham so there are no localised policy recommendations for the village. Where there is a flooding or drainage issue, developments will be subject to National Planning Policy requirements and those identified within Local Plan Policy ST54.</p> <p>Within East Markham, if a flood risk or drainage issue is identified, then planning applications will be subject to consultation with statutory stakeholders such as the Environment Agency. These stakeholders will, if relevant, will provide a detailed response to the District Council. These will then be considered along with other responses during the decision making stage of the process.</p>
REF018	Resident		
1671182 submission inc. pictures	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>Thank you for your unstinting efforts in compiling this Local Plan, and seeking the comments of residents and interested bodies. I write here about S54, and the evidences used to support it.</p> <p>ST54 All development proposals are required to consider and, where necessary, address the effect of the proposed development on flood risk, on-site and off-site, commensurate with the scale and impact of the development. Proposals, including change of use applications, must be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment (where appropriate), to demonstrate that the development, including the access, will be safe, without increasing or exacerbating flood risk elsewhere and where possible will reduce flood risk overall;</p> <p>The Plan is further informed by</p> <p>Bassetlaw Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Progress Update 1</p> <p>In the update on the Bassetlaw Strategic Flood Risk Assessment November 2020, JBA Consultants define various Levels of Flood Risk Assessment. Five of the six Retford developments identified in the Plan table</p>	<p>The Local Plan has prepared several Flood Risk Assessments that identify current flooding issues and recommendations for proposed planning policy or any allocated site that is identified within an area at risk from flooding. However, the Local Plan can only deal with the implications/issues that arise from its proposed growth and any identified locations it seeks to allocate. Where development does, or is likely to have, an impact on flooding or drainage, then Policy recommendations are included within the relevant areas – including Retford.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST54 - FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE		<p>(2-1) are seen to require a Level 2 Assessment. This is detailed here – Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment</p> <p>Since 2018, new information on flooding and flood risk has become available and the District was affected by severe flooding in November 2019. The flooding particularly affected Worksop, Retford, Shireoaks and Rhodesia. The County Council flood investigations for these Retford locations are available here.</p> <p>New river models are now available for the River Idle at Retford (Environment Agency) and Retford Beck (Bassetlaw District Council).</p> <p>The Environment Agency are currently updating the model of the River Ryton in Worksop which should be available in early 2021. JBA Consulting are currently preparing a Level 2 SFRA for the relevant sites identified n Table 2-1.</p> <p>The Level 2 SFRA assessment of sites will assess variations in flood risk across the proposed site allocations, identifying site-specific Flood Risk Assessment requirements and helping guide local policies to ensure sustainable development as well as seeking opportunities through new development to reduce flood risk to existing communities. The Level 2 SFRA will also include a broad scale assessment of suitable Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) options, providing an indication of where there may be constraints to certain sets of SuDS techniques. Sites have been identified as requiring Level 2 SFRA where they are located in the Environment Agency's Flood Zones, adjacent to an Ordinary Watercourse and/or have significant surface water flood risk.</p> <p>The Level 2 SFRA will provide further information to Bassetlaw District Council about the nature of the flood risk to each site and the degree of mitigation and drainage work that would be needed to ensure that the development was safe to occupy and would not increase flood risk elsewhere. Where residential sites are proposed in Flood Zone 3 it will provide the evidence needed to inform the Exception Test. It will enable the District Council to make a decision regarding which sites, or parts of sites are at the greatest risk of flooding and what, if any, mitigation is required to support their development. This will then inform the emerging planning policy for the site or area and the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Level 2 Assessments will be available in early 2021.</p> <p>The note finishes with - What developers should do for now? And says this:</p> <p>For any sites coming through in the interim period, developers should refer to Section 10, 11 and 13 of the Level 1 SFRA. They should contact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The Environment Agency to obtain the latest modelling for the River Idle in Retford if the site is likely to be affected by it; •Bassetlaw District Council to obtain the latest modelling for the Retford Beck in Retford if the site is likely to be affected by it. The models should be used to inform the site-specific Flood Risk Assessments. <p>In the meanwhile, Darrel Road and particularly Blackstope Lane areas of Retford flood relatively regularly, and there's sometimes a requirement for those residents to leave their homes, and always a requirement to repair and renew after each episode. The Environment Agency will provide emergency on-site pumps to alleviate some of the problems, but in certain areas flood water and sewage become mixed. Large areas of the Retford Town Centre are sometimes just a few inches away from a severe (2007 type) flood.</p> <p>The NCC Report paper (11 pages Section19 Appendix D) identified the following responsibilities in connection with the Nov 2019 flood and follow up actions –</p> <p>Environment Agency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a).The Environment Agency carries out maintenance, improvement or construction work on main rivers (Retford Beck) to manage flood risk. b).They have a duty as a Category one responder under the Civil Contingencies Act. This means they must have plans in place to respond to emergencies and control or reduce the impact of an emergency. <p>Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Internal Drainage Boards are independent public bodies responsible for managing water levels in low- 	<p>The Environment Agency, drainage boards and the Lead Flood Authority – Nottinghamshire County Council are responsible for more strategic flooding issues and wider flood prevention measures.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST54 - FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE		<p>lying areas. They are the land drainage authority within their districts and their functions include supervising land drainage and flood defence works on ordinary watercourses (Carr Dyke).</p> <p>b)They hold the powers in Section 25 Land Drainage Act 1991 to require works to maintain a proper flow of water in ordinary watercourses in internal drainage district.</p> <p>So here we are today, 14 months on from November 2019, and these were the promised actions, the Report said this -The Environment Agency will</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Continue to progress the proposals for improvements to the Retford Beck and endeavour to secure funding for a flood risk management scheme. b) Review their Communications and Engagement Plan, including pro-active communications with the community to help them better understand risk management authority responsibilities, maintenance activities and mitigation taking place in the area. c) Review current Environment Agency maintenance schedules. d) Review screen design at Grove Lane. e) Complete bathymetric survey on the River Idle to inform future maintenance. <p>And: The Internal Drainage Board will be reviewing ways of improving the operation of the Carr Dyke and its interaction with the River Idle to reduce the risk of future flooding. These pictures from the NCC report.</p> <p>Unfortunately there is still no strategic plan for Retford to ensure that the Idle levels remain at such a height that will allow the Retford Beck and Carr Dyke to discharge naturally and quickly into the Idle. Only local pumps or strategic mitigation will resolve these flood issues, which are now happening on a frequent basis. In the current Plan it doesn't clearly state what I (and many West Ward residents who have contacted me) believe must happen –all new builds identified in the Local Plan should take place with a significant financial contribution specifically for improvements to the Idle watercourse around Retford, because every one of those new builds will add to the already 'full after rain' River Idle.</p> <p>Various strategies are identified in some other worthy evidence in support of ST54, including clear advice from NPPF and others about how to mitigate rising water levels, our Plan needs to clearly state that these steps WILL be taken and paid for by future development, because Worksop Town Centre, Retford Town Centre and numerous locations elsewhere across the District will be regularly flooded by the time the plan comes to completion – we must plan now to work on the Idle and its tributaries for what will be in 20 years time.</p> <p>The Evidence document and map showing the watercourses across Retford illustrate the problem well, in conjunction with the maps provided within the NCC report. Both the minor waterways (the Beck and Carr Dyke) are naturally in low lying areas, and if the outlet (the Idle) is higher than the drain, back filling will occur and no 'flow' can take place. Unless both of these drains have pumped outlets in times of stress, the flood threat will remain. There remains another alternative involving the permitted flooding of historic floodplains – this too would work over large sections of the Idle Valley. In particular the area close to the Ordsall South plan, where several lakes form on a regular basis, and also the very low quality semi flooded land around Blackstope and Bracken Lane which contributes to the perennial Beck problems. Lakes by design at all these locations will ensure the building of new houses will not adversely affect the eco-system. It will also enhance ST46 Healthy Lifestyles if these lake perimeters are used for footpath and cycle routes where appropriate, and of course ST41 the Green/Blue balance will be well served by the creation of wetland type environments. Another lengthy Retford section of Idle valley between the river and Bolham Lane would also give the land back to nature if it was to be sensitively flooded and a Wetland/lake created. It is not possible to build on that land, and the current state of most of it is deplorable. A large managed lake close to Retford Town centre would be an enormous wellbeing and tourist asset.</p> <p>All this can take place in accordance with Environment Agency and NPPF guidelines as referenced in Evidence to the Plan, and should be included and routinely applied to any further new builds</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST54 - FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE		<p>developments consisting of 10 or more dwellings.</p> <p>These strategies are detailed in the guidelines – extracts here:</p> <p>All new development close to rivers should consider the opportunity presented to improve and enhance the river environment. Developments should look at opportunities for river restoration and enhancement as part of the development. Options include backwater creation, de-silting, in channel habitat enhancement and removal of structures. When designed properly, such measures can have benefits such as reducing the costs of maintaining hard engineering structures, reducing flood risk, improving water quality and increasing biodiversity. Social benefits are also gained by increasing green space and access to the river.</p> <p>FLOOD STORAGE. Flood storage schemes aim to reduce the flows passed downriver to mitigate downstream flooding. Development increases the impermeable area within a catchment, creating additional and faster runoff into watercourses. Flood storage schemes aim to detain this additional runoff, releasing it downstream at a slower rate, to avoid any increase in flood depths and/or frequency downstream.</p> <p>Methods to provide these schemes include: enlarging the river channel; raising the riverbanks; and/or constructing flood banks set back from the river.</p> <p>The construction of new upstream storage schemes as part of upstream catchment-based approaches within Bassetlaw district would provide one potential strategic solution to flood risk. Watercourses which are rural in their upper reaches but have high levels of flood risk to urban areas in the downstream reaches are potential candidates, as the open land in the upper reaches can potentially provide the space for an attenuation area, providing benefit to the urban area downstream.</p> <p>CATCHMENT AND FLOODPLAIN RESTORATION. Compared to flood defences and flood storage, floodplain restoration represents the most sustainable form of strategic flood risk solution, by allowing watercourses to return to a more naturalised state, and by creating space for naturally functioning floodplains working with natural processes. Although the restoration of floodplain is difficult in previously developed areas where development cannot be rolled back, the following measures should be adopted:</p> <p>Promoting existing and future brownfield sites that are adjacent to watercourses to naturalise banks as much as possible. Buffer areas around watercourses provide an opportunity to restore parts of the floodplain.</p> <p>Removal of redundant structures to reconnect the watercourse and the floodplain. There are a number of culverted sections of watercourse located throughout the district which if returned to a more natural state would potentially reduce flood risk to the local area.</p> <p>The Plan needs to be revised to show that all of these options are suitable for Bassetlaw, and all developments (of 10 or more dwellings) as they reach 25% of target will have to make a financial contribution to a dedicated Bassetlaw Strategic Flood Resilience fund.</p> <p>I submit this in my capacity as a Bassetlaw District Councillor for West Ward Retford, having listened to the views and comments of Ward residents.</p>	
REF101	East Markham Parish Council	<p>Under item A. New point suggest #4.</p> <p>That new developments should refer to local parish councils for consultation relating to local concerns and historic flooding or drainage problems.</p> <p>In areas where existing drainage systems are old or inadequate, especially where sewage and rainwater share the same pipework, that new developments are only sanctioned where additional or enlarged drainage systems are provided by the developer and/or waste-water company. E.g. Severn Trent.</p>	<p>Parish Councils are already a consultee for planning applications within their areas. In addition, where a flooding or drainage constraint is identified through a proposed development, then the relevant flooding and water authorities are also subject to consultation.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST54 - FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE			
REF106	Water Management Consortium	<p>The Boards are primarily concerned with the rate of flow and volume of water to our network of maintained watercourses, therefore the Boards support the preference for sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) and recommends that SUDS are incorporated into all developments where feasible. SUDS should be designed to mimic the pre development 'greenfield' surface water regime and must be agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority.</p> <p>The Boards recommend including in this section that drainage design needs to take into account climate change by allowing for an expected increase in the volume of rainfall, when assessing the storage and conveyance requirements for potential development sites.</p> <p>Bassetlaw District Council is served by two Internal Drainage Boards. Below is information regarding Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board and Isle of Axholme & North Nottinghamshire Water Level Management Board's operations and responsibilities which may be useful to include as an overview of the Boards' activities.</p> <p>Overview of Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board</p> <p>Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board (TVIDB) covers an area of low-lying land from the west of Gainsborough, straddling the River Trent and its tributaries, down to the south of Nottingham, a total of 44,093ha. The Board maintains 778km of watercourse and operates 18 pumping stations to ensure that people are safe, and the risk of flooding is greatly reduced.</p> <p>Overview of Isle of Axholme and North Nottinghamshire Water Level Management Board</p> <p>The Isle of Axholme and North Nottinghamshire Water Level Management Board covers an area of 28,737ha running from the Ouse following the west bank of the Trent moving south west down to Markham Moor. The Board maintains 450km of watercourse and operate 20 pumping stations to ensure that people are safe, and the risk of flooding is greatly reduced.</p> <p>Responsibilities of both Internal Drainage Boards</p> <p>The Boards have permissive powers under the Land Drainage Act 1991 to exercise general supervision over all matters relating to the drainage of land within the Boards' district. The Boards also have such other powers to perform such other duties as conferred or imposed on internal drainage boards by this act. The Boards' Byelaws and the Land Drainage Act 1991 allow the Board to take action to ensure that the free flow of water is not restricted.</p> <p>Board maintained watercourses are cleaned out annually and it is important that access is preserved for machinery to enable this work to be undertaken. The Boards' Byelaws prevent the erection of any building, structure (whether temporary or permanent) or planting of trees/shrubs etc. within nine metres either side of a Board maintained watercourse. Responsibility for maintaining all other watercourses generally falls upon the riparian owner(s) unless it is a main river, which is the responsibility of the Environment Agency.</p> <p>Consent will be required from the Board to undertake works such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Works in, over, under or within nine metres of any Board maintained watercourse. • Installation of a culvert, weir or other like obstruction within any watercourse. • Any works that increase the flow of surface water or treated foul effluent to any watercourse within the Board's district. <p>The Boards' also respond to planning development consultations whereby advice is provided regarding surface water drainage and potential impacts up on the Boards' drainage network.</p> <p>In many areas TVIDB's and the Isle of Axholme and North Nottinghamshire Water Level Management Board's catchments extends beyond the district boundary, therefore future development outside of the Board's boundary may require the Board's consent prior to increasing the flow or volume of water into the Board's district.</p>	<p>The Council will continue to work with flooding and water authorities and other stakeholders throughout the preparation of the Local Plan. Thank you for providing additional details for the two local drainage boards.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST54 - FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE			
REF142	Retford Branch Labour Party	<p>The Retford Labour Party Branch is extremely concerned about Flood prevention and protection in the Plan. It is a matter of when not if a major flood event will hit our town and dwellings and businesses in places such as the Retford Beck, the Carr Dyke and several other town centre areas already see serious flood challenges. Bassetlaw has one of the UK's leading water management companies within the District - ACE in Rampton. We have the expertise to address issues, but do not have the measures in place right now.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) recommends that:</p> <p>"Strategic policies should be informed by a strategic flood risk assessment and should manage flood risk from all sources. They should consider cumulative impacts in, or affecting, local areas susceptible to flooding, and take account of advice from the Environment Agency and other relevant flood risk management authorities, such as lead local flood authorities and internal drainage boards."</p> <p>The Plan sets out some 'wish lists' for Flood Management in the Town (and District) without actually presenting any options, costs or implications for either New Build or existing homes. This is unsatisfactory given what the District has experienced so regularly since 2007. Fiddling around the edges should not be part of a 'Strategic' Plan for Bassetlaw – we and future generations deserve better.</p> <p>The NPPF document clearly references "cumulative effects...local areas susceptible to flooding". We expect much more than what is currently written. We need to radically and rigorously devise and plan for extensive flood plain creations on the Idle, in accordance with Environment Agency best advice.</p> <p>Suggested changes to the plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A strategic assessment of flood prevention including specific assessment of the following measures: ○ Assessment and identification of new flood plains. Excluding housing development in these areas ○ Refurbishment or improvement of existing flooding measures e.g., dykes and pumping stations. ● No housing development on any flood plains ● Protection from development of all areas critical for flood protection 	<p>The Local Plan has prepared several Flood Risk Assessments that identify current flooding issues and recommendations for proposed planning policy or any allocated site that is identified within an area at risk from flooding. However, the Local Plan can only deal with the implications/issues that arise from its proposed growth and any identified locations it seeks to allocate. Where development does, or is likely to have, an impact on flooding or drainage, then Policy recommendations are included within the relevant areas – including Retford.</p> <p>The Environment Agency, drainage boards and the Lead Flood Authority – Nottinghamshire County Council are responsible for more strategic flooding issues and wider flood prevention measures.</p>
REF153	Natural England	<p>Natural England notes that in 10.3.11 of the explanatory text that the potential for wetlands to be developed with associated habitat improvement and returning watercourses to a more natural state is recognised as being an important part of natural flood management, which is welcome.</p> <p>We also welcome point B6 which intends to maximise environmental gain through enhancing the green infrastructure network and securing biodiversity gain.</p>	<p>Noted. Thank you for your comment.</p>
REF182	Anglian Water	<p>POLICY ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage (page 162) - SUPPORT</p> <p>We support the requirement to use Sustainable Drainage Systems and that surface water discharge to the public sewerage network should be prevented wherever possible. This is consistent with the surface water hierarchy and would help to ensure that new development does not increase the risk of surface water and sewer flooding.</p>	<p>Noted. Thank you for your comment.</p>
REF201	Severn Trent	<p>Severn Trent are supportive of the approach to include a policy within the plan to specifically highlight the need to manage flood risk and drainage such that development does not result in an increase in flood risk, and properties are protected from flooding.</p>	<p>Noted. Thank you for your comment.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST54 - FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE			
REF211	National Trust	<p>National Trust generally supports Policy ST54. However, we consider that it could be more aspirational by stating explicit support for appropriate flood betterment schemes, such as de-culverting, urban greening and use of areas in the countryside to receive flood water.</p> <p>Part 2 of the policy requires 'major' developments to contribute positively to reductions in flood risk. We suggest that for developments of any scale, appropriate measures to reduce flood risk should also weigh positively in the planning balance.</p>	<p>Reference to urban greening measures has been added to Policy ST54.</p> <p>'Major' has been removed and replaced with 'Developments' (where appropriate).....</p>
1669241	Resident	<p>We support the wording of the policy ST54 and note the necessary requirements imposed upon developers within flood risk areas. However, any application submissions of developers in respect of locations of identified flood risk yet capable of mitigation and in-principle acceptable to the local planning authority, need to be matched by the appropriate and timely responses of the Lead Local Flood Authority and other stakeholder agencies.</p> <p>Our clients have land interests adjoining Retford town centre at Moorgate and have a longstanding commercial/leisure scheme capable of generating local employment which awaits further flood modelling inputs to be undertaken by the Environment Agency to confirm acceptability of the scheme. To date they have been waiting for nearly two years for this response. There are other sites in and around Retford in sequentially appropriate locations with development potential subject to agreeing flood mitigation measures that are being held back as a result of incomplete or delayed modelling work by the respective agencies. We would expect that at the time of examination of this local plan, the Council will be able to assure the Inspector that the flood risk assessment works are fully completed and robust to inform appropriate development opportunities across the District in general and Retford in particular.</p>	<p>The preparation of the Local Plan and associated flooding/drainage policies and evidence base has been subject to consultation with all statutory flooding and water authorities. The Council are also continuously working with flood and water authorities and stakeholders through Duty to Cooperate and other more specific issues related to the Local Plan and its proposed development.</p>
1670869	Resident	<p>10.3 et al.</p> <p>The NPPF is clear that development should be avoided in areas of flood risk. the sequential tests are intended for locations where this is impossible, only, and this does not apply to Bassetlaw as a whole. As such for this District, land in a flood zone should not be proposed for development, especially housing, in this plan (ST7 and ST9) Para 10.3.5). (even with 'supposed' mitigation plans). This is not a 'get out clause' for Authorities or developers to build on land at risk of flooding, now or in the future. Furthermore - given the changes to overall national flood risk, we should expect the NPPF, and associated guidance to be further strengthened in respect of flood risk</p>	<p>National Planning Policy sets parameters for Local Plans in terms of Policy and identifying potential land for development. National Planning Policy makes it clear that development should be sited away from areas of flood risk where possible. Where development is identified within a flood risk area, a flood risk assessment should be undertaken to mitigate any onsite or offsite impacts.</p> <p>The Local Plan has prepared a District-wide Flood Risk Assessment to identify the flooding risks across Bassetlaw either through fluvial flooding or surface water flooding. This also looks at the future implications of Climate Change.</p> <p>Where the Local Plan has allocated sites within an area at risk of flooding, a more detailed flood risk assessment has been prepared to identify what mitigation requirements are needed for the site to be suitable through its design and layout. This could include both onsite and offsite measures. Any policy recommendations or mitigation measures for sites are subject to consultation with the Environment Agency and other water bodies.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST54 - FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE			
REF125	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>I am aware I have already commented on the draft plan however I missed something out which has come to my immediate attention due to the pending weather conditions. I cannot believe I forgot to include it having worked on this issue since 2019 floods devastated large areas of my ward.</p> <p>I have been working with the environment agency to look at the possibility of building a flood defence system near The Beck and Blackstope lane area.</p> <p>Having loooked at the plan again before sending this email I cannot see a robust strategy for flood mitigation for Retford. This will would need a whole systems approach using the expertise of all the agencies involved with water, drainage, rivers NCC and environment agency</p> <p>I would like to see more robust detail of the current situation, forward planning for the 30 years of the plan and beyond.</p>	<p>The Local Plan has prepared several Flood Risk Assessments that identify current flooding issues and recommendations for proposed planning policy or any allocated site that is identified within an area at risk from flooding. However, the Local Plan can only deal with the implications/issues that arise from its proposed growth and any identified locations it seeks to allocate. Where development does, or is likely to have, an impact on flooding or drainage, then Policy recommendations are included within the relevant areas – including Retford.</p> <p>The Environment Agency, drainage boards and the Lead Flood Authority – Nottinghamshire County Council are responsible for more strategic flooding issues and wider flood prevention measures.</p>
1671475	Resident	<p>Any future development in Retford should take into consideration the areas which regularly flood ie Blackstope Lane, Grove Lane, Trent Street and Darrel Road. A Flood Alleviation Plan should take priority before any development is authorised. The implementation of such a plan would ensure that current residents are safeguarded from the effects of flooding on their homes. It would also advise on areas which are suitable for development and discount those which are either prone to flooding, or would put other properties at risk of flooding. The Flood Alleviation Scheme has been long overdue and should be fundamental to all other decisions on development.</p>	<p>National Planning Policy sets parameters for Local Plans in terms of Policy and identifying potential land for development. National Planning Policy makes it clear that development should be stirred away from areas of flood risk where possible. Where development is identified within a flood risk area, a flood risk assessment should be undertaken to mitigate any onsite or offsite impacts.</p> <p>The Local Plan has prepared a District-wide Flood Risk Assessment to identify the flooding risks across Bassetlaw either through fluvial flooding or surface water flooding. This also looks at the future implications of Climate Change.</p> <p>Where the Local Plan has allocated sites within an area at risk of flooding, a more detailed flood risk assessment has been prepared to identify what mitigation requirements are needed for the site to be suitable through its design and layout. This could include both onsite and offsite measures. Any policy recommendations or mitigation measures for sites are subject to consultation with the Environment Agency and other water bodies.</p>
REF176	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>Much of Bassetlaw has seen increased flooding over the years and in light of climate change, this is likely to get worse. It is encouraging that flood risks and mitigation is frequently referred to throughout the plan. A joined up approach with the Environment Agency and NCC (as the lead flood authority) to tackle these problems would be welcomed (it is appreciated that BDC take flooding very seriously).</p>	<p>Noted. Thank you for your comment.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST54 - FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE			
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	<p>Policy ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage</p> <p>Flooding is a very emotive issue and generates many different faceted arguments.</p> <p>The idea of water being allowed to flood onto agricultural land in times of heavy rainfall is quite understandable particularly along the Idle Valley and there are continual reminders that this used to be an annual event before river defences were constructed. However, it is not without its problems. Long term flooding of land releases vast quantities of nitrous oxide into the atmosphere due to the breakdown of nitrogen in water logged soils. This gas is one of the more harmful greenhouse gases and probably the most difficult to recapture and exclude.</p> <p>A clear understanding of the effects of flooding on farmland needs to be undertaken. Land that can remain underwater is preferable to land that dries out, gets worked again, fertilised and cropped. These areas to be lost to agriculture could be identified now following discussions and cooperation with landowners, internal and local drainage boards, the Environment Agency and local authorities including the Lead Local Flood Authority.</p>	<p>The Council has prepared a detailed Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (Level 2) for those sites that are subject to either fluvial flooding or surface water flooding. The assessment identifies the risk type and provides recommendations for policy and the individual sites through design and drainage mechanisms. This assessment and the revised Local Plan Policy will be subject to consultation during Summer 2021.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST55 - PROTECTING WATER QUALITY AND MANAGEMENT			
REF106	Water Management Consortium	<p>The Boards are primarily concerned with the rate of flow and volume of water to our network of maintained watercourses, therefore the Boards support the preference for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) and recommends that SuDS are incorporated into all developments where feasible. SuDS should be designed to mimic the pre development 'greenfield' surface water regime and must be agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority. Recommend including in this section that drainage design needs to take into account climate change by allowing for an expected increase in the volume of rainfall, when assessing the storage and conveyance requirements for potential development sites.</p> <p>Bassetlaw is served by two Internal Drainage Boards. Below is information regarding Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board and Isle of Axholme & North Nottinghamshire Water Level Management Board's operations and responsibilities which may be useful to include as an overview of the Boards' activities.</p> <p>Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board (TVIDB) covers an area of low-lying land from the west of Gainsborough, straddling the River Trent and its tributaries, down to the south of Nottingham, a total of 44,093ha. The Board maintains 778km of watercourse and operates 18 pumping stations to ensure that people are safe, and the risk of flooding is greatly reduced. The Isle of Axholme and North Nottinghamshire Water Level Management Board covers an area of 28,737ha running from the Ouse following the west bank of the Trent moving south west down to Markham Moor. The Board maintains 450km of watercourse and operate 20 pumping stations to ensure that people are safe, and the risk of flooding is greatly reduced.</p> <p>The Boards have permissive powers under the Land Drainage Act 1991 to exercise general supervision over all matters relating to the drainage of land within the Boards' district. The Boards also have other powers to perform other duties as conferred or imposed on internal drainage boards by this act. The Boards' Byelaws and the Land Drainage Act 1991 allow the Board to take action to ensure that the free flow of water is not restricted. Board maintained watercourses are cleaned out annually and it is important that access is preserved for machinery to enable this work to be undertaken. The Boards' Byelaws prevent the erection of any building, structure (whether temporary or permanent) or planting of trees/shrubs etc. within nine metres either side of a Board maintained watercourse. Responsibility for maintaining all other watercourses generally falls upon the riparian owner(s) unless it is a main river, which is the responsibility of the Environment Agency. Consent will be required from the Board to undertake works such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Works in, over, under or within nine metres of any Board maintained watercourse. • Installation of a culvert, weir or other like obstruction within any watercourse. • Any works that increase the flow of surface water or treated foul effluent to any watercourse within the Board's district. <p>In many areas the Boards catchments extends beyond the district boundary, therefore future development outside of the Board's boundary may require the Board's consent prior to increasing the flow or volume of water into the Board's district.</p>	<p>The role of the Internal Drainage Boards has been noted. Reference has been added to the text of the need for developers to consult with them. Criterion 3 has been added to section C of the Policy to require drainage design to take into account climate change by allowing for an expected increase in the volume of rainfall.</p>
REF182	Anglian Water	<p>Anglian Water is supportive of the requirements in relation to safeguarding potable water sources from the potential risk of pollution arising from new development proposals. Welcome the requirement for all development proposals to demonstrate that appropriate water supply infrastructure is available or can be made available in time to serve the development. Opportunities for a more holistic and integrated approach to water management should form part of the plan, to encourage multi-functional water management assets which support other community objectives. This approach combines different elements of water management (e.g. combining SuDS with a water re-use system to both manage runoff and provide an alternative non-potable water supply) together with town planning and design (e.g. integrating the planted SuDS features throughout a development to contribute to 'greener' streetscapes). Fully support the reference made to development proposals incorporating water re-use measures wherever possible to reduce demand on existing water supply.</p>	Support for policy is noted

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST55 - PROTECTING WATER QUALITY AND MANAGEMENT			
REF201	Severn Trent	<p>Supportive of the principles outlined within Section 10.4 to protect water quality, large parts of Bassetlaw are underlain by aquifers covered by Source Protection Zones. These zones are designed to protect the groundwater from contamination. It is important that these zones are protected from development. Severn Trent adopts a strict “no development” policy in SPZ1 areas (i.e. land within an SPZ 1 owned by Severn Trent is subject to strict control measures on land use. Strongly advise the Council adopts similar principals for the Site in the areas overlying the SPZ 1 (e.g. the restriction of these areas to green parks, etc.). No SUDS infiltration should be allowed in SPZ 1 areas. Advise that the limitations are extended to SPZ 2 areas as well. However, if this is not possible, then strongly advise that developers are required to adopt suitable control measures and best industry practice when locating and designing SUDS in the SPZ 2 areas. A suitable train of treatment should be implemented where infiltration SUDS are designed in SPZ 2. Where development is located within SPZ3 it is recommended that the EA pollution prevention guidance is followed to ensure that development does not result in contamination of water. Especially where infiltration SuDS are proposed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HS1 – Peaks Hill Farm – SPZ 3 • HS2 – Former Bassetlaw Pupil Referral Centre – SPZ 3 • HS3 – Radford Street – SPZ 3 • HS4 – Manton Primary School Site – SPZ 3 • HS5 – Talbot Street – SPZ 3 • HS6 – Former Knitwear Factory – SPZ3 • HS7 – Trinity Farm – SPZ 3 • HS8 – Milner Croft – SPZ 3 • HS9 – Former Elizabethan School – SPZ 3 • HS10 – St Michaels View – SPZ 3 • HS11 – Fairygrove – partially in SPZ 3 • HS12 – Station Road – SPZ 3 however SPZ 2 of non-STW GW abstraction site located approximately 0.3 km to the south-west. • HS13 – Ordsall South – SPZ 3 • NP04 – Ollerton Road – Not in SPZ • Garden Village – SPZ 3 • EM001 – Shireoaks Common – SPZ 3 • EM002 – Symmetry Park – SPZ 3 • EM003 – Explore Steetley – SPZ 3 (GIS polygon missing, best estimate of location used) • EM004 – Welbeck Colliery – SPZ 3 • EM005 – Carlton Forest – SPZ 3 (GIS polygon missing, best estimate of location used) • EM006 – Trinity Farm – SPZ 3 • EM007 – Snape Lane – SPZ 3 • EM008 – High Marnham – Not in SPZ • SEM01 – Apleyhead Junction – SPZ 3 • Cottam Power Station – Not in SPZ 	Reference in the Policy and the supporting text to the importance of Source Protection zones, and the need for developers to consult with water and sewage undertakers reflects Severn Trent’s comments and is considered adequate.
REF211	National Trust	Supports Policy ST55. There appears to be a drafting error in part B that needs to be corrected, i.e. ‘any risk to the Sherwood Sandstone Aquifer... will be protected mitigated’.	Support noted. The typo will be amended.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST56 - TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPROVEMENT			
1656935	Resident	Are there no plans to bring rail lines back to Harworth and Bircotes? We sit right in the centre of a large geographical circle that would largely benefit from having a rail link, yet nearest stations are all 20 minutes away. Presumably there is still some infrastructure remaining from the previous rail line that could be restored?	There are no plans to bring a rail service back to Harworth Bircotes within the Local Plan.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST56 - TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPROVEMENT			
1660972	The British Horse Society	Horse riders are legally permitted to use only 22% of traffic-free public rights of way; carriage-drivers only 5%. Increasing pressure for development of houses and industry is making even fewer of those bridleways and byways available. Traffic increases with new development or change of use so roads become even less safe for riders and carriage-drivers (equestrians) to use to access any traffic-free routes there may be. Between 28 February 2019 and 29 Feb 2020 80 horses were killed on the road and one rider died (BHS, 2020). Riders are also increasingly excluded from verges by creation of foot-cycleways – segregated provision for other vulnerable non-motorised users but equestrians are excluded and forced into the carriageway. The Active travel agenda includes equestrians. Jesse Norman MP, Parliamentary Under – Secretary of State for Transport in a House of Commons debate on Road Safety, 5 November 2018 (1) stated: "We should be clear that the cycling and walking strategy may have that name but is absolutely targeted at vulnerable road users, including horse-riders.....Horse riders are vulnerable road users—there is no doubt about that, and there never has been—and they have been included in the work we are doing."	Where opportunities exist, support will be given to the improvement of and the creation of new bridleways. However, the delivery of routes and safety is managed by Nottinghamshire County Council.
REF040	Misterton Parish Council	Page 167, section 11.1 Misterton Parish Council would like to see a radical overhaul of bus services: residents should be able to book a bus trip with an 'on demand' service, like Call Connect in Lincolnshire. This would, it is hoped, reduce the number of empty or near-empty buses seen on rural routes.	Other than where required by new development, Bus service provision is a matter for Nottinghamshire County Council and the bus operators.
REF068	Ranskill Parish Council	Policy ST56 Transport Infrastructure does not include any details of improvements to rural travel infrastructure. Instead, it states that "Maintaining and improving access to rural services, through public transport and active travel modes will be supported by Policy ST2" However, details of rural travel infrastructure do not appear under policy ST2 either.	The Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Assessment identifies the current capacity and issues with the road network. Mitigation or improvements to the road network are only required where it is a direct impact from proposed development. Wider improvement measures may be detailed within the Nottinghamshire County Council Transport Plan.
REF094	Network Rail	Thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment on the above document. Our principal area of interest is the Bassetlaw Garden Village allocation, though we do have observations in relation to other proposed allocations. It is important that the policies within the Bassetlaw Local Plan reflect the aspirations of Network Rail and the wider rail industry as far as they are known at this stage, and that the plan provides suitable flexibility to support future growth of the railway for both passenger and freight services. The railway network is a vital element of the country's economy and a key component in the drive to deliver the Government's sustainable agenda. Passenger growth of 40% is predicted to 2030 and freight tonnage moved by rail is expected to double in the same period. In addition, Network Rail is a statutory undertaker responsible for maintaining, operating and developing the main railway network and its associated estate. Our aim is to protect and enhance the railway infrastructure; therefore any proposed development which is in close proximity to the railway line or could potentially affect Network Rail's specific land interests will also need to be carefully considered. In relation to the overall plan, we note the policies of the transport chapter and the references in particular to the provision of a new station at Bassetlaw Garden Village, on which we comment separately below.	Noted. Thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST56 - TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPROVEMENT			
REF126	Retford Cycling Campaign	<p>Other enhancements to the Bassetlaw plan to help ensure more direct, safe, coherent, attractive and comfortable cycling and walking environments</p> <p>Schools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amnesty on parent parking, trial scheme example in York, students also took part in surveys working with urban planners, we would recommend that the councils engage with schools on piloting these ideas, especially to help tackle childhood obesity - https://www.sustrans.org.uk/our-blog/projects/2019/england/street-design-at-carr-junior-school-york Routes to and from schools, we feel that all route to schools should have modern, safe cycle and walking routes, and strongly urge collaboration between the council and schools, and other relevant parties e.g. parent groups, cycling and walking groups to create a cross-working group to deliver better, safer, more connected, direct, cohesive and attractive means to getting to school, via healthy and sustainable transport. <p>Bike aid and or fix</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We understand NCC has a bike aid scheme planned to help those need a bicycle the most, that is carers, people out of work, receive a bicycle, we also understand that BDC have a planned DR Bike, Bike Fix style sessions organised for Retford and Worksop - this is all to be encouraged, and continued, we urge that this becomes a regular, not one off activity <p>Parks and open spaces</p> <p>Kings Park, a segregated route along the perimeter of the park, from Chancery Lane, to the Bridgate Car Park, would provide access through the centre of town, being safer than the major roads (this has been submitted to the council previously and is supported by the Retford Civic Society and various elected representatives). We provide a walk-through video here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sKjR-ut55AY</p> <p>Cemetery, North Road to Chesterfield Canal, the creation of a small segregated cycle route to connect the North Road cyclepath to the Chesterfield Canal would provide direct access to the greenway route, which is motor traffic free, to the centre of town and beyond. The "kissing gate" and other safety enhanced changes, which compliment the look and feel of the environment could be made. Contributions from developments on the North Road could potentially enable this route (and the canal) to be resurfaced and maintained as a safer commuting route for pedestrians, mobility scooters, carers and parents of those with disabilities.</p> <p>Connectivity and organisation - Transport integration</p> <p>Bus - a challenging thought, is that Retford Bus Station has no provision for cycle parking or storage, given the benefits this would bring, and the low costs. We would encourage the provision of cycle storage, such which has been used in Gainsborough and elsewhere. Train, making the coal-drops and Westfield road would provide much better access, and a choice of access for people of all modes of transport, it could be protected for cyclists, mobility scooters, and walkers. Hybrid, promoting integration with the various transport options, making it easy to use and therefore providing an actual choice through better infrastructure, we are sure would bring benefits. Train, making the coal-drops and Westfield road would provide much better access, and a choice of access for people of all modes of transport, it could be protected for cyclists, mobility scooters, and walkers.</p> <p>Hybrid, promoting integration with the various transport options, making it easy to use and therefore providing an actual choice through better infrastructure, we are sure would bring benefits.</p>	Other than where required by new development, walking and cycling provision, including highway safety, is a matter for Nottinghamshire County Council.
REF126	Retford Cycling Campaign	<p>Cycle parking and storage</p> <p>There are various options available for cycle parking and storage, to encourage uptake, and keep pedestrians and cyclists segregated. Such as the following company (https://www.cyclehoop.com/category/racks/), which we use as an example:</p>	Where opportunities exist, provision will be made on new development sites for appropriate cycling parking and storage facilities. Wider provision of for cycle parking and storage is also being considered as part of the Worksop

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST56 - TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPROVEMENT			
		<p>Suggestions for new cycle storage (keeps cycles safe and secure) / parking (encourage it as transport) to protect cycles and encourage more visitors to our local economy are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Retford town centre; ● Carolgate (e.g. either end to encourage cyclists to park and walk); ● Market Square; ● Bus Station with safe segregated ingress and egress routes for cyclists; ● Train station; ● Schools; ● Car parks (there are so many in the town centre) 1 car parking space = up to ten cycles (that's more shops, more people, more potential spend); and ● Improve supermarkets, we feel that cyclist parking, signage and road markings are not taken seriously at all, completely contradicting the ambitions for sustainability and healthy transport. <p>Routes and proposals from other groups and individuals We see much parity with our charitable aims, BDC's objectives, and some inspirational ideas from local residents with regards to better connecting the Sustrans network to Retford, as well as suggestions for much better use of the council owned land and green spaces through the town centre.</p> <p>Active Travel Fund - Randall Way - NCC's potentially significant contribution to Retford cycle and walking routes The proposed route on Randall Way, funded by central government, would be a very useful and necessary route, to provide segregated cycle and walking routes from the new north road neighbourhood and business estates, and the local high school. We hope that this will include considerations for improving the route, in any way possible, to the Elizabethan school as well. (At the time of writing, no details were released on this plan, due Jan/Feb 2021).</p> <p>Local people and organisations Two enterprising, knowledgeable, and very experienced retired professionals whom have been kind enough to produce and share their impressive ideas and valuable insights on improving our town for all - some really good innovative ideas, and hard work has been done to produce this work, for which we are happy to support and learn from, and grateful for their permission to share:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A cycle plan - David Backhouse - representative of a sustainable transport charity https://tinyurl.com/yyhqw8uz - with a view on wider connectivity; and 2. Improvements to openspace, footpaths and cycleways in Retford - John Talbot - retired landscape architect https://tinyurl.com/yy5esm5p - with a view in summary of utilising our green spaces. <p>Get Out and Get Active - GOGA - is a well known local charity encouraging walking for all. You can find more about them here: http://www.betterinbassetlaw.co.uk/get-active-bassetlaw/</p> <p>The NHS and GP's Surgeries - working together could encourage and refer people to cycling and walking. They are very busy with the local effort in tackling the pandemic, however, we would encourage engagement with healthcare organisations to support the Bassetlaws Plans, if it has not already been considered - especially as given the councils and government are encouraging walking and cycling - we need the infrastructure and other peripheral support to make this a reality.</p>	Central DPD and potentially through the Retford Neighbourhood Plan.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST56 - TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPROVEMENT			
REF126	Retford Cycling Campaign	<p>There are many others, and we are grateful for everyone's support and input into our responses and work.</p> <p>The Chesterfield Canal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Resurfacing could provide all year access and choices, that are traffic-free, protecting walkers and cyclists (this happens safely elsewhere in the country and along the Chesterfield Canal) also Nottingham Canal as a perfect example of modern thinking and partnership with the community; ● Funding could come all of the new housing estates in particular the North Road, Trinity Farm proposals, grants, and other charitable organisations; ● In particular if it could be considered, we would encourage contributions to links to the Chesterfield Canal (through the cemetery, and into town), and a foot/cycle bridge from the Trinity Hospital estate (with access to Babworth Woods and the Canal) to improve the surface as it is not attractive during winter; and ● With an increase in foot and cycle traffic, the potential for erosion will degrade the surface and likely lead to the route not being used, so we would encourage any support that could be given to the Canal Trust and Chesterfield Canal Trust to make this a reality. <p>Existing infrastructure - in use or "abandoned" in Retford</p> <p>We reference these in more detail in our presentation, which the reader can locate at https://trustee.retfordcyclingcampaign.org . We therefore don't detail these routes here.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Coal Drops - https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=j8lACQ3dH28 ; ● The allotments (train station) - https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vba4CiWKg_M ; ● Westfield Road - https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kdoUeQEjpbQ ; ● Tenterfleet Walk; ● Tiln Lane; ● White houses; ● London road - https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OpVp5aWfd0k ; and ● Safety for pedestrians, mobility scooters, parents and carers with prams and buggies, and those of all abilities. Some examples of complaints raised with us ● Parking on cycle lanes (this discourages use, and waste the investment made); ● Cycle Routes not direct, connected, safe, convenient, cohesive or attractive (this does not encourage the uptake of cycling, and its use as a form of transport) ● Lack of maintenance of existing routes e.g. vegetation, ingress of soil, red tarmac eroded and not replaced (puts people, creates perception or reality of it not been safe form of transport); ● Lack of cycle storage as opposed to cycle parking (backs are not cheap, transport needs protecting); ● Space on carolgate for those who have disabilities e.g. wheelchair users, mobility scooters; and ● Everything else referenced in our surveys. Maintenance ● These routes are described in our presentation made to elected representatives and other organisations in August 2020. It can be found here (slide 28 onwards): https://tinyurl.com/y2wbwsn4 ; and ● It is essential that these proposes routes are maintained and kept usable, to encourage and maintain their use, this also helps to create choices for people who choose to cycle and walk, as well as potential employment opportunities for those who work for the route maintainers 	<p>Where opportunities exist, provision will be made on new development sites for appropriate cycling parking and storage facilities. Wider provision of for cycle parking and storage is also being considered as part of the Worksop Central DPD and potentially through the Retford Neighbourhood Plan.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST56 - TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPROVEMENT			
REF126	Retford Cycling Campaign	<p>Benefits for the local economy, tourism and heritage We also talk about the potential benefits for our local economy too, you can find more about our thoughts here: Benefits for the local economy - cycling and walking.</p> <p>We clearly encourage developers and council(s), and associated third parties, to follow the LTN 1/20 design principles, as this will ensure that the infrastructure is equivalent to that which is foreseen, planned, forecasted outside the estate. Or for which guidance is provided from the government on expectations for cycling and walking infrastructure to be delivered outside the site and throughout the town over the years to come and benefiting the local community at all of their life stages - that is everyone from 8 to 80 and beyond. We also look forward to the public publishing and sharing of the WSG cycle audit for Retford. This was referenced in the Bassetlaw Draft Plan, but not available to review at the time of writing.</p> <p>Finally, we are grateful to everyone from the local community and beyond who has contributed to our knowledge and helped to support the charity in its pursuit of its objectives to benefit the community.</p>	<p>Noted. Thank you for your comment.</p>
REF142	Retford Branch Labour Party	<p>There is a mismatch with the ratios of 'dwellings required' to 'jobs created' when the figures for the whole of the District are compared to the Retford implications. Put simply, Retford town is expected in the Plan to carry about 10% of the total district's total 'New Build' through to the end of Plan, and imbalance is particularly distinct when the 'Employment sites' figure for Retford is just around 3%. This will create a huge challenge for people living in Retford and working elsewhere:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Plan will need to see a much more detailed 'commitment' to matched infrastructure and significant public transport enhancements which must be in place as new dwellings are constructed, and not at the tail-end of any significant development. ● We expect "carmageddon" in Retford as those in new homes will need to commute to places of employment (on top of pressure within the town for shopping, school runs and leisure trips). <p>These issues will be exacerbated by the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● No rail connection at the Garden Village which will put pressure on both the A1, A57 and connections between Retford and Worksop for commuters from the Garden Village to employment and schools in Retford/Worksop ● Serious doubts surrounding cycle provision from the new developments in Ordsall by local residents. Poor facilities for cyclists in the Town Centre. ● Overloading of key transport nodes - notably the A638 roundabouts at Hallcroft and Whitehouses, and the A620 roundabout at Ordsall. <p>Suggested changes to the plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● If Bassetlaw District Council are expecting Retford to carry the burden of a disproportionate number of homes, then the Plan must immediately provide for enhanced transportation including better cycling, bus, rail and walking links. ● If the plan cannot provide these then the standard method of assessment for new homes must be followed. ● A development of a Retford wide cycling and walking strategy including consultation of key local groups such as Retford Cycling Campaign, the Town Centre Master Plan and Friends of Retford Station (to name just a few) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cycle routes along all major roads: ○ Refurbishment of existing cycle paths and removal of bottlenecks. ○ Provision of off-street parking so that any new or present cycle paths are not restricted by parked cars. ● Requests for rail connections (which local campaigners can take to Network Rail and other groups) including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Rail stations at all new development areas where a railway exists - such as the High Marnham 	<p>Retford is the Districts second largest settlement and therefore is considered sustainable to take an appropriate proportion of the Districts growth. Existing commitments within the town have been considered as part of the distribution of growth along with any infrastructure issues.</p> <p>Where the proposed growth causes a negative impact to the existing highway network, the Retford Transport Assessment recommends mitigation measures. In addition, the Retford Walking and Cycling Audit also recommends improvements to the existing infrastructure either through the delivery of the proposed growth or through external funding and organisations. This include the provision of cycle storage facilities.</p> <p>Existing rail provision is also considered as part of the Bassetlaw Transport Assessment. Where new or improved rail infrastructure can be accommodated, then this has been explored.</p> <p>The former High Marnham power stations rail infrastructure has now ceased and is only operational for test purposes with some of it being changed into a cycling track to Lincoln.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST56 - TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPROVEMENT			
		<p>development and the Garden Village</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A direct rail service to Nottingham ● Cycling parking must be provided at all new places of employment and amenity. This requires a level (number of spaces per job) defined against national or international best practice. 	
REF169	Resident	<p>page 169, para 3 New and improved walking and cycling links: whilst identifying routes in the District's three main towns, potential links between them are (except for Worksop – Garden Village - Retford) excluded. Given the intended life-span of this Plan, some outline of identified desire lines for longer-distance routes should be included. These routes might include (i) Worksop – Carlton-in-Lindrick – Langold – Blyth – Harworth/Bawtry; and (ii) Retford – Sutton-cum-Lound – Ranskill – Bawtry. Sections of these routes might then be delivered as and when opportunities arise and funding becomes available.</p>	Where new development can improve existing or create new cycle and walking infrastructure this will be supported. However, the majority of measures are likely to be delivered through other mechanisms such as grant funding or by other organisations.
REF172	Elkesley Parish Council	<p>The A1 being an arterial route from the North to South of the Country is more commonly and widely used since the implementation of average speed cameras and constant roadworks along the M1. The A1 is poorly lit, road surfaces in need of update and suffers high or frequent issues with collisions and broken down vehicles. It is only two lanes, and soon backs up for miles during many incidents or emergency situations. We would like to see provision within the plan to address these issues as and when development is progressed to planning stage.</p> <p>We have 50 mph restricted speed limits on the A1 at Elkesley, we would like to see a policy within the Local Plan that outlines the requirement to complete any future changes to the access and egress at Elkesley, Ranby and Gamston, prior to works starting on any new development site. Some of these junctions are simply not fit for purpose, and an increase of vehicles and people will have a significant effect on noise, carbon and general wellbeing of local residents with regards noise pollution.</p> <p>As part of the "Garden Village" development the current route from Appleby Head (A1 junction) to Retford is proposed as being removed. This will create a catalogue of issues for not only the new village, but the existing road network. It will force commuters to use other, less substantial roads and routes (potentially through Ordsall, Morton, Jockey Lane and Gamston) and increase traffic flow in these areas.</p> <p>Some of these roads such as the small single track from Morton and the single carriageway from Ordsall to Elkesley are barely fit for purpose as things currently stand, with extra traffic and commuting these roads would simply not cope. They already suffer major flooding, cracking and pot hole issues and white lines, lighting and general maintenance is already in decline. We believe there needs to be a specific policy within the plan on road infrastructure, to ensure any proposed developments are not compounding issues that have already been highlighted but not being resolved.</p>	The existing route from the A1 to Retford via Mansfield Road is not being removed. The first part of this road between the A1 and the level crossing is to be realigned so that it appropriately incorporates the development associated with the Garden Village. Measures will be put in place to stop minor routes being used as rat-runs and this is something the Council is in discussions with the County Council about.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST56 - TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPROVEMENT			
REF175	Resident	<p>The new estates will increase the amount of traffic coming in and passing through Retford. Traffic on all the main roads leading into Retford are already busy and queues in all directions form at peak times of the day. It is a nightmare when there is an accident on the A1 and traffic diverts through Retford. I suppose this is something we have to live with and where possible avoid travelling at peak times.</p> <p>Another factor is that more and more drivers are taking short cuts along country lanes eg Botney Bay Road and Greenmile Road to get to the A620 and Mansfield Road (B6420). This will probably significantly increase once the Garden Village is built. Also, traffic has increased along Jockey House Lane leading to the A1 and Elkesley. Many drivers seem to have the need to get from A to B as quickly as possible ignoring national speed limits and road conditions. Many are impatient and intolerant of other road users. I used to ride my bike along these roads but no longer feel safe to do so. Whether driving or cycling it does not make for a pleasant experience.</p> <p>Entering/exiting the junction off the North Road (A638) on to Randall Way is difficult due to the constant flow of traffic.</p> <p>Entering/exiting the junction of Tiln Lane on to the A620 is very difficult due to the constant flow of traffic.</p> <p>Entering/exiting the staggard junction at Babworth/Mansfield Road is also difficult due to the constant flow of traffic.</p> <p>Exiting Welbeck Road, Ordsall onto Westhill Road, Ordsall is very difficult because (a) it is a staggard junction with Rufford Avenue and (b) visibility is obscured by parked vehicles on the corners and pathways on both sides of the road. The speed limit is not always adhered to. It is also a heavily pedestrianised area so crossing here for the elderly, those with pushchairs, young children and mobility issues is just as difficult as it is for drivers.</p>	<p>The Retford Transport Assessment has assessed the proposed level of growth and the potential sites within the town for highway capacity, highway safety and public transport issues. Where issues are identified, the assessment has recommended mitigation measures needed to improve the issues identified. Where large sites are proposed, there will need to be appropriate infrastructure to support new or enhanced public transport opportunities. This is particularly the case for Ordsall South and Trinity Farm.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST56 - TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPROVEMENT			
REF178	Councillors, East Retford South, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>Retford Station provides a transport hub at the intersection of the ECML and the Sheffield-Lincoln line. However it ought to be noted that it is an approx. 45mins walk from the southern edge of site HS13 to the Station. Indeed, the option of using the proposed station at the proposed Morton Garden Village might prove more commuter friendly to residents of HS13 if an adequate direct road link could be developed. However, with an anticipated housing figure of only 500 units by the end of the plan period, it remains to be seen if this new station within the Garden Village is achievable.</p> <p>We are disappointed in the missed opportunity to future proof Retford's connection to the District-wide employment opportunities. This should be addressed by maximising the potential to design improved road links between the proposed Garden Village and Retford.</p> <p>In addition, although the emphasis within the plan on improving existing and developing additional footpaths, cycle ways and non-vehicular routes is welcome, there are high levels of concern about escalating traffic moving through Ordsall and on into Retford. Traffic is the primary concern of respondents, with twice as many residents listing it as a concern than any other issue. Ollerton Road, Ordsall Road and the Goosemoor Bridge were highlighted as being areas of particular concern. Further to this, there is a degree of scepticism that the planning system is able to deliver the promises made to the local community. The removal of previous a Planning Condition to improve the Ordsall/Babworth mini roundabout (item 3 in the plan's proposed list of local road improvements) is an example frequently cited by residents as where the planning system has failed to deliver for the local community.</p>	<p>The proposed new station at the Bassetlaw Garden Village is a fundamental part of providing a sustainable development at that site. Although there is no plans for a direct link road, there is the potential for enhanced bus services between the transport nodes.</p> <p>Land has been protected for employment purposes in Retford and additional land at Randall Way is being developed. With its rail links to other larger settlements supports a sustainable commute from to the town to other areas.</p> <p>Where the proposed growth causes a negative impact on the road network, the Retford Transport Assessment proposes mitigation measures where relevant. These include junction improvements, improvements to signalisation and traffic calming measures.</p>
REF184	Doncaster Council	<p>Growth at Harworth and the impact on the local highway network in Doncaster</p> <p>Due to the duty to cooperate issue regarding the impact of growth at Harworth and its impact on the local highway network (as assessed through the Doncaster Local Plan Statement of Common Ground) it is considered that that Policy ST49 – Transport Infrastructure and Improvement Schemes (or at least its explanatory text) should also include the required junction improvement/mitigation measures in Doncaster as well as Bassetlaw junctions listed. This would reflect the work undertaken in the White Young and Green Junctions Assessment Report.</p> <p>Due to past and on-going duty to cooperate discussions regarding the impact of development at Harworth/Bircotes on traffic junctions within Doncaster as well as transport modelling results (undertaken by AMEC for the Bassetlaw Local Plan and part funded by Doncaster Council), it is considered that Section 11.1 should also refer to the A631 corridor, particularly since paragraph 11.1.7 identifies a need to increase capacity along the A57 corridor.</p>	<p>The Council has, and will continue to, worked with Doncaster metropolitan Borough Council on Strategic Transport issues through the Local Plan process.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST56 - TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPROVEMENT			
REF197	Resident	<p>a. North Notts & Lincs Community Rail Partnership (NNLCRP) is the community rail partnership covering the line and stations in Bassetlaw – should it be included on discussions?</p> <p>b. Is there a need for a joined-up public transport initiative with tickets usable on buses and trains? – perhaps a subsidised (season) ticket plan – working with SYPTE perhaps?</p> <p>a. 2c Bus interchange should be a bus/rail interchange.</p> <p>b. 3c including a regular service to the railway station.</p> <p>c. 3d including a Sunday bus connection from the railway to the bus station.</p> <p>d. 4 Conduct a feasibility study for a railway station at Misterton, including a bus interchange, car park with EV chargers and potentially a commercial or health site. This line serves the Doncaster to Lincoln Line and also the alternative Doncaster to London route. The site is disused (cleared) industrial on a designated flood plain.</p>	The Council has consulted the rail partnerships and other rail authorities and operators through the process. It will continue to do so as the plan proceeds to its next stage.
REF211	National Trust	National Trust has significant concerns about the scope and scale of proposed transport upgrades along the A57 corridor. These have potential not only for significant disruption associated with road works in the medium-long term, but also a major change in the character of the surrounding area as a result of the cumulative impact of major development, transport upgrades, traffic increased, congestion and pollution.	The Bassetlaw Transport Assessment recognises that there needs to be future improvements to the A57. However, this is a strategic issue as it also includes traffic from other authority areas including Rotherham. Any improvements will need to be developed through a collective approach between relevant authorities and bodies.
1666086	Resident	<p>I find the Bassetlaw Plan's list of traffic improvements woefully inadequate. Someone with 'imagination' needs to look at Retford as a 'whole' and come up with a long vision as to how road infrastructure and connectivity can be improved. We do not need any traffic passing through our town that is only 'passing through'.</p> <p>What Retford needs urgently is more bus services that allow people to use its services without the need for a car. An additional doctors surgery in the south of the town with more large open spaces to be enjoyed by all and a new community facility to the south of the town centre.</p> <p>We do not need more and more houses without 'major' improvements to road infrastructure, school and health provision.</p>	The Bassetlaw Transport Assessment only assess the impacts of the proposed growth on the highway network. It does not provide solutions that are not a direct result of planned growth through the Local Plan. Other wider improvement measures will be dealt with through Nottinghamshire County Councils Transport Plan.
REF052	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>Page 167, section 11.1</p> <p>I would like to see a radical overhaul of bus services: residents should be able to book a bus trip with an 'on demand' service, like Call Connect in Lincolnshire. This would, it is hoped, reduce the number of empty or near-empty buses seen on rural routes.</p>	The Retford Transport Assessment has assessed the proposed level of growth and the potential sites within the town for highway capacity, highway safety and public transport issues. Where issues are identified, the assessment has recommended mitigation measures needed to improve the issues identified. Where large sites are proposed, there will need to be appropriate infrastructure to support new or enhanced public transport opportunities. This is particularly the case for Ordsall South and Trinity Farm.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST56 - TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPROVEMENT			
REF054	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>re transport and traffic across the whole of Retford London Road and goosemoor lane area are already congested and this will become much more congested due to new developments. This area of Retford, coming from the A1 I feel needs more work from NCC.</p> <p>Moorgate hill area</p> <p>Concerns about this area of Retford and the need for work at the low bridge to mitigate the need for HGVs to access Carr hill school area. The developments around here will impact the area and the transport flow undoubtedly and I would have liked to see more visionary work taking place re the bridge. I would have hoped the plan could have been more imaginative about sorting out this long standing issue.</p> <p>Concerns about the roundabout on North road near west Retford is a concern, already congested most days even before the developments as outlined in the plan are built. We also have the ambulance station located on North road which needs consideration. I have concerns about traffic using Randall way and the route past the high school and beyond into town will take place giving concerns about safety of school children, and there will still be the issues of accessing the roundabout.</p>	The Retford Transport Assessment has assessed the proposed level of growth and the potential sites within the town for highway capacity, highway safety and public transport issues. Where issues are identified, the assessment has recommended mitigation measures needed to improve the issues identified. Where large sites are proposed, there will need to be appropriate infrastructure to support new or enhanced public transport opportunities. This is particularly the case for Ordsall South and Trinity Farm.
REF063	Resident	<p><i>In reference to the Garden Village</i></p> <p>I have read the document and although it goes into great depth of the actual development I can't see anything about the road leading up to it. I live on the very dangerous "s" bend from the Retford side and has many accidents already with the amount of traffic and I feel with all the extra traffic that this development will bring, I feel that the number of accidents can only increase. I also know that the dog sanctuary is very worried about the volume of traffic on the same stretch of road at the level crossing.</p>	The Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Assessment identifies potential improvement measures for Mansfield Road, including the improvements to the Babworth/A620 and the realignment of Mansfield road from the A1 to the level crossing at Mansfield Road.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST56 - TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPROVEMENT			
REF077	Carlton in Lindrick Parish Council	<p>You will recall that in our original submission observations were made on the possibility of increased and potentially dangerous usage being made of Hundred Acre Lane, Tinkers Hill and Greenway both for access to the village and for access to the A60 highway.</p> <p>I would like to expand our views on that particular issue.</p> <p>It is appreciated that the new road is designed in part to encourage residents on the Peaks Hill Farm Development to gain access to the A57 highway, the M1 motorway at Aston and to other commuter areas in Sheffield and South Yorkshire. In addition, there is an assumption that residents on the new development will travel to Doncaster via Blyth joining the A1 or proceeding to Doncaster via Bawtry.</p> <p>In normal circumstances the assumptions on traffic flow would not seem unreasonable, however the Parish Council would welcome views on the following.</p> <p>At peak periods of travel time, commuters to and from work along with others travelling to and from larger shopping centres in Sheffield and Doncaster with some attending leisure facilities in those areas, there could be a significant number of residents who wish to avoid the hectic travel conditions on the recommended routes via trunk roads preferring instead to access the A60 via Hundred Acre Lane and Greenway, then proceeding to Sheffield, the M1 and South Yorkshire via Rotherham Baulk in the Village or to Doncaster via the A60 through Langold and Oldcotes.</p> <p>The routes described would certainly be preferential to those wishing to avoid the trauma of heavy traffic at Blyth (to Doncaster and the A1) and the A57 at Gateford/Worksop (to Sheffield, South Yorkshire and the M1 motorway). In terms of journey 'time' the routes through the village of Carlton in Lindrick could well be preferable at peak periods.</p> <p>If you add the above potential to the increased volume of traffic generating from approved housing developments in the village on the eastern side of the A60 and at Firbeck Colliery and in Langold, there is, in our view, an identified potential for increased road usage in areas within the village which are already subject to public concern at the foot of Long Lane at its junction with the A60, in addition to the extremely narrow highway access to the village through Greenway via Hundred Acre Lane in the midst of a much valued Conservation Area.</p> <p>Whilst I have no doubt that extensive highway expertise has been applied to the Local Plan proposals, the Parish Council would be pleased to receive further views on the highway concerns being expressed at this stage and what measures can be included within the Plan to negate the described concerns.</p>	<p>Existing transport infrastructure within the area is considered to be either at capacity or slightly below capacity at peak times. The proposed development at Peaks Hill Farm provides a new East/West link road through the site which will make it easier and safer for traffic to access Carlton Road and Blyth Road without having to use other constrained East/West links within the area.</p> <p>The new link will be of a standard to take public transport and the junctions at either end will also be improved. This should help to improve highway safety at Blyth road in particular.</p> <p>The new link should also help to reduce traffic north towards Carlton – particularly those who are accessing the A1 at Blyth as they can use the link to access Blyth Road before entering Carlton.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST56 - TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPROVEMENT			
REF109	Resident	<p>11.1.1 & 11.1.2 Due to a potential 440 houses being built on the Trinity Farm site, Retford, North Road and Hallcroft roundabout will not be able to sustain the increase in vehicles. Traffic congestion will increase not decrease regardless of any changes made to the traffic infrastructure. The plans show that the developers anticipate that every household will have 2 cars which would increase the traffic by approximately 400 vehicles from the first phase and 880 vehicles if the second phase is also approved. The majority of the people purchasing the proposed houses will already have jobs and use their car to travel to work. In addition, there will be increased HGV traffic from the planned industrial units. Adding a few cycle lanes and improving footpaths and public transport will not reduce the volume of traffic significantly to allow the traffic to flow.</p> <p>The current road infrastructure already struggles and during peak times it can back up from Hallcroft roundabout, sometimes all the way to Randall Way (opposite the new development site) and it is often difficult to join from the existing side roads. With no proposals as to how the current road layout can be adapted to reduce the build up of traffic, this building scheme will contribute towards major hold-ups and could also contribute towards an increase in the number of road traffic accidents. When the A1 is closed, this is used as a main diversion route before re-joining the A1 and traffic is at a standstill to Sutton and beyond. The Hallcroft estate could also see an increase in cars as drivers seek alternative routes to cut their journey times. Hallcroft Road also backs up from Hallcroft roundabout at peak times.</p>	The Retford Transport Assessment has assessed the proposed level of growth and the potential sites within the town for highway capacity, highway safety and public transport issues. Where issues are identified, the assessment has recommended mitigation measures needed to improve the issues identified. Where large sites are proposed, there will need to be appropriate infrastructure to support new or enhanced public transport opportunities. This is particularly the case for Ordsall South and Trinity Farm – and links to Randall Way and North Road
REF110	Resident	Has the transport policy provided to your team taken in to consideration the effect of the A1 being closed either North or Southbound in their calculations ?	No, the Transport Assessment looks at the strategic network flows over a period of time – including AM and PM flows and impacts.
REF144	Resident	<p>One aspect about the evolving growth of Worksop and its surrounds is that much of the housing development has been occurring on the North of the town, whereas the major traffic route is the A57 which itself is supporting many of the major employment facilities on the South of the town - resulting in the need for a large number of local residents to travel across town each day ! This is not an easy task as there is no well developed route for that traffic (and even the Ashes Park Road was not constructed as a suitable dual carriageway to help alleviate that growing problem !).</p> <p>The allocation of land on the A57 opposite the Wilko factory for industrial use is surely going to add to that problem</p>	The Bassetlaw Transport Assessment recognises that there needs to be future improvements to the A57. However, this is a strategic issue as it also includes traffic from other authority areas including Rotherham. Any improvements will need to be developed through a collective approach between relevant authorities and bodies.
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	<p>Policy ST56: Transport Infrastructure and Improvement Schemes</p> <p>Reference to the Bassetlaw Garden Village should be reassessed if, as I suggest, the housing is to be relocated.</p> <p>Improvement and expansion of bus services, particularly throughout the rural areas, has to be a priority. This policy fails miserably in addressing what is currently a woeful service. It needs serious investment and assistance and, who knows, we may be able to tempt more people to use it particularly if the service is frequent, buses are new and small and the routes are interconnecting.</p>	Where bus services can be improved through planned growth then this will be supported through investment in infrastructure. However, the decisions about general bus services, particularly those within the rural area taken by the County Council and Public Transport providers.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST56 - TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPROVEMENT			
REF224	Sheffield City Region	<p>Transport policies in the Draft Plan, for both rail and active travel, support key planks of our own work in South Yorkshire, helping to improve connectivity and sustainable travel modes whilst tackling issues like poor health and air quality. Importantly, the Garden Village proposal includes provision for a new public transport facility including a rail station on the Sheffield to Lincoln line. This will complement other initiatives in SCR as well as strengthen rail connections to Sheffield from the east. The SCR Integrated Rail Plan (July 2019) provides more detail on how we see these services developing in the future.</p>	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF117 Ordsall South	Barton Wilmore on behalf of land owners	<p>6.71 Policy ST56 is a district-wide transport strategy which aims to mitigate the impacts of traffic growth as a result of the delivery of the whole Local Plan. Having a district-wide mitigation strategy is something that is encouraged to demonstrate the holistic approach undertaken in relation to transport. Policy ST56 provides strategic connectivity improvements by non-car modes of transport. These non-car improvements have the opportunity to encourage sustainable mode share from the individual allocations, as well as increased sustainable mode share from the surrounding communities who will also benefit from them. This approach helps to reduce reliance on the private car across the district, leading to reduced reliance on the private car and, consequently, reducing the scale of highway interventions which are likely to be required. 6.72 As set out in Paragraph 11.1.5 of the Local Plan, schemes required to mitigate individual allocations are set out in the site-specific policies, with the detailed requirements to be determined as each allocation is advanced to planning submission. The transport requirements pertaining to Site HS13 are discussed within the Transport Technical Note (forming part of this submission).</p>	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF225	Sheffield City Council	<p>We note that the Plan acknowledges impacts on parts of the A57 as well as noting existing transport and traffic flow issues on parts of the strategic A57, which feeds into and out of Sheffield, however we welcome the policies promoting sustainable transport (ST57), and acknowledgment of the potential role of the rail corridor in future (ST56).</p>	The Bassetlaw Transport Assessment recognises that there needs to be future improvements to the A57. However, this is a strategic issue as it also includes traffic from other authority areas including Rotherham. Any improvements will need to be developed through a collective approach between relevant authorities and bodies.
REF170	A&D Architecture	<p>12) Policy ST56 and ST57 should be modified to safeguard pedestrians against inappropriate cyclist speeds on shared networks by modifying the text of subsection B1 (Policy ST56) and B7(Policy ST57) as follows: Policy ST56: "B 1 Measures to facilitate and encourage safe access by cycle and foot including measures to calm cycle speeds where these might otherwise endanger pedestrians"</p>	Noted. Thank you for your comment.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST57 - PROMOTING SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND ACTIVE TRAVEL			
1660972	The British Horse Society	<p>It is commendable to see the inclusion of equestrians in the provisions for improving and extending routes to promote Active Travel.</p>	Thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST57 - PROMOTING SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND ACTIVE TRAVEL			
REF089	Resident	<p>I have lived in Retford and then Welham for the last 37 years bringing up a family of 4 and now with grandchildren. I and my family have always walked and cycled around the town and know the footpaths, short cuts and public spaces very well. Over this time many houses have been built and two new schools, but very little in the way of new open spaces or segregated footpaths or cycleways. Meanwhile the vehicular traffic has increased and the roads are too dangerous for children to cycle on and increasingly unpleasant to walk alongside. This last year has emphasised the need for safe open spaces close to home where we can all exercise and appreciate the freedom and spiritual uplift that walking and cycling in traffic free areas brings. Many of us travel by car to Clumber Park or other local spots but it would be so much better and 'greener' if this need could be provided in Retford where it would be readily accessible to all, including children, and people with mobility scooters and pushchairs etc. Need an improved and larger network of traffic free paths and cycleways linking one housing area with another and links to the local schools, parks and the town centre. The paths and cycleways alongside the roads are good in some places but are not wide enough, and are not pleasant or relaxing to walk along right next to busy traffic. Cars parked over paths and marked cycle routes make them frustrating and dangerous. The best places for walking in traffic free, pleasant surroundings are Kings Park, the Cemetery and the pedestrianised town centre but these are not directly linked to most housing areas. The canal tow path is good but is mostly narrow and often muddy. Retford has grown up over the years with its river, canal and historic road layout to become a very pleasant Market Town with the excellent King's Park, but we need more public open spaces, footpaths and cycleways to match the large increase in the number of houses built in the last 40 years. The new development could provide for some of this and along with the Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 Agreements, it would also be fair to use some of the resulting increase in council tax that all the new housing brings to the town. Need improvements to, and better maintenance of, the paths we have so we can benefit from their full width and potential and prevent the gradual deterioration in the fabric of the town and the air of dereliction and neglect that results. It would be money well spent and is a very visual benefit and immediate return for the tax payer and the general public. Make the following suggestions and hope they could be given some consideration to be included in any future plans and budgets for our town. It would be good to have an overall plan for the town but any one of them would be a welcome and beneficial improvement.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A linear open park along the river Idle from Ordsall in the south to the Idle Valley Nature Reserve in the north which could provide for recreation, exercise, tree planting and wild life, and also footpath and cycle way links to housing areas, schools and the town centre. 2. A riverside path and cycleway through a linear park from Ordsall to Albert Road with connections to housing areas and existing footpaths on both sides of the river. 3. An improved footpath and additional cycleway across the river between the railway station and Thrumpton Lane. 4. An improved riverside path and cycleway through a linear park from Bridgegate past Morrisons and extending to the footbridge across the Idle at Bolham Lane. 5. A riverside path and cycleway from the Bolham Lane footbridge through or alongside the fisheries site to the Idle Valley Nature Reserve. (recently closed after being open for at least 25 years) 6. An improved footpath and cycleway from houses and Carrhill School in the Tilne Road area to the footbridge across the Idle at Bolham Lane. 7. An improved footpath, widened footbridge and new cycleway from the Bolham Lane footbridge across the Idle to the houses and the Elizabethan School in Hallcroft. 8. A foot path and cycleway from Morrisons through parkland along the back of the houses off Hallcroft to the Elizabethan School with connections to the housing areas and school. 9. Widen the very narrow footbridge over the Idle linking Morrison's to the town centre. 10. A cycle way along Arlington Way to connect to that already proposed along Amcott Way. 11. Widening of existing roadside footpaths and provision of a cycleway between Retford and the nearby villages of Sutton, Welham and Clarborough to give safe access into Retford for all groups of society. 12. Reduce the width of the roads to the minimum for traffic and correspondingly increase the width of the footpaths and if possible accommodate a cycleway where it would be protected by the new kerb. This to be considered generally throughout the town where possible but it would be possible and most desirable along Hallcroft, North Road, London Road and Moorgate. 13. Close the town centre to through traffic or at least make it one way only, pedestrianise the 	<p>Thank you for your comprehensive response. In terms of the Local Plan, improvements or new walking and cycling infrastructure can only be sought to support the needs or to mitigate an impact for a new development site. This could mean that a new development should provide new walking and cycling infrastructure within the development and/or provide appropriate connections to existing infrastructure to the edge of the site. It may also include offsite contributions towards walking and cycling infrastructure, but this will only be included where the proposed development is materially impacting the existing network.</p> <p>National legislation is clear that development cannot address existing issues. So the majority of issues raised cannot be resolved by the Local Plan. The Retford Walking and Cycling Audit 2020 provides information about the quantity, quality and accessibility of the towns walking and cycling infrastructure. There are some general recommendations which cover broader improvements as well as those for the proposed development sites in the Local Plan. These, and other issues you raise, could be explored through other channels such as via Nottinghamshire County Council (as the Highways Authority) or Sustrans.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST57 - PROMOTING SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND ACTIVE TRAVEL			
		<p>end of Bridgegate or at least widen the paths, and widen the paths in Market Place and Grove Street. 14. Increase spending on maintenance of the existing footpaths and cycleways to remove encroaching soil, mud and grass to restore them to their full usable width. This to be done throughout Retford but notably on surfaced sections of the canal tow path and on the paths alongside Welham Road. This is a long and expensive list of improvements but we need to start with some of them and also have an annual budget so that, over time, we can bring our public communal areas up to the same standards that we strive for in our own private homes. The quality of the environment in our immediate surroundings has a big impact on our daily lives and only the Local Authority can improve this in the public areas. These suggestions would help improve our health and wellbeing as well have practical benefits in improving and encouraging journeys by foot or on bicycle especially for those who do not have, or do not wish to use a car. A more attractive town makes for a more prosperous town as more people want to live and work in the area and would be public money well spent. These proposals also meet the aspirations in many sections of the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan including 'Greening Bassetlaw', and 'Green and Blue Infrastructure' and also the 'Retford Intervention Plan Strategies'. They would translate aspirations into real benefits. Compared to what we collectively spend on our houses the cost is relatively small per household (tens of pounds annually not hundreds or thousands) and, if the public could be reassured that an increase in the Council Tax would be 'ring fenced' and spent on projects close to their homes, am sure the majority would welcome it or at least not complain. It would be money well spent, leave a lasting benefit for future generations and pay for itself by the general increase in the quality and value of all of our lives. Am a retired Landscape Architect with a life time experience working in the public sectors and would be more than willing to discuss any of, or all of the above suggestions with whoever they concern and would like to voluntarily contribute to improving my adopted town.</p>	
REF089	Resident	<p>Recently wrote a letter regarding 'Improvements to Paths and Cycleways in Retford' to all the District Councillors in Retford and Cllr David Pidwell (copy Attached). Of the 6 replies so far received, all agreed with the content and David asked me to send my comments to you in relation to the Bassetlaw Local Plan. Also written to Sustrans and 'Retford Cycling Campaign. I know that the Local Plan largely deals with future development whilst most of my suggestions relate to improvements to existing paths and roads, and the creation of a new riverside park in Retford. Jo White's introduction talks about 'an emphasis on healthy lifestyles and active travel' and states 'the Plan provides for more walking and cycling routes, new parks and open spaces.' Over the past decades new housing developments have been built in Retford and just linked onto the existing paths alongside the roads, many of which are too narrow and less than the 2m and 3m required to meet the NCC standards. In 3.19 it says that 'the local cycle network in Retford makes cycling between residential areas, work and leisure possible'. It does not mention schools but the roads are often too dangerous for cycling on, especially for children and the more nervous. Both senior schools are a long way from residential areas in Ordsall and the east side of the town. Retford needs a plan showing improved and new links for safe walking and cycling throughout the town and to nearby villages, and how these can be delivered. The proposals for paths and cycleways in the Garden Village sound wonderful but could we have a strategy in the Local Plan to bring Retford up to similar standards?</p>	<p>The Local Plan will only identify improvements or new walking and cycling infrastructure where it is required to deliver the proposed development. These will then form part of the infrastructure requirement for the necessary development site.</p> <p>National legislation is clear that development cannot address existing issues. External bodies and funding are a mechanism to implement other improvements to the walking and cycling infrastructure in and around Retford.</p>
REF094	Network Rail	Note and support this policy, particularly criterion 2(i) and its reference to "other transport mode" which will also cover issues with level crossings that may arise from development proposals.	Thank you for your comments.
REF101	East Markham Parish Council	Point C. This point needs to be expanded to include clear expectations for connecting major new commercial and residential development. In many cases these will be adding to vehicular transport and could worsen air quality and discourage existing healthy and active pursuits of cycling and walking. Adding cycle lanes and footpaths to connect to nearby towns of Worksop and Retford will discourage car use and make cycling and walking safer.	<p>Where improvements to the existing road infrastructure are required as part of a new development in the Local Plan, then these will be detailed within the relevant planning policies for the proposed development site.</p> <p>New development will only be required to deliver the necessary infrastructure to support its proposed</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST57 - PROMOTING SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND ACTIVE TRAVEL			
			<p>development and to mitigate against any adverse impact on the existing network.</p> <p>National legislation is clear that development cannot address existing issues. External bodies and funding are a mechanism to implement other improvements to the walking and cycling infrastructure in and around Retford.</p>
REF175	Resident	<p>It is good that you are promoting rights of way improvements within and through these new sites. It would be even better if paths/bridleways in the area all connected up to form a coherent network. Love cycling and try to keep to off road tracks. Any improvement to make cycling easier and safer has got to be a good thing although cycle lanes do have their pros (eg improves health, reduces congestion and pollution and cons (eg disrupt the flow of traffic - cause bunching, increase congestion and thus pollution). Having difficulty visualising the West Carr Road to Retford Oaks due to on street parking both on the grass verge and on the road. Also, Ordsall Park Road to Ordsall Primary School which is a very busy road. It would be ok for experienced cyclists not one for primary aged children.</p>	<p>The Retford Walking and Cycling audit has been prepared to help inform the Local Plan about the quality, quality and accessibility of the existing walking and cycling infrastructure around Retford. In addition, where new development can improve the network on and offsite it will be identified within relevant site allocation policies.</p> <p>Wider improvements identified will largely be delivered through external channels to this Local Plan and through external modes of funding.</p>
REF178	Councillors, East Retford South, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>The ambition evident within the plan to 'reduce the need to use of the car for everyday journeys' is regarded as overly optimistic. The pinch points that funnel all journeys between Ordsall and Retford through a limited number of bridges and tunnels across the natural and man-made barriers of river, canal and railway, mean that journeys are extended beyond any crow's direct flight. To establish a development beyond the extreme edge of the existing established settlement boundary, with a significant population of senior citizens and individuals with additional physical needs, will necessitate reliance on the car. The proposed extension of the bus service into the site will need to be a commitment that residents can rely on in order to access work, leisure and social activities 7 days, evenings and nights each week. Residents are also concerned about the retrofitting of cycle routes to busy narrow road systems in residential areas e.g. Brecks Rd. The impact for residential on-street parking is of concern and will need to be addressed at an early stage if established residents are not to be negatively impacted by these additions to the local cycle network.</p>	<p>A Transport Assessment for Retford has been produced to identify what impacts arise from the proposed growth identified within the Local Plan. This assessment also looks at the necessary mitigation that is required to support the delivery of the proposed growth in Retford. Some of this will be onsite and offsite.</p> <p>Improvements to the existing walking and cycling network will also be required, particularly where development can connect to existing networks or enhancements are required to support the additional volume of usage.</p>
REF197	Resident	Working with NNLCRP, promote bus/rail/walk routes and produce leaflets and website/social media communications – to promote walks/cycle rides along the Chesterfield Canal including the town centres, accessed via public transport.	Thank you for your comments.
REF211	National Trust	National Trust supports Policy ST57.	Thank you for your comments.
1668503	Resident	I fully support the sentiments expressed in the above policy - particularly section B. 4. Encourage forms of active travel etc. With this in mind - particularly as the plan envisages increases in population who will need more opportunities for exercise propose the section of footpath in Elkesley Parish that runs from Brough Lane to the bridge across the River Poulter Grid Ref. 684742 could be changed to a bridleway to allow cyclists and horse riders to access the bridleway network on the other side of the bridge (known locally as stone bridge).It is a cheap fix as the path is only approx. 100 meters or so - already wide enough to be designated a bridleway and the bridge will not need changing as the river is already easily fordable by horses on the west side of the bridge. This small change will provide cyclists and horse riders considerable safe connectivity to local routes enabling them to take exercise while avoiding routes like the A1 Trunk road.	In terms of the Local Plan, improvements or new walking and cycling infrastructure can only be sought to support the needs or to mitigate an impact for a new development site. Other, wider improvements identified will largely be delivered through external channels to this Local Plan and through external modes of funding.
REF058	Sport England	Policy ST57 – Active Travel supported	Thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST57 - PROMOTING SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND ACTIVE TRAVEL			
REF109	Resident	The Government's ambition to make cycling and walking the natural choice for all shorter journeys or as part of a longer journey by 2040 is only an ambition and should therefore not be the only course of action to reduce traffic. There are no details as to how the travel plan is expected to work and in some locations, it will not reduce traffic as the local plan predicts it will. Minimising single occupancy car travel will be difficult to implement as people travel at different times to various locations and with Covid, car sharing isn't advisable.	Where improvements to the existing road infrastructure are required as part of a new development in the Local Plan, then these will be detailed within the relevant planning policies for the proposed development site. Where a proposed development triggers the need for a Travel Plan to accompany a planning application, then this will detail how that particular scheme will seek to deliver or incorporate sustainable travel options.
REF110	Resident	The desire to improve links with other areas such as Goosemore recreation area and Retford Town is commendable but it shows no methodology of how this could be done Improvements for cycle traffic and pedestrians	The Retford Walking and Cycling audit has been prepared to help inform the Local Plan about the quality, quality and accessibility of the existing walking and cycling infrastructure around Retford. In addition, where new development can improve the network on and offsite it will be identified within relevant site allocation policies. Other, wider improvements, identified will largely be delivered through external channels to this Local Plan and through external modes of funding.
REF176	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	It is very positive to see plans to encourage cycling and greener methods of transport.	Thank you for your comments.
REF170	A&D Architecture	12) Policy ST56 and ST57 should be modified to safeguard pedestrians against inappropriate cyclist speeds on shared networks by modifying the text of subsection B1 (Policy ST56) and B7(Policy ST57) as follows: Policy ST57: "B 7 Measures to facilitate and encourage safe access by cycle and foot including measures to calm cycle speeds where these might otherwise endanger pedestrians"	The technical specification of all new multi-use paths is agreed with the Local Highways Authority. This includes ensuring that the speed is appropriate. This is a detailed matter and will form part of the proposals considered at planning application stage.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST58 - SAFEGUARDED LAND			
REF214	Historic England	Policy ST58: Safeguarded Land - Historic England has concerns in respect of the approach to the historic environment in relation to the proposals and Policies relating to Peaks Hill Farm and Bassetlaw Garden Village which link to this policy. We note the policy requires proposals to have regard to other policies within the Plan which would include historic environment elements and that provision is welcomed.	Safeguarded land has been designated to support the implementation of new critical or strategic infrastructure or regeneration. These will be subject to review and other policies within the Local Plan. Any change to these designations will also be subject to public consultation through a review of the Local Plan.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST59 - DIGITAL INFRASTRUCTURE			
REF040	Misterton Parish Council	Page 174, para 12.2.6 Should read 'fibre to the kerb' not 'curb'!	Supporting text amended accordingly.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST59 - DIGITAL INFRASTRUCTURE			
1670589	Resident	12.2.1 Access to digital technologies is supported – and will be a significant strand to enable Small Rural Settlements to accommodate home working, supporting the need for increased expansion of housing in these settlements.	Thank you for your comments. Your support is noted.
REF052	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	BDC must do all it can to support the roll-out of fibre in rural areas: the Coronavirus pandemic has shown how important it is for education, employment, leisure, and keeping in touch with relatives and friends (to name but a few). Rural communities have been disadvantaged in all of these because of poor services in their communities. Para 12.2.6 Should read 'fibre to the kerb' not 'curb'!	Comments noted. Supporting text amended accordingly.
REF208	P&DG on behalf of Welbeck Estate	Suggest that consideration must be given throughout the policy wording to the specific conditions and limitations presented within rural Bassetlaw to deliver the means of the policy requirements via conventional means. Heritage and landscape constraints are just two of the potential reasons. It is suggested that the policy must be written subject to the proof that they can be viably and practically delivered in the specific context of the proposals concerned. There must be an ability in the policy wording for the applicant to demonstrate if such conditions are unsuitable to deliver the policy aspirations (in part or full).	Impact of delivering the policy requirements in the rural area is addressed by A1c. Part B ensures that if the provisions of the policy are not practical or economically viable that an alternative approach can be considered. This would include for heritage or landscape reasons.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST60 - PROVISION AND DELIVERY OF INFRASTRUCTURE			
REF003	Canal & River	As explained previously, significant new developments in the vicinity of the canal network place extra liabilities and burdens upon the waterway infrastructure and it is therefore essential that appropriate contributions are secured from developers, where necessary, in order to mitigate the impact of new development on the Trust's assets. We welcome the account given in paragraph policy ST60 that developer contributions will be required to meet the infrastructure requirements of new development, which should account for the potential demands on the wider walking and cycling network in proximity to new development sites.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
1656935	Resident	The planning around new housing developments in Harworth and Bircotes, with lack of consideration towards the infrastructure of the town, has been nothing short of ridiculous. On the recent consultation calls, we were informed that the already agreed housing developments had all been approved on individual merit, yet nobody has looked at the larger implications and needs that 2000 new homes will bring. We simply will not have enough school spaces for young children in our area, and post 16 provision is non existent. Yet the new school agreed for the development at the colliery site has been removed from planning. The council have also agreed to 3 new schools, none of which are in HandB. A delegate on the consultation call spoke of families having to transport children to separate schools in neighbouring villages. This is quite simply unacceptable and will drive people from the area, rather than attract and build what should be a great town to live in! As mentioned in another item, the leisure and retail opportunities in the town are not fit for purpose when considering all of the new housing as a whole, rather than individual developments. There are clear links between lack of opportunities and anti-social behaviour which we do not want to see increase in the town. It is abundantly clear to see that proactive actions must be taken NOW to support the growth of Harworth and Bircotes, rather than reacting to shortages in infrastructure down the line.	The development around Harworth Bircotes has come via speculative planning proposals and have not formed part of a comprehensive Local Plan. This is the result of the Core Strategy being out of date and the Site Allocations document not being adopted by the Council back in 2011. The emerging Local Plan recognises the recent development within Harworth Bircotes and does not seek to allocate any additional growth whilst other developments are still being built out. If further development is required in Harworth in the future then this can come through a review of the Local Plan once it is adopted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST60 - PROVISION AND DELIVERY OF INFRASTRUCTURE			
1661418	Resident	<p>Policy ST60 requires developers to consider infrastructure requirements for all development. How can the council support large scale developments at Trinity Farm, Ordsall south and the garden village when the road system in Retford cannot support current traffic volume through the town, especially when there is a hold up on the A1. Traffic is regularly backed up on North Road, Arlington Way, Amcott Way, Babworth Road and London Road to name but a few. Without a major new bypass for Retford these hold ups will become a permanent feature of our town with this degree of concentrated new development.</p> <p>I am surprised that the council is supporting a new garden village which would adversely affect many Retford residents when the similar proposal for Gamston Airport failed to gain support. This proposal would just become joined to Retford. before we know it Retford and Worksop will end up merging thus losing our identity. Surely multiple small scale developments throughout the district including all villages would help dissipate traffic concentration?</p>	<p>Where development causes an impact to existing infrastructure, then it is appropriate for the Council to seek either physical improvements to infrastructure or through financial contributions.</p> <p>These will vary between development and depending on their impact. All infrastructure improvements as part of the Local Plan are detailed within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
REF040	Misterton Parish Council	<p>Page 176, para 12.3.5</p> <p>Add other healthcare providers, e.g., Doncaster & Bassetlaw Teaching Hospital NHS FT and Primary Care Networks (as we move towards integrated care, and universities/colleges</p>	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF101	East Markham Parish Council	<p><i>Written in reference to the January 2020 DLP</i></p> <p>Provision and delivery of infrastructure needs to be based around size of the housing in any given development rather than amount of housing. 10, 3 bed room houses fall within ST52 but 9, 5 bedroom houses do not. Yet the latter will have a bigger impact on the infrastructure of the village.</p>	The delivery of infrastructure will vary between developments depending on their impact to existing infrastructure and what is required to mitigate or improve issues caused by the development.
REF142	Retford Branch Labour Party	<p>Building Better Public Services</p> <p>In evaluating the Plan, we have done so under the following three principles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investing in education to ensure good school places for everyone • Expand local health services for residents • A Plan for better sports facilities, community spaces, broadband, leisure facilities. <p>Although we recognise that some areas may be beyond the immediate remit of Bassetlaw District Council, we strongly feel that the Plan must at least consider and discuss the implications of housing on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policing numbers in Retford, recognising that the town does not presently have cells or a proper police station. - School places (both at primary and secondary level) - Health facilities - Transport infrastructure (see note above) - Leisure facilities <p>If the projected growth of Retford is to occur, then the Plan must require consideration of impacts on all public services. No development should be allowed to increase the strain on any of our services beyond that seen in 2020. We expect the Plan to be measured against:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The number of police per person - The number of GPs per person - The number of school places per person <p>We do note provisions for Digital infrastructure. We insist however that minimum connection speeds for internet access be included in all future homes. This may include a requirement of fibre to the home (rather than fibre to the cabinet).</p>	<p>The Local Plan and its proposed development can only provide improved infrastructure as a direct result from its proposed growth. Infrastructure is often delivered in two ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Through onsite or offsite physical infrastructure such as green spaces, new roads, schools, land acquisition; or 2. Through a financial contribution towards existing infrastructure – this often occurs for highways, health or education. <p>All infrastructure required to deliver the proposed growth in Bassetlaw is detailed within the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST60 - PROVISION AND DELIVERY OF INFRASTRUCTURE			
1671189	Resident	<p>Other infrastructure and community and recreation facilities provision is also welcomed. While I recognise that a good deal of this will be delivered later in the plan period or even beyond this plan period, I would advocate an 'infrastructure first' approach, prioritising delivery of key pieces of infrastructure (such as road links) early on in the development process can be critical in achieving a positive response from the existing local community. Although the need for affordable housing is recognised and, based on recent delivery rates, is always a challenge in Bassetlaw, consideration should be given to back-loading affordable housing in the phasing process to allow infrastructure delivery.</p>	<p>The majority of the larger development sites will be phased alongside the delivery of infrastructure. Affordable housing and other housing types will also be delivered in phases.</p>
1671475	Resident	<p>Retford has already seen large estates, such as the Kenilworth Nurseries Site off London Road, being developed without community facilities.</p> <p>Provision of a school, a meeting place and a play area is crucial in any future developments of this size. 230 houses in a cul-de-sac development without facilities is not a community.</p>	<p>These developments have provided contributions via a financial contribution. The details of which will be provided within a Section 106 agreement between the Council and the developer.</p>
REF052	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>Page 176, para 12.3.5</p> <p>Add other healthcare providers, eg Doncaster & Bassetlaw Teaching Hospital NHS FT and Primary Care Networks (as we move towards integrated care, and universities/colleges).</p>	<p>Noted. Thank you for your comment.</p>
REF054	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>School places.</p> <p>This has been discussed on many occasions however I feel I need to register my concerns about school places which are currently stretched and therefore will become more so in the life of the plan. I am aware that NCC have done work on this however I do think it needs to be challenged more robustly as we already know that children are being split in families where one child goes to one school and a sibling another. This is unacceptable now. I also have families where children are being driven out to the village schools as well as children coming and going from one of the town to the other due to ongoing short supply of places.</p>	<p>The Council consults with the education authority on the proposed growth and allocations throughout the process. The education authority provide details of where additional education provision is needed. This is not always delivered via a new school, it can come through financial contributions towards providing additional capacity at existing schools across the District.</p>
REF189	NHS Bassetlaw CCG	<p>We welcome that the November 2020 plan recognises the requirement to make sufficient provision for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • physical infrastructure: including for flood risk, transport, telecommunications, security, water supply and wastewater; • social infrastructure: including that for education and health; and • green infrastructure: including open spaces, habitat and wildlife creation and measures to address climate change mitigation and adaptation. <p>Appreciating the plan identifies that the 'Council will work with partners such as the Local Highways Authority, Highways England, the Local Education Authority, the utility companies, Nottinghamshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust, and neighbouring local authorities to anticipate and bring forward the necessary infrastructure that is required in order to deliver Policy ST1'. However Nottinghamshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust are just one health partner that delivers community services, Doncaster and Bassetlaw Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust delivers secondary care, and GPs delivery primary care commissioned by the CCG</p>	<p>Noted. Thank you for your comment.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST60 - PROVISION AND DELIVERY OF INFRASTRUCTURE			
REF198 Bevercotes	Gladman Developments	<p>4.15.1 Gladman note the proposed approach towards infrastructure provision that is set out through Policy ST52. It is intended that the identified infrastructure set out in the Bassetlaw Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be provided through a combination of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), Developer Contributions, and appropriate funding assistance from Council's, central Government and funding partners.</p> <p>4.15.2 The allocation of Bevercotes Colliery as an additional Priority Regeneration Area can provide the necessary mitigation 'across the board' and mitigation measures can be included as part of appropriate conditions or planning obligations associated with the redevelopment of the site where necessary.</p> <p>4.15.3 Furthermore, Gladman highlight that the regeneration of Bevercotes Colliery for employment uses offers the opportunity to deliver improved highway and junction access to the A1 network along the B6387 at the Twyford Bridge junction.</p>	Noted. Thank you for your comment.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	EVIDENCE BASE DOC	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
GARDEN VILLAGE VISION AND MASTERPLAN				
REF202	Savills on behalf of land owner	Bassetlaw Garden Village Vision Document and Masterplan	Draft Garden Village Vision Statement (Status) Note from the draft Vision Statement that it is not a detailed masterplan, but is the 'first step in providing certainty and confidence alongside the indicative density of different parts of the development' – to shape a design that is flexible whilst of a suitably high quality. This is welcome, albeit there are some essential amendments relating to phasing and flexibility which we will come on to make. The point here is the ambiguity over the status of the Vision Document and process involved. i.e. are the council envisaging a formal SPD process (as set out at paragraph 5.3.42) and adoption or will it instead form part of the evidence base for the plan/ a matter for discussion and agreement with the developer party which paragraph 5.3.41 appears to state. Our preference would be for the latter and clearly we would appreciate clarification before we proceed to marketing. We note that the timing for the masterplan framework has been given a target date for completion in 2025. Note the wording now states by 2025 picking up on our earlier comments so it supported and appreciated. The fundamental point to make is one of phasing. Throughout our discussions to date we have discussed that my client is only able to commit to the release of land north of the 'old' line of Mansfield Road pre-2037 due to the operational needs of the farm. A plan setting this out is attached: Figure 1 – Land release south of Mansfield Road pre-2037 (black line) c. 5Ha net developable. Secondly, we note that throughout the pretext of the policy there is a continued commitment to a number of design features, including reference to hitting a range of specific number targets. While we agree to these principles the wording seems to infer that these components will be delivered rather than the aspirational concepts they are at this stage. To better reflect the status of the masterplan it should be highlighted throughout that this is an 'initial' masterplan with explicit explanatory text stating that it is not prohibitive to other masterplans being developed as we progress the scheme in greater detail. This will allow flexibility to be built in to the scheme, which as detailed within the plan is a long term prospect which will adapt and change as we progress. The inclusion of the 'aspirational concept' masterplan to help better reflect the stage we are at. We do note however that the initial masterplan has been included within the Garden Village Vision Statement and that this document more frequently refers to the initial masterplan. It would therefore be useful to reflect this to a greater extent within the Local Plan itself and clearly clarify the status of the masterplan.	The Vision Statement will be adopted as a Council policy document to inform the progression of the Local Plan. The Vision Statement is clear that only land to the north of the old line of Mansfield Road will be released in this plan period. Through the Bassetlaw Garden Village Consultative Group the design principles have been agreed as being necessary to deliver the additionality sought by a Garden Village. It is appropriate that these are reflected in policy. The policy states that a developer-led masterplan framework will be required providing the necessary detail to inform the decision making process.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	EVIDENCE BASE DOC	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
GARDEN VILLAGE VISION AND MASTERPLAN				
REF217	Sport England		Confirm Sport England's support. The statement specifically includes active Design and active travel. New strategy being launched in the next week or so will have as one of its main pillars the concept of an Active Environment which is a banner for all of the elements listed. The vision requires that the community is easily able to walk/cycle to a range of..... understand that you are already involved in pulling together a guidance document with the TCPA/SE and others on the 20 minute neighbourhoods which will be launched on 26th March. The vision also fits around this concept.	Support noted and welcome.
REF226	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust		The text seems to cover what is needed, as are aiming for 40% GI, but should make it clear that wildlife habitats should meet the 30% of land for wildlife by 2030 target , and that GI figures should not count sports pitches in meeting 30%. Note that 20% BNG is also in there as a target. Believe the target could be more ambitious, as most of the land is currently arable and so low biodiversity value. Advocate 30% to be consistent. Do not think it is clear enough that the developer should put aside large commuted sums for the long term management of the habitats as wildlife-rich greenspace , in the same way as they have to put money up for a station for example, so that could be stronger. Wood pasture is an extremely important habitat in the area (like the SAC) and that this should form part of the habitats created as well as species rich grasslands and woodlands, to guide what would be suitable. SAC and SPA are recognising that they will need an HRA, but in fact it may actually be an AA.	The Council supports the Wildlife Trusts aspirations for nature recovery. The Garden Village will make a significant contribution to supporting the nature recovery network by providing for 40% green/blue infrastructure. However, it is an aspiration for at least 30% of our land and sea to be connected and protected for nature's recovery by 2030, and not a national policy requirement. This provision would lead to viability concerns. 20% biodiversity net gain is the level that is financially viable on site. The management and maintenance arrangements are still to be confirmed but it is a requirement of other policies in the plan that new green infrastructure is appropriately maintained. Wood pasture is recognised and the reference to appropriate assessment added to the Local plan policy.
REF193	Savills on behalf of land owner	Bassetlaw Garden Village Vision Document	The preparation of a standalone Vision document is welcomed and it is an important tool in explaining the Garden Village concept. The comments above about policies ST3, ST4 and ST5 are also relevant in the context of the Vision. It would be useful to clarify the status of the Vision document and its relationship with the Local Plan going forward to ensure that there is a clear and consistent message about the development of the Garden Village. This is essential to encourage delivery in a timely manner.	The Vision Statement will be adopted as a Council policy document to inform the progression of the Local Plan.

The Bassetlaw Local Plan – Statement of Consultation

Local Plan Focussed Consultation 2021 (June Consultation)

The following table includes the representations received during the consultation and the responses provided by the Council to address them. Where necessary, the Council's response identifies the changes which would be made for the following iteration of the Plan as a result of the submitted representations.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST6: Worksop Central			
REF030	WSP on behalf of The Priory Shopping Centre	<p>We previously submitted representations to the last draft Bassetlaw Local Plan consultation (dated 13 January 2021) and commented on draft Policy ST6 as the wording of the policy did not require a sequential assessment to be undertaken in respect of main town centre uses proposed outside of the town centre (ie in the Worksop Central area). We highlighted that draft Policy ST6 was, therefore, contrary to the NPPF and draft Policy ST14. As part of these representations, we urged the Council to make amendments to the wording of the policy to require a sequential assessment to be undertaken if main town centre uses were proposed in the Worksop Central designated area in line with draft Policy ST14. We note that the Council have taken into account our representations and included additional wording to ensure that main town centre uses proposed within the Worksop Central area are in line with draft Policy ST14. On this basis, we do not have any further comments on the draft Bassetlaw Local Plan, however, if the Council undertake any additional consultations on the Development Plan and/or the draft Local Plan is submitted to the Inspector, we wish to remain involved in the consultation process.</p>	The Council will continue to work on the detail of the policies moving forward. The DPD will be consistent with national and local planning policy.
REF052	NCC – Planning Policy Team	<p>Section 5.4.7 (page 4) is supported: “Integral to the regeneration is the delivery of an integrated area wide transport strategy. It aims to reduce traffic in the area and improve the traffic flow to and through Worksop Central. Providing a well-connected network of walking and cycling routes will encourage greater use to reach everyday services, whilst the re-configuration of the road network in places will ensure that public transport routes are more direct and convenient promoting greater use. Strategic highways interventions will manage traffic flow more efficiently.” Section 10 of the Policy relating to public transport is supported: “The provision of an integrated area-wide transport network to improve the safe movement of people and vehicles through the area including; managing the impact of traffic on the local road network, enhancement of public transport connectivity, improvements to Worksop railway station, and a comprehensive network of walking and cycling routes to provide good connectivity for active travel”</p>	The Council is currently preparing a Transport Assessment for Worksop Central. This will detail the necessary issues and mitigation required in relation to the proposed sites identified in the DPD area.
REF055	ID Planning on behalf of Lidl	<p>Lidl support the identification of the Worksop Central area and future Worksop Central DPD to guide delivery of regeneration and future development within the central area. We deal with the extent of the Worksop Central Area definition on the Proposals Inset Map for Worksop further below.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.4.5 – Lidl support the Council’s recognition of the issues facing the town’s core as experienced across the UK and the desire to re-focus and purpose the town’s core to provide a more mixed use approach to future development with a range of uses including commercial, leisure, tourism, education and cultural facilities.</p> <p>Policy ST6, Paragraph A - At the outset Lidl support the identification of Worksop Central, including their land interests off Carlton Road / Blyth Road, as a Priority Regeneration Area.</p> <p>Policy ST6, Criteria 2 – Lidl support the ambition to see a wide range of uses come forward within the Central Worksop area.</p> <p>Policy ST6, Criteria 3 – Lidl support the emphasis given to the re-use of underused or vacant land. Lidl’s land interests in Central Worksop incorporate a brownfield site which is in need of regeneration and is currently unattractive, run down in appearance and has been the subject of some previous development works to commence delivery of a new superstore, which was never completed. Consequently, the site (W53) is in need of investment and regeneration.</p>	Thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST6: Worksop Central			
REF063	CCG NHS Bassetlaw	<p>The provision of at least 660 dwellings by 2037 to provide an appropriate mix of house types, sizes and tenures to achieve a balanced and inclusive community;</p> <p>The provision of commercial, education, health, employment, retail, community and other main town centre uses and temporary uses, of a suitable scale to meet identified needs, subject to the provisions of Policy ST14. As per the original consultation the document identifies that the 'Council will work with partners such as the Local Highways Authority, Highways England, the Local Education Authority, the utility companies, Nottinghamshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust, and neighbouring local authorities to anticipate and bring forward the necessary infrastructure that is required in order to deliver Policy ST1'. However Nottinghamshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust are just one health partner that delivers community services, there are a range of other community providers, Doncaster and Bassetlaw Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust delivers secondary care, and GPs delivery primary medical care commissioned by the CCG. The National Planning Policy Framework sets out two key tests that should be applied when considering proposals for main town centre uses which are not in an existing town centre, namely the sequential test and the impact assessment. Both are designed to ensure that development does not undermine the health of existing town centres. Any developments in the Worksop area will put significant pressure on health services in Worksop.</p> <p>Worksop has two main GP practices delivering services to the local population, Larwood Health Partnerships and Newgate Medical Centre. Larwood Health Partnerships deliver services from five sites and have recently benefited from an extension to their main site premises, and investment in two of their branch sites). Larwood Health partnerships have practice bases at the main site in Larwood, Carlton, Langold, Harworth and Manton. Newgate Medical Centre deliver services from one main site in the town centre of Worksop, the practice is currently undergoing some internal reconfiguration to increase clinical space, however, using the NHS England space estimator this will only allow for meeting current demand and not for growth. The CCG is working closely with BDC NHS England and NHS Improvement to agree delivery of a new build site adjacent to the existing building.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The Council will continue to work with the NHS through the development of the DPD. The DPD will be supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Schedule so further detail about new or enhanced infrastructure will be detailed within these documents.</p>
1857992	BDC Councillor	<p>I welcome the provision of safe cycling routes through the centre of Worksop. It is a priority for me to provide the North-South cycle route - roughly aligned with Carlton rd and along Bridge St and on to Sparkenhill. Ideally, a cycle way should be separate from the road way and separate from pedestrian paths. This is safer and limits potential conflict with traffic/pedestrians. However, where space is limited a shared use path could be provided - perhaps along Carlton Rd. I accept that one way to get a cycle route onto Bridge St could be by allowing one way traffic. There is an East-west route in form of NCN 6, however, this could be improved and development of the Priory Centre site could open up possibilities for a better canal side route and maybe a cycle/foot bridge over the canal into the priory centre car park.</p>	<p>The regeneration of Worksop Central will include improvements to Green Infrastructure which will include new and enhancements to footpaths and cycle provision across the area.</p> <p>A Green Infrastructure Strategy will be produced that will detail the enhancements moving forward.</p>
1859314	Resident	<p>Page 4-5: The provision of at least 660 dwellings by 2037 is unrealistic, we can not meet local need now in relation to resources required for a growing community, lack of medical care, health centres, school places . We do not have the infrastructure to deal with the increase in traffic. We can not manage our flooding issues currently. Putting housing on every available vacant space, carpark existing buildings is not the answer to town centre regeneration. The plan lacks vision and innovation which takes into account modern day living and the increased use of information technology which is affecting the small business growth in our town. Whilst we continue to increase the number of supermarket suppliers we introduce into one area we will effectively destroy our town centre small business regeneration.</p>	<p>The level of growth is seen as appropriate and a sustainable way to regenerate brownfield sites within Worksop. There is enough suitable land available to accommodate this growth and the Council will prepare an Infrastructure Plan that will detail what infrastructure is required and how this will be delivered throughout the plan period.</p>
REF005	Chesterfield Borough Council	<p>I have reviewed the focussed consultation document and have no specific comments other than to support the clear and positive reference to the Chesterfield Canal in Policy ST6 Worksop Central.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST6: Worksop Central			
		I look forward to the forthcoming consultation on the full Draft Plan, and to continue to work with you on strategic and cross boundary planning matters via the Local Plan Liaison Group.	
REF007	Resident	<p>This council are a joke you keep building more houses in a small town with no amenities to cater for all these extra people parents are struggling to get child places here even though they have been worksop residents all their life not enough schools not enough doctors and a hospital which is not used to it's full potential I am 62 with health problems and am constantly having to travel for treatment we have a town centre which is not being used to it's full potential and becoming a no go area this council need to start earning their big wages by doing what's best for worksop residents rather than ignoring them and going ahead anyway</p> <p>Yours sincerely a very angry lifelong resident</p>	The level of growth is seen as appropriate and a sustainable way to regenerate brownfield sites within Worksop. There is enough suitable land available to accommodate this growth and the Council will prepare an Infrastructure Plan that will detail what infrastructure is required and how this will be delivered throughout the plan period.
REF027	Network Rail	<p>In relation to the above and the recent consultation Network Rail have only one comment to make. This is in relation to revised Policy ST6 (Worksop Central). We support the revised policy and the continued inclusion of a commitment to seek improvements to public transport connectivity and in particular improvements to Worksop station as part of the proposed DPD.</p>	Thank you for your comments.
REF028	Resident	<p>Thank you both for your very informed presentation to us in the Rotary Club last Tuesday. This rekindled somewhat my youthful past enthusiasm for my Planning professional working time in Sheffield and Private Consultancy, although I have been out of the loop now for over 25 years!! Still, as I now consider the present to be a unique and un-precedented time to promote many environmental ideals due to the major sea-changes in our lives due to Covid, changing shopping habits, and renewed demands for environmental improvements/ air quality, we maybe have a chance of making REAL changes to our WORKSOP TOWN CENTRE. I was fortunate enough to have met Patrick Lutjens, Wynne Thomas and other early Planning pioneers, promoting the need for greater environmental quality in our living and working environments, perhaps only really achieved in the New Towns where they worked, and where Planners could start from scratch and segregate quality environmental spaces from vehicular access pressures and needs! In existing towns and Cities the high cost of acquiring land, especially by Compulsory Purchase, really precluded the opportunity to make what I would call real environmental changes.</p> <p>Not any more! Land is only worth what you can use it for? Due to IT considerations, now many retail needs are being satisfied 'On-line'. People mostly prefer to do weekly food shopping in supermarkets by car for convenience, and you have here acknowledged this trend by approving new supermarkets on the periphery of the Centre in locations easily accessible to the Region. Also sadly, however, much 'Open Countryside' land has been allocated to new housing, a large part unsympathetic to the villages that have been expanded, and present a totally different character, with a large part of new residents now being commuters; traditional village community life is becoming severely compromised I would suggest from experience! BUT, although housing need/ land allocation has recently been a priority of government and the Council, brown field land should ideally always be used first, and I would contend that a major source could now be found or created in the Town Centre.</p> <p>I know you will have done a lot of work on current population demographics; the needs and aspirations of different groups within our present population? It is one in particular that I now can speak for with first-hand knowledge. The oldest end of the spectrum; the aged and retired. Many of this group have time on their hands and also, very importantly if they have made wise provision, more money to spend on everyday living. Their families have flown, need downgrading of their dwellings to something smaller, and many prefer to be less reliant on using private motor cars! With the large demise of department stores as a key function of the High Street, we need a new approach to regenerate the Centre as a major public asset or amenity? In your presentation you alluded to the need of more small 'boutique' or custom retail units, together with various forms of leisure outlets such as restaurants,</p>	<p>The level of growth is seen as appropriate and a sustainable way to regenerate brownfield sites within Worksop. There is enough suitable land available to accommodate this growth and the Council will prepare an Infrastructure Plan that will detail what infrastructure is required and how this will be delivered throughout the plan period.</p> <p>The DPD also include various interventions to help regenerate the town centre, including the retail area of Bridge Street. This is a comprehensive regeneration strategy and will be delivered through a combination of ways including working with the community, businesses and external organisations.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST6: Worksop Central		<p>cafes, pubs and entertainments - all set in a high amenity Centre environment, perhaps with traffic limited to essential service only? Agreed, but we do not want all the periphery parking to the Centre to be developed for housing say, if visitors from the Region are going to then be denied easy access to this new Community Centre. A large part of the community, especially those with spending power, will not use public transport; the car is more convenient and fast. Other public assets such as the Library, cinema , Council offices etc. as you stated are all retained close to the High Street and easily accessible by foot (or other mobility forms). Why can't we plan, therefore, for some older persons' housing adjacent to this main High Street spine? The retail facade and character of the High Street could be retained and enhanced with infill to scale, some offices and banks retained as local services, and new housing over or behind, perhaps grouped around private environmental and pedestrian courts? Retail and housing servicing could be provided from the rear within a 'box' highway approach, and the High Street would then become a place to MUST VISIT, with its central space used for markets, craft displays/markets, entertainment, fairs etc. A great place for everyone to meet, especially the elderly, to natter with friends and occupy the cafes, etc., and also enjoy and spend time in the small shops. With our climate, however, some form of shelter would be necessary throughout street length for it to work!</p> <p>All right in theory you might say, but could it be done in practice? Well, despite all the development complexities of separate private ownerships, the value of this Town Centre land is perhaps now perhaps at its lowest ever in real terms, and owners/developers will be sympathetic to any sort of regeneration plan that will improve their current low returns. Charity shops, desirable as some might be in the right place, do not provide a satisfactory rental for what should be a Class 'A' frontage? Could a High Street Development Plan be devised that could sell such a radical strategy to the benefit of everybody? I suggest its a case of now or never - conditions have never offered such an opportunity before, apart from say specific Action Areas say in major Cities. What do you think? Fact or Fiction?</p>	
POLICY ST11: Existing Employment Sites			

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST11: Existing Employment Sites			
REF029	BDC Councillor	<p>Policy ST11 p6</p> <p>A. The following Existing Employment Sites, as shown on the Policies Map, are important drivers for the District's economy and will be safeguarded for new or additional E(g), B2, B8 development or for small-scale ancillary uses required to support employment development:</p> <p>EES12 Randall Way, Retford</p> <p>EES13 Hallcroft Industrial Estate, Retford</p> <p>EES14 Thrumpton Goods Yard, Retford</p> <p>EES15 Thrumpton Lane, Retford</p> <p>EES16 West Carr Industrial Estate, Retford</p> <p>None of these existing sites are in South Ward, and no specific South Ward Employment Site has been earmarked.</p>	<p>Existing and proposed employment sites will serve the needs of the whole community.</p> <p>Although there may not be employment sites falling specifically within the Retford South Ward there are existing and proposed sites with good accessibility close, including within the built up area of the town.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST11: Existing Employment Sites			
REF050	Stone Planning Service	<p>The need to safeguard existing employment sites is recognised but with changing trends it does not always present the right type of premises for all end users. As has been witnessed by both Brexit and COVID 19, customer attitudes can change quite dramatically and rapidly. For example the growth in online shopping has taken the industry by surprise such that new ways of working, particularly in logistics, are evolving rapidly. Other changes, such as the impacts of Artificial Intelligence, will evolve over the life of the Plan and inevitably some of the safeguarded employment sites will no longer be suitable. Hence, coupled with Policy ST11 there needs to be support for the wider employment prospects ie storage and distribution on A1 corridor, sites like Markham Moor that are infrastructure ready.</p> <p>The latest Quarterly Report by Deep Insights analyses tends and notes the forthcoming challenges and opportunities to raising economic prosperity. Transitioning to a low-carbon economy. Levelling up. Adapting for a digital age. Solving a housing crisis. Rethinking high streets. Reconfiguring for an ageing population.</p> <p>It also identifies a number of key areas and trends</p> <p>"With people returning to workplaces, the offices subsector saw a large bounce in activity in Q2. However high-street and out-of-town retail remains in the doldrums as Covid-19 cases increase again".</p> <p>"The warehousing sector has now averaged £500m per month for 6 months as Brexit and the online revolution drive changing behaviour."</p> <p>Economic focus will transform over the life of the Plan, and it needs to be adaptive to change. We consider that the suitability of some of the protected sites cannot be relied upon to engage in these changes. Other more flexible sites need to be identified.</p>	<p>Bassetlaw contains a wide variety of existing employment sites in a range of locations which provide a diverse stock of buildings in terms of size, type and condition.</p> <p>The Council is supporting the development at the strategic Apleyhead Junction site Situated adjacent to the A1/A57 junction at the eastern gateway to Worksop, Apleyhead junction provides a significant opportunity capable of accommodating employment uses. Given its location, the site would be attractive for logistics and distribution. It is capable of attracting high quality occupiers, or very large single occupiers with a choice of location, and/or large scale uses in the B2 or B8 classes.</p> <p>The Council is also supporting land at the former High Marnham Power Station as a long-term opportunity for specific employment uses within the renewable energy and low carbon technology sectors and their supply chain, making a significant contribution to this D2N2 growth sector. This will aid the transition to a low carbon economy.</p> <p>Part C of Policy ST11 establishes criteria for assessing proposals for the change of use or redevelopment of an existing employment site or buildings to a non-employment uses.</p>
REF070	Rapleys on behalf of Dooba Development Limited	<p>The draft Policy ST11 proposes to allocate the Sandy Lane Industrial Estate - within which the Vesuvius site is located - as an Existing Employment Site (Ref. EES002), whereby land is to be safeguarded for development that either falls within Use Classes E(g), B2 and B8, or is small-scale and ancillary in supporting such development. While it is encouraging that Policy ST11 does seek to allow non-conforming small-scale ancillary development on Existing Employment Sites, the policy in more general terms is considered to be too restrictive and in conflict with the Government's intention of amending the Use Classes Order. This concern is elaborated on below.</p> <p>As Officers will be aware, the Government introduced the new 'Commercial, Business and Service' Use Class E in September 2020 in order to simplify the system of Use Classes in England. The intention behind this was to provide businesses with the additional flexibility to enable them to adapt and diversify, in order to meet changing demands. The amendment to the Use Classes Order was, however, brought forward at great pace more directly as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic and the consequent need to support businesses and stimulate economic activity. Despite this, and prior to the pandemic, the principle of Use Class reform was mooted for many years, as it was evident that the established Order was both incapable of capturing current and future retail models, and inadequate in allowing businesses to diversify and incorporate ancillary uses.</p> <p>Whilst wider in scope than anticipated, the new Class E has provided businesses (which includes, as in the case of our client, the owners and managers of commercial property) the opportunity to adapt to changing market conditions, with the benefit of greater planning certainty, helping them to remain</p>	<p>Policy to be revised to take into account changes to UCO, abolition of Class B1 and introduction of the new E Class.</p> <p>To enable flexibility for business operation, it is recognised that complementary and ancillary uses to support employment uses can be appropriate where they provide employment, adding to the character, mix and vitality of the designated employment areas.</p> <p>As offices, research and development and light industrial uses now fall under use class E together with retail and other main town centre uses, this may result in unintended consequence where they could undermine the Local Plan policy objective to protect the retailing function of the town centres. A proliferation of retail uses on existing employment sites will therefore will be resisted, with the exception of small scale ancillary uses supplementing the predominantly employment provision.</p> <p>It may be necessary to impose planning conditions to restrict movement within use class E. Determination will be made on a case by case basis.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST11: Existing Employment Sites		<p>viable against a number of challenges that include the growth of online shopping and the consequent impact on footfall and trading. Therefore, by embracing the flexibility that Class E offers, especially by embedding its principles in planning policy, it is possible to add to the vitality of an existing business or property asset, thus improving on its overall viability in the long term.</p> <p>While high streets and town centres are likely to benefit the most from the changes to the Use Classes Order, the potential opportunities for edge of centre and out of centre locations should not go unrecognised. Rather, there should be provision within policy to enable opportunities in these locations where appropriate. It is with this premise in mind that the proposed draft Policy ST11 is not supported as it seeks to sustain an age-old approach to employment land, that can no longer be considered relevant in the context of the new Use Classes Order. In its current wording, the policy makes the outdated assumption that only uses falling within the former Class B (B1/B2/B8) are employment generating and are thus 'employment' uses, which is plainly not the case in an economy that is so heavily reliant on the commercial, business and service sectors.</p> <p>In addition to this, the policy neglects the fact that there are many uses that fall within Class E (beyond Class E(g) which the policy allows, consistent with the former B1/B2/B8 grouping) that are complementary to, and more typical of - in terms of their space and access requirements - the former B Class uses. Such uses include the public sale of niche bulky goods, for which specific access and parking arrangements are required to allow for unincumbered trade and delivery; and sports and fitness facilities, for which often modern premises with generous ceiling heights and a continuous floorspace are sought over premises within the town centre. Notwithstanding the provisions set out at part C of the policy, under the current wording, the principle of these uses would not be accepted on Existing Employment Sites, despite them likely being the most appropriate sites on which to be located. This is the inherent flaw of the policy that our client wishes to emphasise. Contrary to what is suggested at paragraph 6.4.2, the policy could therefore potentially hinder the long-term viability of Existing Employment Sites as such a rigid approach is applied in terms of the Use Classes permitted, meaning flexibility is not afforded against unprecedented economic events that dictate market conditions.</p> <p>The amendment to the Order coinciding with the preparation of the new Local Plan, and fundamentally, this Focussed Consultation, presents an opportune period following which the Plan's approach to Existing Employment Sites can be reviewed. It is recommended that the policy is reworded in such a way that the extent of permitted uses falling with Class E is expanded, save for where there are obvious and reasonable concerns surrounding principle and the harm to the District's town centres. In doing so, builds in flexibility for Existing Employment Sites against fluctuating and challenging market conditions over the 15-year plan period to 2037. This approach would still accord with paragraph 20 of the NPPF (which requires strategic policies to make sufficient provision for employment development), as well as the spirit of the Government's intentions in amending the Use Class Order, to introduce the new Class E.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST11: Existing Employment Sites			
1858552	BDC Councillor	<p>Page 7&8- To ensure that well paid jobs remain in the District we must continue to develop our high end vocational training. I am pleased to see that major developments will have to ensure they are involved in a skills plan. Perhaps we need to think imaginatively how we ensure the people undertaking these training posts are genuinely local and not simply apprentices of contractors based in other locations. In terms of supporting local businesses in rural communities I would like to see more emphasis/support for businesses based at home that can also support community infrastructure e.g. I'm aware in local villages of bakers who sell cakes etc from home (and make a living from the endeavour). How do we encourage them to take the next step and physically open a premise in a rural community where other products could also be stocked. This in turn would hopefully reduce car journeys and help vulnerable persons retain community links.</p>	Proposals for small scale rural enterprise from the home that deliver local employment opportunities and diversify the rural economy are supported providing there is no loss of residential amenity to surrounding properties.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST14: Town Centres, Local Centres, Local Shops and Services			
REF029	BDC Councillor	<p>The Plan does note that the development will be so huge (comparing it with the Worksop Peaks Hill - with its new road, and the A1 Morton Garden Village - with its network of new roads and a new railway station) that a new local centre will be created, but shows that no local employment site has been proposed, and there is no significant improved road or rail infrastructure promised.</p>	Although not providing employment specifically in the B use classes the Ordsall South proposal will provide many community benefits including a new local centre, health care hub with services and facilities, a primary school. All these will generate new employment opportunities. The housing will also meet the wider needs of planned employment growth in Retford and other identified areas, such as strategic growth at Apleyhead.
REF055	ID Planning on behalf of Lidl	<p>Policy ST14 – Criteria F –states as follows:</p> <p><i>"Development in the local centres will be supported where they would, on their own or cumulatively with other permitted development, generate no significant harm upon the vitality and viability of that centre, or any other centre in within the hierarchy"</i></p> <p>We object to the wording of Criteria F as the policy test is whether 'significant adverse impact' would arise and not whether a proposal would generate 'no significant harm'.</p> <p>In addition, and provided a proposed development is 'within' the local centre, trading impact on other facilities in that 'local centre' is not a material planning concern as it is located 'within' the centre and therefore in a preferred policy location.</p> <p>In light of the above, the following element should be deleted from the policy wording <i>"generate no significant harm upon the vitality and viability of that centre"</i> and replace that with:</p> <p><i>"on their own or cumulatively with other permitted development not lead to significant adverse impact upon the vitality and viability of other centres within the hierarchy".</i></p>	Criterion F has been amended to more accurately reflect Policy in the NPPF.
1859314	Resident	You will not support future retail and leisure as you suggest whilst you continue to ignore the growth in IT and the support for bigger stores outside of the town. Our town centre needs investment in crime and disorder if there is any hope of attracting people to it.	Out of town retail development which would have an adverse impact on the vitality and viability of town centres is not supported. A key objective of the Local Plan is to support the vitality and viability of the District's town centre, and this is very much reflected in the town centre policies.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST14: Town Centres, Local Centres, Local Shops and Services			
1858084	Resident	<p>Whilst Retford does have an ongoing Town Centre Neighbourhood Policy just getting off the ground, it is extremely concerning that in terms of Bassetlaw there is a large discrepancy in the level of support and monies given to each town. The Worksop Town Centre Master Plan has in the region of £20 million in the budget/proposals, whereas Retford has zero. This is certainly not conducive to ensuring that Retford Town Centre grows as a result of BDC and/or the Bassetlaw Local Plan. I would like to bring this to the attention of officers and the inspector when he/she begins their face to face inspection of the plan.</p>	The Council is equally committed to supporting the vitality and viability of all town centres and communities within the District as considered appropriate in accordance with council objectives and priorities.
1858552	BDC Councillor	<p>Pages 12 & 13- Why does Retford itself not have a master plan in line with Worksop? Although I accept Worksop is larger it is clear from the retail spaces currently unoccupied within Retford Town Centre that a more strategic approach with the full support of Council officers is required.</p>	The Town Centre Masterplan for Retford when made will have the same status and carry the same weight as the Worksop Central DPD. Both will form part of the Development Plan for the District. The Council is supportive of the Retford Town centre NP, which could also draw government funding and support.
REF072	Retford Business Forum & Retford Town Centre Neighbourhood Planning Group	<p>I am responding on behalf of Retford Business Forum (RBF) and the Retford Town Centre Neighbourhood Planning Group (RTCPNG), and you have been kind enough to attend both of our groups, you will have had some direct interaction to give you a flavour of our views.</p> <p>The focus of both RBF and RTCPNG has mainly been on the impact of the Plan on Retford Town Centre and its local area.</p> <p>On the positive side:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RTCPNG, and RBF especially, welcome increased levels of housing in the local area, which would increase the potential customer base for the retail and hospitality organisations in Retford. • RBF also welcomes potential investment into improving local businesses opportunities and infrastructure • RBF and RTCPNG would look forward to receiving investment funds from the developers of the housing relevant to Retford Town Centre in order to enhance the town centre to moderate the potential negative impacts. <p>On the negative side:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RBF and RTCPNG are concerned about large scale residential developments which bring with them the potential for social issues which will play out in the Town Centre. There have been examples of satellite population developments without sufficient social services investment, especially amongst young people, leading to disruptive anti social and criminal consequences for nearby town centres. • Large population increases are likely to provide increased traffic levels to the town centre and this will require investment in highways, car parking and communications to avoid gridlock effects at peaks. • Part of the direction of thinking of RTCPNG is to promote the Green Agenda in the future development of the town, which might include traffic restrictions/exclusions from parts of the town centre, specific cycle and walking tracks, air pollution monitoring, preferential electric car and motorcycle promotions, and car size restrictions along with an ecology corridor and green space developments. • Retford Town Centre provides significant levels of support to the health agenda in both corrective and preventative procedures across the physical, mental and spiritual elements. These services will be put under further pressure by increased levels of population in the surrounding area 	<p>House building is recognized as a key driver of economic growth, as well as providing much needed housing to support sustainable communities. It offers a lifeline to communities that need investment to modernise and thrive. Developer contributions help to provide new facilities, road improvements, and new schools. All this improves the quality of life for residents.</p> <p>The policies in the plan support design of external spaces (such as highways parking areas, gardens and areas of open space to reduce the opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour and facilitates the safe use of these areas by future residents, service providers or visitors.</p> <p>The policies are designed with national guidance in mind. conservation and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment, including landscapes and green infrastructure, and planning measures to address climate change mitigation and adaptation.</p> <p>In accordance with government agenda housing development in appropriate locations in town centres and upper floors is supported.</p> <p>One of the key objectives of the Local Plan is the regeneration of the District's town centres by attracting new uses and investment opportunities.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST14: Town Centres, Local Centres, Local Shops and Services			
		<p>and would benefit from a strategic investment perspective. This may include the creation of relevant zones, adjacencies and repurposing.</p> <p>General comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RTCNPG is seriously considering the potential to encourage commercial companies, currently located within the town centre, whose business could be better located out of town on an industrial estate to relocate. This would free up land space which could be used for high quality accommodation, hospitality, green spaces and affordable housing as well as assisted housing for senior citizens. It is unfortunate that , because of the timing of the plans, this potential will provide housing in excess of the number required for the District. An accessible town centre would seek to reduce the distance between home/work/hospitality/retail. • Retford Town Centre is often not considered for town centre development funding, possibly because it is considered to be in a good state of repair generally. Both RBF and RTCNPG feel that investing in the town centre before it falls into serious disrepair would be more effective and efficient use of funds. There are many buildings and areas in the town centre that would benefit from funding support for refurbishment and others which could be rebuilt appropriately to provide services relevant to the increased future populations. • Education and training ‘ladders’ from local schools to employment, especially self employment, within the Town Centre area will significantly improve the prosperity of the town and will reduce the potential for anti social outcomes from the population increases. This requires investment in these processes and opportunities in the town centre area. 	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST15: Management of Town Centres			
REF008	Retford Civic Society	<p>The revised wording of Policy ST15 is welcome, although the phrase ‘non-Ea use’ will be meaningless to many. Better wording here is desirable. The revised Policy would have only a marginal effect on the introduction of uses within Class E of the Use Classes Order as most central premises are already in such uses. However it should help protect the vitality of the centre by restricting residential use of ground floor premises.</p> <p>This protection should be extended to all the premises around Canon Square by extending the Primary Shopping Area slightly. Canon Square is a very distinctive and attractive part of the town centre and its commercial character should be protected.</p>	The Council will clarify this within the updated version of the Bassetlaw Local Plan
REF043	Resident	<p>Page -14, Para - 2 c</p> <p>The present wording, although welcome, is vague and insufficiently specific.</p> <p>Is it intended to include the improvement of pedestrian and cycle links in Retford town centre similar to those in Harworth & Bircotes (para. 3 c), plus links to adjacent residential and employment areas and community facilities (including schools)? In any case, given that such improvements are vital, an appropriate item should be added.</p>	<p>To improve connectivity and enhance the District’s network, including pedestrian and cycle links the Council will, work with its partners, neighbouring authorities and utilise developer contributions in order to achieve this.</p> <p>Increasing opportunities for accessible and safe walking and cycling is a key priority for the Council. As well as providing walking and cycling routes to and through the larger site</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST15: Management of Town Centres			
			a local improvements, such as measures to enhance connectivity within Worksop, Retford and Harworth & Bircotes town centres by active travel will be taken.
REF059	Environment Agency	<p>Whilst we're really pleased to see "blue-green Infrastructure" referenced (ST6 – Point 6), after this first reference the text appears to go back to just "green infrastructure". We recommend that you amend the following references to highlight the importance of blue-green infrastructure;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy ST15 – D. 1. c) – "providing public realm and green infrastructure improvements" • Policy ST15 – D. 2. b) – "Improving existing public realm and enhancing green infrastructure connectivity;" • Policy ST15 – D. 3. b) – "Improving the public realm and enhanced green infrastructure connectivity" 	The Council will clarify this within the updated version of the Bassetlaw Local Plan where considered appropriate.
1859314	Resident	You will not support future retail and leisure as you suggest whilst you continue to ignore the growth in IT and the support for bigger stores outside of the town. Our town centre needs investment in crime and disorder if there is any hope of attracting people to it.	A key objective of the Local Plan is to enhance the vitality and viability of town centres. Proposals f will be determined in accordance with the policy criteria, and those which will have an adverse effect upon vitality and viability will not be supported.
1858658	Resident	6.8.8- page 12- The plan makes no provision of funds to support the Retford Town Centre plan. That was provided to Worksop.	The Council is equally committed to supporting the vitality and viability of all town centres and communities within the District as considered appropriate in accordance with council objectives and priorities.
REF072	Retford Business Forum & Retford Town Centre Neighbourhood Planning Group	<p>I am responding on behalf of Retford Business Forum (RBF) and the Retford Town Centre Neighbourhood Planning Group (RTCPNG), and you have been kind enough to attend both of our groups, you will have had some direct interaction to give you a flavour of our views.</p> <p>The focus of both RBF and RTCPNG has mainly been on the impact of the Plan on Retford Town Centre and its local area.</p> <p>On the positive side:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RTCPNG, and RBF especially, welcome increased levels of housing in the local area, which would increase the potential customer base for the retail and hospitality organisations in Retford. • RBF also welcomes potential investment into improving local businesses opportunities and infrastructure • RBF and RTCPNG would look forward to receiving investment funds from the developers of the housing relevant to Retford Town Centre in order to enhance the town centre to moderate the potential negative impacts. <p>On the negative side:</p>	<p>House building is recognized as a key driver of economic growth, as well as providing much needed housing to support sustainable communities. It offers a lifeline to communities that need investment to modernise and thrive. Developer contributions help to provide new facilities, road improvements, and new schools. All this improves the quality of life for residents.</p> <p>The policies in the plan support design of external spaces (such as highways parking areas, gardens and areas of open space to reduce the opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour and facilitates the safe use of these areas by future residents, service providers or visitors.</p> <p>The policies are designed with national guidance in mind. conservation and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment, including landscapes and green</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST15: Management of Town Centres			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RBF and RTCNPG are concerned about large scale residential developments which bring with them the potential for social issues which will play out in the Town Centre. There have been examples of satellite population developments without sufficient social services investment, especially amongst young people, leading to disruptive anti social and criminal consequences for nearby town centres. • Large population increases are likely to provide increased traffic levels to the town centre and this will require investment in highways, car parking and communications to avoid gridlock effects at peaks. • Part of the direction of thinking of RTCNPG is to promote the Green Agenda in the future development of the town, which might include traffic restrictions/exclusions from parts of the town centre, specific cycle and walking tracks, air pollution monitoring, preferential electric car and motorcycle promotions, and car size restrictions along with an ecology corridor and green space developments. • Retford Town Centre provides significant levels of support to the health agenda in both corrective and preventative procedures across the physical, mental and spiritual elements. These services will be put under further pressure by increased levels of population in the surrounding area and would benefit from a strategic investment perspective. This may include the creation of relevant zones, adjacencies and repurposing. <p>General comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RTCNPG is seriously considering the potential to encourage commercial companies, currently located within the town centre, whose business could be better located out of town on an industrial estate to relocate. This would free up land space which could be used for high quality accommodation, hospitality, green spaces and affordable housing as well as assisted housing for senior citizens. It is unfortunate that , because of the timing of the plans, this potential will provide housing in excess of the number required for the District. An accessible town centre would seek to reduce the distance between home/work/hospitality/retail. • Retford Town Centre is often not considered for town centre development funding, possibly because it is considered to be in a good state of repair generally. Both RBF and RTCNPG feel that investing in the town centre before it falls into serious disrepair would be more effective and efficient use of funds. There are many buildings and areas in the town centre that would benefit from funding support for refurbishment and others which could be rebuilt appropriately to provide services relevant to the increased future populations. • Education and training ‘ladders’ from local schools to employment, especially self employment, within the Town Centre area will significantly improve the prosperity of the town and will reduce the potential for anti social outcomes from the population increases. This requires investment in these processes and opportunities in the town centre area. 	<p>infrastructure, and planning measures to address climate change mitigation and adaptation.</p> <p>In accordance with government agenda housing development in appropriate locations in town centres and upper floors is supported.</p> <p>One of the key objectives of the Local Plan is the regeneration of the District’s town centres by attracting new uses and investment opportunities.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
REF008	Retford Civic Society	<p>The Society remains of the view that the proposed extension to Ordsall is not needed and could be simply removed from the Plan if a more sensible housing target were adopted. Even if house building on the District-wide scale proposed by the Council is needed, putting so many more houses into Ordsall is unacceptable.</p> <p>Ordsall has already expanded a lot in recent years with minimal improvement to the local infrastructure. What is now proposed would see its population double relative to what it was in 2011. This would lead to a very considerable increase in traffic on local roads. Improvements to a few junctions would not off-set the narrowness of many of these roads or remove the pinch-points at the river bridge and where West Carr Road crosses the railway. The extensive provision of cycle lanes proposed in the 2020 draft Plan has already been scaled back. The cycle lane proposed along Brecks Road is impractical as the road is too narrow. A cycle lane along West Hill Road may be possible but would adversely affect local residents who need to park in the highway. The increased traffic would inconvenience local people, making the area a much less pleasant place in which to live and this is unacceptable when there are alternatives available. The Society also commented in January that if the Council decides to proceed with the proposed Ordsall development, it must not start unless and until there are arrangements in place to secure the funding and timely provision of all the additional retail and community facilities referred to in the Draft Plan. This concern has not been addressed. The only specific built provision required in the revised draft Plan is one community shop. There is nothing to indicate how and when the other facilities proposed would be provided. Would the District Council be able to run and maintain the country park? If not, who would? Who would provide and run the health care hub, built community facility, school and sports pitches? For how long would the subsidy for bus services last and would these services be viable in the long term? The Ordsall allocation should not proceed unless and until all this provision is secured as otherwise there is a very real risk that what would be provided would be just another big housing estate with inadequate infrastructure. The Society asked for a specific requirement to be added to the Plan requiring that that employment land on North Road be serviced before phase 2 of the housing there is started. This has not been done, but is essential if employment provision in Retford is to grow. Without such a requirement there will be no incentive for the landowner to invest in servicing the employment land or to accept a lower price for its housing land in return for someone else carrying out the servicing. They may well just maximise their income from the housing land sale and invest it in more profitable ventures elsewhere.</p>	<p>The Council's evidence base has identified the need for new homes and employment over the plan period. The Council assessed a number of alternatives to its proposed spatial strategy and the locations for growth since 2016. These alternatives have been subject to public consultation.</p> <p>For Retford a number of locations have been assessed. It is important for the Plan to provide a balance between the level of growth and the need for new or enhanced infrastructure. The Plan has allocated a combination of brownfield and Greenfield sites to accommodate this growth. The redevelopment of smaller brownfield sites will help regenerate underused or vacant sites within the town and the allocation at Ordsall South will provide a new sustainable neighbourhood that delivers new homes along with new community infrastructure such as a new school, health facility, public transport, shops and parks. Offsite enhancements to the existing road and footpath network will also be provided where the developments make an impact. These are detailed within the Council's Transport Assessments.</p> <p>Due to its scale, the delivery of the site will be phased over and beyond the plan period. The implementation the new or enhanced infrastructure will be detailed within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The pieces of infrastructure are identified as policy requirements and therefore must be delivered to support the sustainability of the development.</p> <p>The employment land at North Road is not linked to the delivery of Ordsall South as it is a site in its own right and employment delivery is linked to the employment market.</p>
REF015	Severn Trent	<p>As previously detailed within our responses regarding this site, there is a high likelihood that sewerage capacity upgrades will be required to accommodate the flows from the development. It is noted that section 7.14 details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the need to create multifunctional green / blue infrastructure, • ensure development is located within the areas of the site in flood zone1, • integrated surface water routing through green / blue infrastructure, • maximise the use of permeable surfacing, • utilise grey water reuse, • utilisation of sustainable drainage to manage flood risk, and delivery water quality, biodiversity and amenity benefits. <p>Severn Trent are supportive of these aspects, we would however recommend that the policy also highlights:</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Your recommendations have been included within the revised Policy for Ordsall South where appropriate.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • water efficient design (Water Efficiency Standard - Building Regulations Part G 110 l/h/d) • utilisation of the drainage Hierarchy (Planning practice Guidance Paragraph 80). <p>The addition of these two points would support the reduction of flood risk and mitigate some of the impacts on the sewerage network, in a more sustainable way.</p> <p>It is recommended that these aspects are also incorporated into Policy 29.</p> <p>It is noted that Section 7 identifies that there are watercourses on the east and west boundaries of the site, therefore no connection of surface water to the sewerage system shall be permitted.</p>	
REF016	Barton Willmore on behalf of Howard Retford Ltd	<p>As authors of the Preliminary Concept Plan, our client does not wish to comment upon the content of the document which has been produced to help the Council understand the potential of Ordsall South and the development parameters. Our client is, however, keen to point out that the document does not represent a 'fixed scheme' at this stage. It is the firm view of our client that Ordsall South will be a consultative and dynamic process, with the design evolving in consultation with the community. The aim is to create a new neighbourhood in Retford which provides much needed new homes, homes for young people and the elderly, community facilities and local employment opportunities. This is to be set within an attractive and publicly accessible network of green infrastructure which includes new footpaths and bridleways, community growing and woodlands, formal and informal open spaces and playing pitches. As the project evolves, our client is producing a number of evidence-based reports to support the scheme including a drainage and flood risk assessment, transport and access reports and ecological impact studies. These will enable the further evolution of the designs for the site. It is noted that the current Council consultation is 'Focussed' towards specific themes of the Local Plan and this particular site only. In taking this approach, the site is not being considered in comparison with other development locations and will be the sole focus of attention. Our client wishes to note that we support Ordsall South as it represents the best option for development in Retford which is most accessible to both the Town Centre and A1 corridor. Development of this site will negate the need for multiple other sites around Retford in less sustainable locations. Our client notes that in addition to the allocation boundary, the Policies Maps seeks to wash over the proposed allocation with a 'Green Gap' designation (Policy ST40 refers). We refer to our client's representations to the November 2020 consultation. We do not believe that there is sufficient evidence to support such a designation around Retford. Also, if proved sound, the designation of the allocation as lying within the Green Gap would cause a policy tension. We fully recognise that the Council has stated its intention to ensure separation of Eaton from south Retford. We believe that this can be better achieved via the creation of good design and strong defensible boundaries via the allocation. The Council could add a criterion to Policy 29 and HS13 to that effect. Our client has reviewed the June 2021 focussed Consultation document subject to this consultation. The following comments are provided: (4.2 -> 4.8)</p> <p>4.2 Paragraph 7.14.2 states that "a condition of the redevelopment is that revenue generated by the scheme should be reinvested in the quality of the sports offer at the golf club ". For the avoidance of doubt, this statement needs to be qualified as it relates only to the parcel of land which is controlled by Retford Golf Club, not the wider site. Clarity is sought from the Council as to how that would be achieved.</p> <p>4.3 Paragraph 7.14.3 states that the Council will approve a masterplan prepared by the promoter. Whilst we accept this general proposition, the Council will need to engage with the consultant team to ensure that the masterplan can be prepared and agreed in a timely manner.</p> <p>4.4 Paragraph 7.14.4 states that construction of the first homes is not expected until at least 2027. Our client disagrees with this timetable in the Trajectory. A more realistic trajectory would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Plan reg 19 stage - Autumn 2021; • Local Plan Examination – Early 2022; • Plan adopted late Spring 2022; 	Thank you for your comments. We will continue to work closely with you through the planning for the site and the necessary infrastructure requirements, masterplan and any other related issues concerning the delivery of the allocation.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Masterplan developed Autumn 2021 (as evidence to the EiP) – adopted by the Council Spring 2022; • Planning application (part outline, part detailed for phase 1) – submitted late summer 2022; • Application approved end of 2022; • Preliminary infrastructure works – Spring 2022; • First homes commenced – Autumn 2022; • With an anticipated build out rate of 50 homes per year thereafter. <p>4.5 Paragraph 7.14.7 refers to a Retford-Eaton Green Gap. As we set out in our submissions to the November 2020 consultation, we do not believe that there is sufficient evidence to warrant a specific policy on a Green Gap around Retford. However, our client fully accepts the need to ensure that, through good design, places retain individual identity and character. We believe that the intentions of the Council to ensure distinctiveness between Retford and Eaton can be achieved via good design and landscaping rather than a policy tool.</p> <p>4.6 Our client supports the helpful suggestions in paragraphs 7.14.8-7.14.13 relating to the provision of green infrastructure.</p> <p>4.7 At 7.14.14, we refer to our comments above in relation to the policies maps. The location of the school and health hub needs to be further discussed with the County Council. Whilst we agree that it needs to have the very best connectivity, this might be restricted by inclusion of the 'safeguarded land' part of the Council's strategy. We believe that a criteria-based Policy in HS13 would be better.</p> <p>4.8 Paragraphs 7.14.15-7.14.17 relate to transport and access. The text suggest that a new dual roundabout will be required on Ollerton Road. We have yet to discuss this with Nottinghamshire County Council and therefore the text should refer only to new access arrangements to be provided. We note that roundabouts can be expensive and even unsightly, so early discussions with the County Council is essential.</p>	
REF020	Rampton and Woodbeck Parish Council	<p>In our previous response we pointed out that housing estates such as the Ordsall South and Bassetlaw Garden Village were a lazy, outdated, inappropriate and very damaging response to a twenty first century housing crisis. There is some acknowledgement of this in the document e.g. limited support for the use of upper floor shop premises for housing. It is a lazy response because for developers it is far easier and cheaper to build uninspiring pattern book houses on greenfield estates than provide unique solutions required in adapting existing structures for residential use. New builds are also environmentally damaging because they require more building materials than adapting existing structures. This point has been reinforced by the recent report from the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) https://www.architecture.com/knowledge-and-resources/knowledge-landing-page/can-your-designs-be-sustainable-without-adopting-a-whole-life-approach. This report argues, with absolute logic, for the reuse of existing structures and materials rather than new builds pointing out both the economic and environmental advantages. The authors report out that some local planning authorities have already adopted this as a policy and argues that other authorities will soon follow. The question is will Bassetlaw be part of this trend?</p> <p>It is outdated and inappropriate because the practice of zoning residential areas separate to industrial and commercial areas was a nineteenth and early twentieth century response to the noxious and toxic environment associated with heavy industry. We are now in a post-industrial age in this country, and it is no longer necessary to separate residencies from places of work. It is damaging for a number of reasons. Greenfield land is a finite and very precious resource. With global warming food shortages are certain and Brexit has produced its own problems in importing food from the EU. Indeed, food shortages in the UK are predicted for later this year. In addition, there is increasing trend to convert agricultural and horticultural land into solar power generation sites. While we whole heartedly support the increase in green energy production it should not be at the expense of the countryside and we must safeguard what agricultural and horticultural land that is left for food production. The countryside is also of</p>	<p>The Council undertook an assessment (sustainability appraisal) on all reasonable locations to accommodate growth around Retford, with a priority on reusing brownfield land. The local plan has identified brownfield land for development where is considered available and suitable within Retford, such as on the Former Elizabethan School off North Road. However, there is not enough available or suitable brownfield land in Retford to accommodate the level of proposed growth in the local plan. Therefore, some greenfield land is needed to support Retford's growth over the plan period and beyond.</p> <p>A new "health-hub" facility will be provided on the site so that new health services are available for both new and existing residents. It is likely this will form part of the Local Centre for the development which will become a focus for shops, community facilities and transport services. The Council has also been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there is a need for a new 1-form entry</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South		<p>major importance for recreation and contributes to both physical and mental good health. It is nothing short of a scandal to squander this precious resource for housing when other locations are available. The zoning of residential accommodation has other environmental and social damaging effects. It inevitably results in more and longer car journeys for employment, shopping and other purposes which will only be slightly mitigated by proposed public transport provision. Where will the residents access health care, schools? Currently our local surgeries are working at capacity and with predicted severe staff shortages in the NHS new surgeries are unlikely to be staffed. This will, off course, be especially true if specific provision is made for the elderly in these new estates. There is also a predicted shortage of teachers, so the same issues apply to schooling as health care. We do not question the need for more housing in Bassetlaw and nor do we doubt the estimates of the size of the need. However, this need can and should only be met by dispersing the new accommodation into existing areas and specifically by the adaption and reuse of existing structures. In this way the added burden on primary care services, schools and other services will also be dispersed and more bearable. Meeting this need by the construction of new housing estates on green field estates is the cheap, lazy but very destructive solution to the problem though very profitable for the developers. The alternative of adapting existing structures is more demanding and require both intelligence and imagination but it is the appropriate response for this century's housing crisis.</p>	Primary School to be provide onsite. The Local Plan has safeguarded land on the site for education and community use and has been included within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and is a policy requirement for Ordsall South.
REF021	Resident	<p>Whilst I am in favour of the plan for housing and community facilities, in principle, the HUGE FLAW in the plan are the totally inadequate plans for increased traffic. The following are the reasons and suggestions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Because of the River Idle, the main route into Retford will be via High Street Ordsall. At least 20 properties on High Street have no off-street parking. Cars are parked all day along one side of the road reducing the carriageway to a single carriageway. This is on a main bus route with 4 buses an hour attempting to travel along plus delivery vehicles. Currently a problem, NOW, but potentially a disaster with the plan. 2) At the end of High Street traffic has to cross the river bridge. Although we were told that £500,000 was spent recently on the bridge, only one vehicle can use, at a time, if a bus, Lorry or large van is crossing. 3) The proposed, enlarged island on the London Rd/ Goosemoor Lane junction is not a solution for this, or any other problem. 4) Another alternative route into Retford is via West Carr Road where again, cars are permanently parked on one side of the road due to terraced houses with no off-road parking. The road also has a secession of speed calming bumps. 5) Ordsall Road is another alternative route into Retford with cars often parked on one side of the road and no facilities for meaningful road widening. The proposed enlarge roundabout at Babworth will achieve little. 6) The other route to Retford is via Eton village with a very old narrow bridge over the river, again not a solution at all. <p>The main shopping area, with 2 mini markets has very limited parking. The council has recently installed yellow lines in the area of the shops, so shoppers now park on the pavement! There is only one expensive solution. A new road would be needed, south of Ordsall, crossing the river, and coming out on London Road between Eaton College and Grove Road. With a potential of AT LEAST 1000 more cars using the Ordsall roads the current plan would be a DISASTER. Also, when the A1 is blocked due to an accident, the vehicles often divert through Ordsall. I note that Councillor Richards, a long time Ordsall resident and councillor for the ward has resigned over what may be her view that the decisions are already made and that the "consultation" is actually "window dressing" I hope, for the sake of our future that this is not the case.</p>	<p>The Council's Transport Assessment assessed the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The projected additional traffic flows from the proposed new developments were then applied to the transport model. This assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic, which this plan has aimed to mitigate. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p> <p>The Council's Transport Assessment identified a small rise in traffic volume through Eaton as a consequence of the proposed development at Ordsall South, but this impact can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures. The Transport Assessment details the type of measures proposed for Eaton.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
REF023	Natural England	<p>We would like to comment in particular on the amendments to the Ordsall South site allocation.</p> <p>Green Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England welcome the amendment in paragraph 7.14.8 to ensure the use of species of local provenance in GI proposals. • We also welcome paragraph 7.14.14, which supports provision of active travel, as well as connections to and extension of the PRoW network. The Covid-19 pandemic has brought to the fore the critical role that time in nature plays in supporting health and wellbeing. We recommend inclusion of green footpaths/cycleways throughout all new developments, to allow for common commuting routes to be more scenic and thus provide an easy, accessible way for everyone to spend time in nature. • We note the omission of the suggestion for community orchards in Policy 29, 3. V. 'Edible Space for allotments and community planting'. We would advise that community orchards could be beneficial to the development. There are various areas of traditional orchard priority habitat nearby, to the east of the site, thus, their inclusion would be in keeping with local character and could improve the network of priority habitats in the locality. <p>Biodiversity Net Gain</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We still welcome the requirement for a 10% net gain in biodiversity for this development (Paragraph 7.14.11). We would also like to note that the new Biodiversity Metric (3.0) has just been launched; we recommend this is utilised for this development. The advantage of using a recognised metric to deliver net gain is that it provides a clear, transparent and evidence-based approach to assessing a project's biodiversity impacts that can assist with "de-risking" a development through the planning process and contribute to wider place-making. • We are happy to see an amendment to recommend the expansion of the nearby lowland heath priority habitat into the country park, which will help to strengthen the mix of habitats on site, as well as improve the network of priority habitats in the locality. 	Thank you for your comments.
REF026	Resident	<p>Section 1. Questions, in no particular order.</p> <p>How many allotments are proposed and what is the size of each allotment?</p> <p>Are these allotments to be available to others not living on the Ordsall South development?</p> <p>How many people are on the current waiting list for allotments in Retford?</p> <p>How many Council allotments currently exist in Retford, excluding the proposed allotments on the Ordsall South development?</p> <p>How are the wetland areas going to be sourced with water?</p> <p>Are the tree lined roads planned as per the picture in the Barton Wilmore literature?</p> <p>Are the roads going to be tree lined both sides?</p> <p>The Barton Wilmore literature shows a picture of a private drive. Where are these planned on the development? I couldn't see them on the map/diagrams produced by Barton Wilmore.</p> <p>What sports pitches are proposed and are they full size or reduced size? Are Barton Wilmore adhering to the areas allocated to the sports pitches and other green spaces as proposed in the draft Bassetlaw Local Plan?</p> <p>From the Draft Bassetlaw Local plan, page 18, Policy 29, section 3, point v) what is "Edible space for allotments and community planting"? Does this mean it can be taken away for development later?</p>	<p>The details of the development are yet to be finalised. The Local Plan identifies the area, level and type of development and the necessary infrastructure needed to support the development. The developers have proposed a concept plan which provides further detail on particular issues, but this will continue to be altered as it moves forward.</p> <p>The concept plan has to be policy compliant, so it is important to have a look through this when the plan is next publicly available.</p> <p>The sites is large in scale so it provides multiple opportunities to create a high-quality development what provides benefits to local residents. The density of the site will vary, with higher densities around local community hubs and lower densities around the outer edge of the site which is adjacent to the countryside.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South		<p>Are the green spaces including the sports area, woodland and landscape buffer protected from possible future development?</p> <p>Section 2. General comments.</p> <p>From the Bassetlaw draft Local plan, 7.14.6 Ordsall South was to provide the opportunity that the older people of Retford could 'age well in place'. I don't think the Barton Wilmore proposal applies this principal in their plans. Yes, there is a woodland area, some allotments, and local amenities but is there not more that can be done? Are there not development examples in this country and others that have benefited the elderly that ideas can be taken from? Could the residents of Retford be consulted for ideas?</p> <p>The Barton Wilmore proposal seems congested with housing for the amount of land available. The point 1 iii) under Policy 29 in the Draft Local plan on page 17 suggests the development should be "interspersed with appropriate use of shared spaces". I don't think the Barton Wilmore plan addresses this point. I can't at present comment on whether too many houses are planned. But whatever number is finally decided upon I would propose taking some of the landscape buffer and making green areas within the areas proposed for houses and maybe even interlink those green areas if possible. Part of the idea of this is to encourage the residents to use the green spaces and I believe that it has been shown that proximity to such spaces is a factor. So instead of an elderly resident having to walk through the roads and houses to a landscape buffer or woodland area, smaller green areas would be available much closer if the housing was fragmented and interspersed with green areas. This use do to proximity would I am sure apply to all age groups and not just the elderly. From the past demand for allotments, I would consider that better value to the residents would be gained from giving up more housing or landscape buffer or woodland to the provision of allotments. I would suggest other allotment schemes in this country and abroad be studied to get ideas for most beneficial use. For example, allocating allotments for a fixed term period (possibly just 1 year) and then allocating to the next on the waiting list, public or community allotments where all can help and providing access to enable those with a disability to benefit from the joy of growing on an allotment. The proposed location of the school, I presume is close to the sports pitches to enable them to make use of those facilities. Could the school not be adjacent to the Sports facilities proposed? Also, could an allotment or rough area be reserved for the school to enable them to use it for Outdoor learning or Forest school, or relocate the school so that they have easier access to the landscape buffer and woodland area and permission to use that area for their outdoor learning and or Forest school? From the Draft Local plan, Policy 29 section 3. Green infrastructure and biodiversity seems good in promoting green spaces, sports facilities and access for people to get out and use it but what about access and sports facilities for the older generation or those with a disability. There seems to be no mention of them. Will those in a wheelchair be able to traverse the landscape buffer around the rural periphery of the site? What about sports facilities for the elderly and those with a disability. In the Draft Bassetlaw Local plan the Ordsall South project is to have "Appropriate off road parking provision for vehicles an cycles ...". What parking provision does the Barton Wilmore plan propose? The tree-lined roads are nice, but from my experience without sufficient parking provision those lovely tree lined roads become tree lined roads interspersed with cars parked on the verges between the trees.</p>	<p>The site will provide a good mix of housing types with a particular focus for older peoples housing and family homes. These areas of development will be interspersed with green space and public rights of way to encourage greater connectivity and opportunities for walking and cycling. The road network will be legible and the access into the site will be served by a regular bus to and from other parts of the town.</p> <p>The site will be landscaped and the country park and green infrastructure on the site will help provide a green buffer between it and the countryside.</p>
REF029	BDC Councillor	<p>Situated on the southern edge of Ordsall, Retford; Ordsall South is adjacent to an existing residential area. The site (108.7ha) provides an opportunity to create a sustainable and well integrated extension – for 1250 dwellings, open space and community uses - to significantly contribute to Retford's housing needs in this plan period, and the next. The site will <u>have good access to a range of employment</u> and other local services within the wider planned development and Retford itself.</p> <p>The underlined section is the crux of the matter; it is not true to say that the site will have 'good' access to either</p>	<p>The Local Plan proposes employment growth as well as housing. The employment growth doesn't always benefit from being located with housing. The employment types in Bassetlaw are often logistics or distribution and these need to be located near the main road network. Ordsall South is a largely residential scheme, but with improved public</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South		<p>Retford or further afield. This is a serious access problem which needs a detailed commitment to resolve - this commitment will have to come from NCC, The UK Government, BDC, Highways England and Network Rail and without it, the Plan is weak and not sufficiently forward looking to meet the needs of a growing town in the first half of 21st Century. There is a fundamental issue here which can be resolved as the Plan develops but needs an honest and truthful admission that the current proposals are not fit for purpose now, and will certainly be weak and of limited value in 25 years time. It would appear the Planners and the politicians are choosing to fudge the Retford South issues now in the desire to develop and complete a District wide Plan.</p> <p>This is what will happen -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The 1250 houses (and possibly more) will appear here and in smaller numbers elsewhere in Ordsall b) These houses will have residents who require work c) There are no work locations identified in South Ward - either existing or new <p><u>Therefore the residents will have to travel to work</u>, and they will continue to travel by car be it electric or fossil fuel driven, until 2050 at least. Some its true will use buses – but only if the buses can get them to work locations, for a town centre shuttle is no use for 6am shift workers in Worksop, Retford or anywhere in Bassetlaw. This development will inevitably present problems, and whilst mitigations have been proposed they will be woefully inadequate for the reasons detailed here -</p> <p>It appears that this latest Plan offer and the corresponding analysis misses some quite severe potential problems - for example:</p> <p>In order to travel NORTH for local work at Bircotes/Harworth, or on the Trinity Farm area of Retford ALL such traffic, buses, cars, bicycles, (& scooters if you wish) will have to pass through Retford Hallcroft roundabout - there is no other way, unless you choose the A1 for the more distant locations. To choose the A1 to go NORTH requires the use of a quite narrow West Hill Road and Ordsall Road (past a Primary school), leading to the A620 roundabout at Ordsall Woods - an already 'full' section of road as indeed noted by NCC recent traffic data. This route will also be used (as it is now) to carry virtually all the work traffic intending to travel WEST to Worksop and Sheffield area. There are work opportunities to the EAST of Retford - the Hospital is a major employer, and Gainsborough and Lincoln offer work opportunities; traffic heading EAST from Ordsall has an option to use the historic narrow bridge at Ordsall (already the site of extensive work, but still not a safe as it could be) or queue with everyone else to cross the railways, the canal and river via Hallcroft roundabout, or zig-zag through the town or Eaton on narrow streets. There is a little bit of good news - the route South from Ordsall leads to the A1 at Markham Moor, and connection to the A1 with its good links to Lincoln, Newark, Nottingham, Worksop, Sheffield and Doncaster could help ease the burden on other 'via Retford' routes. We know that even now because drivers cut through pretty, picturesque (and totally unsuitable for volumes of traffic) Eaton to get to the A1; cutting through Eaton village is presently really well used - so much so that the Plan has already identified it as a problem. This Plan is offering in the main a few marked cycle lanes on already busy narrow roads, plus a cycle route out to a yet to built 'Garden Village' that might not happen anyway, and might not get a Station and is a disappointing cop-out of responsibilities for the future - we are facing a climate and energy emergency and we need to be building safe dedicated routes for cyclists all over Bassetlaw, and that the paucity of commitment to high quality lit separate bike routes away from a development that will increase the population of Retford by at least 10% is unacceptable and, as referenced earlier a critical weakness of the Plan. For example, there's still no suitable bike route from Ordsall to the Railway Station – despite local groups and Councillors repeatedly calling for it the only route for cyclists to the Station is via a 'Cyclists Prohibited' route, even though there's scope for excellent cycle access nearby.</p> <p>*The reference to a junction of Ollerton Road/Whitehall Road junction is a typo – no such junction exists.</p>	<p>transport to and from the site, it will help local residents access key transport infrastructure and employment opportunities further afield.</p> <p>A revised Transport Assessment for Retford has been produced in response to your feedback. This has looked at the uplift in development to 1250 and the other sites around the town. The assessment also looks the proportionality in terms of which development should contribute towards what scheme or mitigation proposals.</p> <p>The assessment doesn't identify the need for a new dual road from the site to the A1. This would be unfeasible in terms of impacts from development and unjustifiable in terms of cost and business case.</p> <p>The assessment also looks at Public transport and walking and cycling infrastructure from the site to the wider area.</p> <p>The Council will continue to consult and engage with the County Council through the rest of the Local Plan process and during its implementation.</p> <p>The Council will also work with Network Rail to agree a level crossing closure programme as part of the development of the Garden Village.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>So how can we improve the Plan? Here are offered some solutions -</p> <p>Unless the Plan can contain an agreement in principle to produce a new road leading (dual carriageway standard?) SOUTH to the A1 - effectively a major improvement to the full length of Ollerton Road/Brick Yard Road/Jockey Lane - the current plan condemns Retford residents to a further 30 years of traffic congestion, with all the incidents and losses that come with that.</p> <p>Such an improved road could also provide a <u>safe adjacent cycle route</u> to and from Elkesley, and at last allow Retford cyclists a safe route <u>South to the National Cycle Network Route 647 via Crookford</u>.</p> <p>A grander Plan altogether would be to encourage further employment and residential development inside a carefully planned perimeter of tarmac around our beautiful historic town. This is a Plan for 50 years that we are putting together and we want to ensure that 50 years from now, it won't just be the developers and their shareholders that look approvingly at Retford.</p> <p>Network Rail have already stated that they want to see Level Crossings disappear because of the risks they bring - the two near Mansfield Road are actually referenced in the Garden Village Transport vision. The East Coast Main Line (ECML) has three level crossings near Retford - two of which (Botany Bay and Barnby Moor/Sutton cum Lound) could be closed with minimal disruption (and no bridges!), and the 'parcels' of land thus created could be used for residential and or employment opportunities.</p> <p>Such parcels of land around Retford would be ideal for the District Council to (perhaps compulsorily purchase if needs be) plan for more building of 'council houses' in the town – Retford has no land presently earmarked specifically for such work, though it is much needed and already planned elsewhere in Bassetlaw. Dozens of 'pocket' hectares would be released with such a Plan, and the Council/Developer could choose the most appropriate house/hectare density between 25 to 50 to suit the evolving needs.</p> <p>The third ECML crossing on Grove Road would require a railway bridge to eliminate it, but the resultant highway would create another 'pocket' and would also invite a strategic but challenging link road to Ordsall South across the Idle flood plain - a carefully designed improvement like this would protect the environment over which it passes, allow cycle routes to built at the side of the new carriageway, further protect Eaton, provide a better route to the East for Ordsall residents keeping them away from the historic narrow bridge, and as an added bonus create more potential triangles of housing development or employment land adjacent to the railway and London Road. ECML will be pleased with all of this – just 1 bridge required and 3 Level Crossings eliminated - and they have committed in their 2025 Plan to agree assistance with costs – it is disappointing that the current Plan lacks this kind of future commitment in black and white.</p> <p>The Plan also neglects to deal with the particular and well documented issues of overdevelopment of housing already being sought in some parts of the East Ward of Bassetlaw District Council. The Planning Inspector recently agreed with BDC Planning Committee and <u>rejected</u> an appeal from the Developer in connection with new housing in the Tiln Lane area of Retford. Traffic issues of various kinds were noted as a problem, and the one which will remain so is whilst large vehicles seek to travel on the A620 East from Retford and pass under two railway bridges, one of which is a bridge about 11ft at Welham, and has caused fatal accidents and been struck into a number of times.</p> <p>This particular issue could be solved in a number of ways, including the fabled Retford by-pass.</p> <p>However there are other good options - and one such option would be to create a single carriageway road that simply 'hugs' the existing railway line, eliminating at a stroke the need for A620 traffic to use both railway bridges.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>It's not a particularly useful infrastructure improvement with regard to additional housing, but it would solve some social issues including the removal of LGVs passing a school (where fatal RTAs have occurred) and a duo of bottleneck junctions. What it would do is create a safe cycle route with no through traffic into and out of Welham, and open the possibility of a well made cycle route from the A620 across the Leverton Road and into Bracken Lane and then through to Ordsall South and the national network. Retford people will definitely want to, and may even need to travel by other than personal car in the future - we should be planning and detailing these ideas in this Plan now so that in the future the safe cycleways all over town will be available for all to use.</p>	
REF041	Resident	<p>I am not a resident of Eaton Village but have been a regular worshiper at Eaton Church since 1967. Obviously traffic has increased during this time but traffic flow presently is really heavy, considering the narrow bendy road and bridge in Eaton Village. In recent times there have certainly been three collisions with the bridge necessitating considerable repairs. On two other occasions vehicles ended in the river. Whenever you're in church I guarantee you will hear the squeal of breaks as vehicles have to stop very suddenly at the bridge.</p> <p>With the development of housing and increase in traffic at Ordsall South, I am extremely afraid that there are accidents waiting to happen through Eaton Village, particularly at the bridge. Let us hope they do not involve fatalities. Considerable road improvement will be required to avoid this impending scenario.</p>	<p>The Council's Transport Assessment has identified that there would likely be a small rise in traffic volume through Eaton as a consequence of the proposed development at Ordsall South. This can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures. The Transport Assessment details the type of measures proposed for Eaton.</p>
REF043	Resident	<p>HS13 Ordsall South: the wording continues to contain several proposals (including Brecks Road) to provide a "marked cycle lane" along connecting streets, despite comments during the November 2020 consultation.</p> <p>Construction of this forwards-looking major greenfield development with cycling provision from a previous era (on-road marked cycle lane[s]) would be a serious failure of planning and design. Rather, it must be future-proofed from the outset. Where possible, the principal active travel (walking and cycling) routes should be on paths separate from road alignments, particularly the east-west spine route connecting the country park (7.14.8) [and the future route to the Garden Village (5.iii.3)], the community facilities (7.14.14), crossing Ollerton Road and continuing towards the River Idle. The Department for Transport's design standard LTN 1/20 may be appropriate for this. Shared-use paths (pedestrian and cyclist) alongside roads should be considered only where unavoidable and on-road marked cycle lanes should be excluded. In addition to the benefits to active travellers of cleaner air and lower noise levels, this would also avoid conflicts with vehicles parked wholly or partially on roadside paths and verges. As also mentioned in November 2020, this Policy should extend to making provision for a new cyclepath bridge over the River Idle, perhaps in the vicinity of Bank Side in Ordsall (from East Retford FP1), linking to a safe crossing of Goosemoor Lane and giving access to the recently improved bridleway (East Retford BW34) to Thrumpton Lane. I have been informed by Nottinghamshire County Council [NCC] that such a bridge has previously been considered, so a feasibility study may already exist.</p>	<p>A new network of footpaths and cycle routes will be provided on site so that residents can easily access the green spaces and local services. Where new roads and cycle ways are provided, these will be segregated or form part of a shared space for cyclists and pedestrians. Any alterations to existing cycle ways are likely to be improvements to the existing infrastructure such as new surfacing or better lighting.</p>
REF045	Resident	<p>i) Para 7.14.13 - what exactly is meant on flooding? You say matters should be explored – surely a matter that should have been done before promoting this site. Residents gardens flood. More tarmac/hard landscaping is likely to mean more flooding.</p> <p>ii) Para 7.14.16 - "junctions requiring improvements including the Ollerton Road/Whitehall Road junction and Goosemoor London Road mini roundabout at Whitehouses" There is no junction of Ollerton Road/Whitehall Road – indeed they are on opposite sides of the East Coast Railway line and the River Idle with no road connection. There is a mini roundabout at Whitehouses but there is no mini roundabout at the junction of Goosemoor Lane and London Road. These are elementary mistakes either through a lack of knowledge which must raise doubts on how well Bassetlaw Council knows the area and how many other mistakes are in your paper. You still have no firm proposals on traffic management, through what you call Ordsall Old Village and at Eaton. Why not? There has been plenty of time to undertake a study, consult and publish recommendations. A comment - "The Ordsall South Concept Plan is the promoter's initial draft vision for Ordsall South. Please note that this vision has been produced by an external site promoter, Barton Willmore and we accept no responsibility for the content included within this document." - a</p>	<p>The Council has produced a detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the proposed Ordsall South development, as well as all relevant sites across the District. This assessment identifies the type and frequency of flooding and states the necessary type of mitigation required to help reduce the threat of flooding. For Ordsall South, the highest flooding risk occurs when high rainfall events result in water running off fields into existing developments. The Flood Risk Assessment has indicated that new on-site water storage facilities will help reduce the risk of surface water run-off into both the new development and existing development in Ordsall. Onsite urban</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South		meaningless document doing nothing to address concerns and not worth you putting it on your website.	<p>drainage systems are also required and these will likely form part of the development's Green Infrastructure provision.</p> <p>The Council has produced a Transport Assessment which assessed both the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford and the impact that the proposed new development would have on these. The existing traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas such as Eaton village. The Transport Assessment identifies that Eaton will likely see a small rise in traffic volume as a result of the proposed development at Ordsall South, but that this impact can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures. The Transport Assessment details the type of measures proposed for Eaton.</p>
REF052	NCC – Planning Policy Team	<p><u>Strategic Highways</u></p> <p><i>Paragraph 7.14.15</i></p> <p>Roundabouts are proposed to serve the site. The Highway Authority has had sight of the draft Retford Transport Assessment 2021 (RTA) being prepared in support of the allocation of sites in Retford, albeit for 800 dwellings on this site rather than the 1250 now included in the consultation. Comments have been provided with respect the content of the RTA separately. The RTA confirms that the roundabouts will have a 40m ICD. On balance that would be a reasonable choice of junction arrangement. However, there is no junction capacity assessment to demonstrate that the junctions would operate within capacity. Furthermore, the land available for the southern of the two roundabouts has necessitated the sharpening of the bend to the south of the boundary of the site and a tortuous northern junction exit as the roundabout is offset westwards from the Ollerton Road centreline due to land not being available on the east side. It must be demonstrated that this layout could be achieved in accordance with geometric standards. The acceptability of the proposed roundabouts is therefore not certain.</p> <p>The western parcel of land benefits from a junction with both proposed roundabouts. This could provide a convenient bus route through the site. However, the eastern parcel would only have one junction with Ollerton Road. Bus operators are generally reluctant to enter cul-de-sacs as this often necessitates a need to track back. Therefore, to facilitate a bus serving, the internal layout must be designed as a loop that picks up as much of the site as possible and which minimises the need to cover the same streets twice when returning to the wider road network. This should be reflected on the Ordsall Concept Plan Vision.</p> <p><i>Paragraph 7.14.16</i></p> <p>The Highway Authority would expect an outline planning application to be supported by a Transport Assessment (TA). This must identify each junction that would experience capacity issues and propose a suitable scheme of mitigation. The agreed mitigation measures should then be secured by planning condition rather than financial contribution. Whilst the RTA goes some way to demonstrate which junctions may have capacity issues following the development of 800 dwellings, this does not demonstrate how these capacity issues could be addressed. There</p>	<p>A revised Transport Assessment for Retford has been produced in response to your feedback. This has looked at the uplift in development to 1250 and the other sites around the town. The assessment also looks the proportionality in terms of which development should contribute towards what scheme or mitigation proposals. It also looks at Public transport and walking and cycling infrastructure.</p> <p>The Council will continue to consult and engage with the County Council through the rest of the Local Plan process and during its implementation.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South		<p>therefore remains uncertainty as to whether the wider highway network could be suitably improved to address capacity issues should this site come forward, particularly as there could be another 450 dwellings above those currently included in the RTA.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, Eaton is unlikely to be subjected to such an increase in traffic that would then raise highway network capacity concerns. However, the route through the village is not considered appropriate for a material increase in traffic. Main Road is a single carriageway with limited footway provision and limited street lighting. Main Road is also narrow in places with reduced visibility.</p> <p>Furthermore, the existing bridge over the River Idle is only wide enough for one-way vehicular traffic. It therefore may be appropriate to seek a financial contribution in this instance towards measures to deter traffic from using Main Road as a through route and to discourage vehicle speed. It is likely that the introduction of any measures would be best done following engagement with the local community.</p> <p><i>POLICY 29 A.1.iii</i></p> <p>The Policy includes references to the use of shared spaces. The DfT publication "The Inclusive Transport Strategy: Achieving Equal Access for Disabled People – July 2018" recommends that local authorities pause the development of shared space schemes whilst the DfT review and update their guidance due to concerns raised about shared space and navigability.</p> <p><i>POLICY 29 A.5.a)iii.1. and 2.</i></p> <p>DfT LTN 1/20 "Cycle infrastructure design" should be applied to all changes associated with highway improvements, new highway construction and new or improved cycle facilities (paragraph 1.1.1), including those on other rights of way such as bridleways and routes within public open space (paragraph 1.3.1).</p> <p>The LTN states that on urban streets, cyclists must be physically separated from pedestrians and should not share space with them. Shared use routes in streets with high pedestrian or cyclist flows should not be used (paragraph 1.6.1 2). On roads with high volumes of motor traffic or high speeds, cycleroutes indicated with only road markings or cycle symbols should not be used (paragraph 1.6.1 3). To allow faster cyclists to overtake, and make room for non-standard bikes, cycle tracks should ideally be 2.0m wide in each direction, or 3.0 to 4.0m (depending on cycle flows) for bidirectional tracks, there may have to be exceptions (paragraph 1.6.1 5)). The absolute minimum width at constraints is 1.5m (table 5-2). Within a 30mph zone, a 0.5m buffer is desirable adjacent the carriageway increasing to 1.5m adjacent a pedestrian crossing point (Table 6-1). There are also design parameters relating to gradient, headroom, forward visibility, etc.</p> <p>In accordance with Manual for Streets, the minimum unobstructed width for pedestrians should generally be 2.0m (6.3.22). DfT Inclusive Mobility recommends that there should be minimum widths of 3.0m at bus stops and 3.5m to 4.5m by shops though it is recognized that available space will not always be sufficient to achieve these dimensions (Chapter 3). The minimum required overall segregated footway/cycleway width could therefore be considerable and may well be unachievable adjacent the existing highway network due to existing constraints accept within or adjacent the allocation.</p> <p>Parking provision should include charging points for electric vehicles.</p>	
REF054	Resident	I am writing to inform you that I strongly object to the proposed planning of the area of Ordsall South. I am very saddened to read that since the huge objections from the residents of Ordsall there are now plans to increase the housing in this area. I object to this proposal entirely and there are several reasons for my objections. Firstly, the proposal would have a huge effect on the wildlife in those fields and surrounding areas. Also, there would be massive increase of traffic in the area, not only would this be detrimental to the environment but also to the health and safety of the current residents that live in the area. I believe that this would have an overall impact on climate change, due to the increase environmental damage and decrease of wildlife in the area. Retford as a whole cannot cope with any further increase of traffic. This proposed area, South of Ordsall, is agricultural land and should remain so. Land is a natural resource and of utmost importance, as it supports natural vegetation, wildlife and benefits human life. Many people use this area for walking, and it provides huge benefits to people's mental health having	The Council undertook an assessment (sustainability appraisal) on all reasonable locations to accommodate growth around Retford, with a priority on reusing brownfield land. The local plan has identified brownfield land for development where is considered available and suitable within Retford, such as on the Former Elizabethan School off North Road. However, there is not enough available or suitable brownfield land in Retford to accommodate the level of proposed growth in the local plan. Therefore, some greenfield

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South		<p>what feels like the countryside on their doorstep. I do not agree that there should be any building of houses beyond the current boundary of Retford; I strongly feel that the existing boundaries of Retford and Ordsall should be maintained with no further expansion given. This area needs to be protected in order to avoid the town losing its geographic identity and resulting in the area merging with areas such as Eaton. The fields to the south of Ordsall also flood when there is heavy rainfall. If this area was to be built on not only would this area be prone to flooding but also there is an increase risk to the current properties being flooded due to the water not being able to be absorbed into the fields as it currently is. I can see you have attempted to address this in the new proposal, but this has only heightened my anxieties as it is clearly describing flood areas. You can clearly see that following rainfall there are huge patches of wet ground that remains in the fields for days afterwards, also the ditches still have water in them following days of warm or hot weather. Adding infrastructure, concrete and road to these fields would cause massive problems in the future. Bassetlaw District Council have also oversubscribed the requirement for the number of homes needed within the Retford area. There is no need for this development in this area.</p>	<p>land is needed to support Retford's growth over the plan period and beyond.</p> <p>All major development are required to provide at least a 10% net gain in biodiversity. The land at Ordsall South is currently utilised for intense agricultural purposes and is therefore not particularly supportive for wildlife habitats. The new development at Ordsall South will deliver a significant level of green infrastructure, such as new trees, green space, and a country park, which will provide space for wildlife enhancement and offer a greater degree of biodiversity.</p> <p>There are currently no concerning air quality issues at Ordsall. The inclusion of new green infrastructure, including the country park and woodlands on site will help mitigate against any increased issues with air quality in the area.</p> <p>The Council has produced a detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment for all relevant sites across the District. For Ordsall South, surface water flooding is the main risk where water runs off the fields into the existing developments in periods of high rainfall events. The Flood Risk Assessment has stated that new (on-site) water storage facilities will help reduce the risk of surface water run-off into the new development and in to the existing development in Ordsall. Onsite urban drainage systems are also required and these will likely form part of the developments Green Infrastructure provision.</p>
REF065	Resident	<p>I am writing to inform you that I strongly object to the proposed planning of the area of Ordsall South. I am very saddened to read that since the huge objections from the residents of Ordsall there are now plans to increase the housing in this area. I object to this proposal entirely and there are several reasons for my objections. Firstly, the proposal would have a huge effect on the wildlife in those fields and surrounding areas. Also, there would be massive increase of traffic in the area, not only would this be detrimental to the environment but also to the health and safety of the current residents that live in the area. I believe that this would have an overall impact on climate change, due to the increase environmental damage and decrease of wildlife in the area. Retford as a whole cannot cope with any further increase of traffic. This proposed area, South of Ordsall, is agricultural land and should remain so. Land is a natural resource and of utmost importance, as it supports natural vegetation, wildlife and benefits human life. Many people use this area for walking, and it provides huge benefits to people's mental health having what feels like the countryside on their doorstep. I do not agree that there should be any building of houses beyond the current boundary of Retford; I strongly feel that the existing boundaries of Retford and Ordsall should be</p>	<p>The Council undertook an assessment (sustainability appraisal) on all reasonable locations to accommodate growth around Retford, with a priority on reusing brownfield land. The local plan has identified brownfield land for development where is considered available and suitable within Retford, such as on the Former Elizabethan School off North Road. However, there is not enough available or suitable brownfield land in Retford to accommodate the level of proposed growth in the local plan. Therefore, some greenfield land is needed to support Retford's growth over the plan period and beyond.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South		<p>maintained with no further expansion given. This area needs to be protected in order to avoid the town losing its geographic identity and resulting in the area merging with areas such as Eaton. The fields to the south of Ordsall also flood when there is heavy rainfall. If this area was to be built on not only would this area be prone to flooding but also there is an increase risk to the current properties being flooded due to the water not being able to be absorbed into the fields as it currently is. I can see you have attempted to address this in the new proposal, but this has only heightened my anxieties as it is clearly describing flood areas. You can clearly see that following rainfall there are huge patches of wet ground that remains in the fields for days afterwards, also the ditches still have water in them following days of warm or hot weather. Adding infrastructure, concrete and road to these fields would cause massive problems in the future. Bassetlaw District Council have also oversubscribed the requirement for the number of homes needed within the Retford area. There is no need for this development in this area.</p>	<p>All major development are required to provide at least a 10% net gain in biodiversity. The land at Ordsall South is currently utilised for intense agricultural purposes and is therefore not particularly supportive for wildlife habitats. The new development at Ordsall South will deliver a significant level of green infrastructure, such as new trees, green space, and a country park, which will provide space for wildlife enhancement and offer a greater degree of biodiversity.</p> <p>There are currently no concerning air quality issues at Ordsall. The inclusion of new green infrastructure, including the country park and woodlands on site will help mitigate against any increased issues with air quality in the area.</p> <p>The Council has produced a detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment for all relevant sites across the District. For Ordsall South, surface water flooding is the main risk where water runs off the fields into the existing developments in periods of high rainfall events. The Flood Risk Assessment has stated that new (on-site) water storage facilities will help reduce the risk of surface water run-off into the new development and into the existing development in Ordsall. Onsite urban drainage systems are also required and these will likely form part of the developments Green Infrastructure provision.</p>
REF066	Resident	<p>I am writing to inform you that I strongly object to the proposed planning of the area of Ordsall South. I am very saddened to read that since the huge objections from the residents of Ordsall there are now plans to increase the housing in this area. I object to this proposal entirely and there are several reasons for my objections. Firstly, the proposal would have a huge effect on the wildlife in those fields and surrounding areas. Also, there would be massive increase of traffic in the area, not only would this be detrimental to the environment but also to the health and safety of the current residents that live in the area. I believe that this would have an overall impact on climate change, due to the increase environmental damage and decrease of wildlife in the area. Retford as a whole cannot cope with any further increase of traffic. This proposed area, South of Ordsall, is agricultural land and should remain so. Land is a natural resource and of utmost importance, as it supports natural vegetation, wildlife and benefits human life. Many people use this area for walking, and it provides huge benefits to people's mental health having what feels like the countryside on their doorstep. I do not agree that there should be any building of houses beyond the current boundary of Retford; I strongly feel that the existing boundaries of Retford and Ordsall should be maintained with no further expansion given. This area needs to be protected in order to avoid the town losing its geographic identity and resulting in the area merging with areas such as Eaton. The fields to the south of Ordsall also flood when there is heavy rainfall. If this area was to be built on not only would this area be prone to flooding but also there is an increase risk to the current properties being flooded due to the water not being able to be absorbed</p>	<p>The Council undertook an assessment (sustainability appraisal) on all reasonable locations to accommodate growth around Retford, with a priority on reusing brownfield land. The local plan has identified brownfield land for development where is considered available and suitable within Retford, such as on the Former Elizabethan School off North Road. However, there is not enough available or suitable brownfield land in Retford to accommodate the level of proposed growth in the local plan. Therefore, some greenfield land is needed to support Retford's growth over the plan period and beyond.</p> <p>All major development are required to provide at least a 10% net gain in biodiversity. The land at Ordsall South is currently utilised for intense agricultural</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South		<p>into the fields as it currently is. I can see you have attempted to address this in the new proposal, but this has only heightened my anxieties as it is clearly describing flood areas. You can clearly see that following rainfall there are huge patches of wet ground that remains in the fields for days afterwards, also the ditches still have water in them following days of warm or hot weather. Adding infrastructure, concrete and road to these fields would cause massive problems in the future. Bassetlaw District Council have also oversubscribed the requirement for the number of homes needed within the Retford area. There is no need for this development in this area.</p>	<p>purposes and is therefore not particularly supportive for wildlife habitats. The new development at Ordsall South will deliver a significant level of green infrastructure, such as new trees, green space, and a country park, which will provide space for wildlife enhancement and offer a greater degree of biodiversity.</p> <p>There are currently no concerning air quality issues at Ordsall. The inclusion of new green infrastructure, including the country park and woodlands on site will help mitigate against any increased issues with air quality in the area.</p> <p>The Council has produced a detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment for all relevant sites across the District. For Ordsall South, surface water flooding is the main risk where water runs off the fields into the existing developments in periods of high rainfall events. The Flood Risk Assessment has stated that new (on-site) water storage facilities will help reduce the risk of surface water run-off into the new development and in to the existing development in Ordsall. Onsite urban drainage systems are also required and these will likely form part of the developments Green Infrastructure provision.</p>
REF068	Resident	<p>I am writing to inform you that I strongly object to the proposed planning of the area of Ordsall South. I am very saddened to read that since the huge objections from the residents of Ordsall there are now plans to increase the housing in this area. I object to this proposal entirely and there are several reasons for my objections. Firstly, the proposal would have a huge effect on the wildlife in those fields and surrounding areas. Also, there would be massive increase of traffic in the area, not only would this be detrimental to the environment but also to the health and safety of the current residents that live in the area. I believe that this would have an overall impact on climate change, due to the increase environmental damage and decrease of wildlife in the area. Retford as a whole cannot cope with any further increase of traffic. This proposed area, South of Ordsall, is agricultural land and should remain so. Land is a natural resource and of utmost importance, as it supports natural vegetation, wildlife and benefits human life. Many people use this area for walking, and it provides huge benefits to people's mental health having what feels like the countryside on their doorstep. I do not agree that there should be any building of houses beyond the current boundary of Retford; I strongly feel that the existing boundaries of Retford and Ordsall should be maintained with no further expansion given. This area needs to be protected in order to avoid the town losing its geographic identity and resulting in the area merging with areas such as Eaton. The fields to the south of Ordsall also flood when there is heavy rainfall. If this area was to be built on not only would this area be prone to flooding but also there is an increase risk to the current properties being flooded due to the water not being able to be absorbed into the fields as it currently is. I can see you have attempted to address this in the new proposal, but this has only heightened my anxieties as it is clearly describing flood areas. You can clearly see that following rainfall there are huge patches of wet ground that remains in the fields for days afterwards, also the ditches still have water in them following days of warm or hot weather. Adding infrastructure, concrete and road to these fields would cause massive</p>	<p>The Council undertook an assessment (sustainability appraisal) on all reasonable locations to accommodate growth around Retford, with a priority on reusing brownfield land. The local plan has identified brownfield land for development where is considered available and suitable within Retford, such as on the Former Elizabethan School off North Road. However, there is not enough available or suitable brownfield land in Retford to accommodate the level of proposed growth in the local plan. Therefore, some greenfield land is needed to support Retford's growth over the plan period and beyond.</p> <p>All major development are required to provide at least a 10% net gain in biodiversity. The land at Ordsall South is currently utilised for intense agricultural purposes and is therefore not particularly supportive for wildlife habitats. The new development at Ordsall South will deliver a significant level of green infrastructure, such as new trees, green space, and a</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South		problems in the future. Bassetlaw District Council have also oversubscribed the requirement for the number of homes needed within the Retford area. There is no need for this development in this area.	<p>country park, which will provide space for wildlife enhancement and offer a greater degree of biodiversity.</p> <p>There are currently no concerning air quality issues at Ordsall. The inclusion of new green infrastructure, including the country park and woodlands on site will help mitigate against any increased issues with air quality in the area.</p> <p>The Council has produced a detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment for all relevant sites across the District. For Ordsall South, surface water flooding is the main risk where water runs off the fields into the existing developments in periods of high rainfall events. The Flood Risk Assessment has stated that new (on-site) water storage facilities will help reduce the risk of surface water run-off into the new development and in to the existing development in Ordsall. Onsite urban drainage systems are also required and these will likely form part of the developments Green Infrastructure provision.</p>
REF069	Resident	I am writing to inform you that I strongly object to the proposed planning of the area of Ordsall South. I am very saddened to read that since the huge objections from the residents of Ordsall there are now plans to increase the housing in this area. I object to this proposal entirely and there are several reasons for my objections. Firstly, the proposal would have a huge effect on the wildlife in those fields and surrounding areas. Also, there would be massive increase of traffic in the area, not only would this be detrimental to the environment but also to the health and safety of the current residents that live in the area. I believe that this would have an overall impact on climate change, due to the increase environmental damage and decrease of wildlife in the area. Retford as a whole cannot cope with any further increase of traffic. This proposed area, South of Ordsall, is agricultural land and should remain so. Land is a natural resource and of utmost importance, as it supports natural vegetation, wildlife and benefits human life. Many people use this area for walking, and it provides huge benefits to people's mental health having what feels like the countryside on their doorstep. I do not agree that there should be any building of houses beyond the current boundary of Retford; I strongly feel that the existing boundaries of Retford and Ordsall should be maintained with no further expansion given. This area needs to be protected in order to avoid the town losing its geographic identity and resulting in the area merging with areas such as Eaton. The fields to the south of Ordsall also flood when there is heavy rainfall. If this area was to be built on not only would this area be prone to flooding but also there is an increase risk to the current properties being flooded due to the water not being able to be absorbed into the fields as it currently is. I can see you have attempted to address this in the new proposal, but this has only heightened my anxieties as it is clearly describing flood areas. You can clearly see that following rainfall there are huge patches of wet ground that remains in the fields for days afterwards, also the ditches still have water in them following days of warm or hot weather. Adding infrastructure, concrete and road to these fields would cause massive problems in the future. Bassetlaw District Council have also oversubscribed the requirement for the number of homes needed within the Retford area. There is no need for this development in this area.	<p>The Council undertook an assessment (sustainability appraisal) on all reasonable locations to accommodate growth around Retford, with a priority on reusing brownfield land. The local plan has identified brownfield land for development where is considered available and suitable within Retford, such as on the Former Elizabethan School off North Road. However, there is not enough available or suitable brownfield land in Retford to accommodate the level of proposed growth in the local plan. Therefore, some greenfield land is needed to support Retford's growth over the plan period and beyond.</p> <p>All major development are required to provide at least a 10% net gain in biodiversity. The land at Ordsall South is currently utilised for intense agricultural purposes and is therefore not particularly supportive for wildlife habitats. The new development at Ordsall South will deliver a significant level of green infrastructure, such as new trees, green space, and a country park, which will provide space for wildlife enhancement and offer a greater degree of biodiversity.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			<p>There are currently no concerning air quality issues at Ordsall. The inclusion of new green infrastructure, including the country park and woodlands on site will help mitigate against any increased issues with air quality in the area.</p> <p>The Council has produced a detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment for all relevant sites across the District. For Ordsall South, surface water flooding is the main risk where water runs off the fields into the existing developments in periods of high rainfall events. The Flood Risk Assessment has stated that new (on-site) water storage facilities will help reduce the risk of surface water run-off into the new development and in to the existing development in Ordsall. Onsite urban drainage systems are also required and these will likely form part of the developments Green Infrastructure provision.</p>
REF058	Gamston with West Drayton and Eaton Parish Council	<p>The Parish Council appreciate that Bassetlaw District Council has to identify suitable land to support the development of new housing to meet future needs in the area however, the Parish Council have raised strong objections to this plan for the following reasons. The proposed rate of this development is not only almost double what is required using the Government's recommended method of calculation but the time scales do not allow for the considered development of necessary infrastructure to support the needs of such an increased population. The updated plan includes the building of even more houses than identified in the original plan adding 450 houses to the original 850, in reality the Parish Council can not foresee the need for this size of development</p> <p>The following issues were identified as specific issues to consider:</p> <p>Please note that although the plan was deemed to be detrimental to the whole Parish with increased traffic and a general shortage of supporting services, the village of Eaton would be at greater risk because of its location on the route to Ordsall from major A roads in the vicinity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional traffic – The proposed plan would produce an enormous amount of additional traffic deeming local roads not fit for purpose and dangerous. There is limited scope to improve the existing road system in this area for example the two old bridges at Ordsall and Eaton which are very narrow and cannot cope with the amount of traffic they carry currently. Recently N.C.C. Highways/Via have been involved in devising and enhancing existing traffic measures in Eaton following instances of speeding and antisocial behaviour. Even with recent improvements this has only had a negligible impact with Eaton being used as a “cut-through” from major ‘A’ roads. The mini-roundabouts at the North of Ordsall and at Whitehouses are even now exceptionally congested and the plan identifies no opportunity to make alternative new/enhanced roadways for the proposed Ordsall South development. • Cyclist and pedestrian usage - Improvements for cyclists would require the removal of much needed kerbside parking in Eaton village. The narrow road through the village of Eaton is precarious and dangerous for pedestrians at present as they have to be aware of speeding vehicles and this would only get worse. • Additional facilities - As the infrastructure of schools, health and leisure facilities does not exist at present the building of these and ensuing chaos created because of the construction will add another layer of 	<p>The volume of development is closely linked to its viability and the provision of infrastructure. A development of this scale will need to be phased so that the housing and infrastructure are delivered in a sustainable way throughout the lifetime of the development. The Local Plan proposes that the first 800 homes will be delivered before the end of 2037. A further 450 homes will be delivered thereafter.</p> <p>The uplift in the number of homes from November 2020 was undertaken for two reasons. Firstly, to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework and its policy on the effective use of land, and secondly to provide a viable development that can support the delivery of necessary infrastructure to support a sustainable development for the community.</p> <p>The Council's Transport Assessment assessed the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The projected additional traffic flows from the proposed new developments were then applied to the transport model. This assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic, which this plan has aimed to mitigate. Where the proposed development</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South		<p>difficulty to the plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection of Rural countryside - In proposing the Ordsall South development the well-being of residents in the Gamston with West Drayton and Eaton Parish Council are blatantly being put at risk with the encroachment of new building on rural areas that cannot support such an extensive plan. <p>It would be more sensible, in our opinion, for Bassetlaw Council to increase the number of houses to be built in the Bassetlaw Garden Village as the infrastructure would already exist and could be tied in with the proposed development.</p>	<p>has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p> <p>The Council's Transport Assessment has also identified a small rise in traffic volume through Eaton as a consequence of the proposed development at Ordsall South. However, the Transport Assessment indicates that these impacts can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures, the specifics of which can be found in the Transport Assessment itself.</p> <p>Conditions may be put in place for the developers regarding the potential for disruption to be caused through the construction process of the development. This would be done through the standard planning process.</p> <p>The wider countryside beyond the proposed allocation isn't earmarked for development and is therefore subject to the rural policies within the Local Plan.</p>
REF059	Environment Agency	<p>Whilst we're really pleased to see "blue-green Infrastructure" referenced (ST6 – Point 6), after this first reference the text appears to go back to just "green infrastructure". We recommend that you amend the following references to highlight the importance of blue-green infrastructure;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.14 Site HS14: Ordsall South – 7.14.8 – "The use of green infrastructure will...." • 7.14 Site HS14: Ordsall South – 7.14.9 – "Elsewhere on site, appropriate use of green infrastructure, such as...." • Policy 29 – 3. – "Green infrastructure and biodiversity" • Policy 29 – 3. a) – "Provide for a multifunctional green infrastructure network....." <p>7.14.9:</p> <p>We're really supportive of a buffer paragraph; however, we recommend that buffers should be provided alongside all watercourses including rivers, canals, drains and ditches for the benefits they provide in terms of corridors for wildlife movement. Therefore, it'd be beneficial to see reference to that requirement here. Our advice is that undeveloped buffers of 10m should be provided adjacent to all watercourses on site, where existing constraints allow.</p> <p>Also, on the western edge of the site there are two drains which have culverted sections. Our preference is for culverts to be opened where possible, due to the significant improvements is has on biodiversity. We suggest an addition to the site specific Policy 29 which requires the removal of culverted sections of watercourse to improve biodiversity.</p> <p>7.14.11:</p> <p>Excellent to see reference to biodiversity net gain in here. We note that a Biodiversity opportunity mapping project</p>	Thank you for your comments. We have included your recommendations to the policy where appropriate.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>has been completed for Nottinghamshire, including Bassetlaw so we recommend that you refer to this mapping within the text as it's a great evidence base for highlighting relevant options here.</p> <p>7.14.12:</p> <p>As mentioned above, watercourses should also be buffered for the biodiversity benefits it provides, not just flooding and separation; we'd therefore like to see those reasons added here for extra weight.</p> <p>Policy 29:</p> <p>In light of the above, we recommend the following additions to Policy 29 in order to improve the effectiveness and clarity of the Policy;</p> <p>3. vii – remove existing culverts on the site; in particular, one culvert on the watercourse on the western boundary of the site and another in the North Western Corner of the site, parallel to Retford golf course, in order to improve these watercourses for biodiversity.</p>	
REF062	National Trust	<p>An increase in the amount of new housing is proposed at Ordsall South. This forms part of an overall strategy within the Bassetlaw Local Plan to drive up housing and employment numbers, including large tracts of proposed greenfield development, which appear to be led more by land supply than by identified need. National Trust is concerned that this overall strategy does not represent sustainable development.</p> <p>While land at Ordsall south in some respects may present a more sustainable development proposition than the proposed Garden Village – being well related to an existing settlement, further from the noise and pollution associated with the A1, and less likely to impact on the sensitive ecology of Sherwood Forest and Clumber Park – we are nevertheless concerned about the potential impact on the identified Green gaps between settlements.</p> <p>Part (1)(a) of the policy states that the development should, through a Landscape Strategy and Density Plan, protect and enhance the Retford Eaton Green Gap and its landscape qualities. We suggest that the policy could more explicitly exclude land within the defined Green Gap from the built development area, having regard to the findings of the Green Gap Report 2019, p32-33.</p> <p>Part (1)(a)(ii) of the policy proposes low density development of 15-30 dwellings per hectare. It is unclear whether this relates to the proposed density across the site as a whole (i.e. including green spaces and other uses) or within residential areas. We suggest that this needs to be clarified. If the latter then 15-30 dwellings per hectare is a very low density and would therefore represent an inefficient use of greenfield land. We suggest that dwelling density within residential areas should be at least 30 dwellings per hectare, thus allowing a reduction in greenfield land take. Part 3 of the policy proposes a multi-functional green infrastructure network. National Trust supports this concept as part of any site allocation in this location.</p>	<p>The allocation of land at Ordsall South provides a balance of growth proportionate between the two largest settlements. The site is located on the edge of Ordsall and therefore needs to be carefully designed. The site is also located within a more sensitive landscape and green gap which strengthens the need for it to be sensitive to place. The design of the scheme will provide a mix of densities. Higher densities will be located around the local centre and transport infrastructure whereas lower densities will be located to the edge of the site and closer to the proposed country park.</p>
REF063	CCG NHS Bassetlaw	<p>The 108.7 hectare site will deliver 800 homes up to the year 2037, with a further 450 homes to follow after. 20% of homes delivered will be affordable housing, 20% will be designed for older people and 5% will be designed for wheelchair access.</p> <p>20% affordable housing – 160 homes 20% older people – 160 homes 5% wheelchair access – 40 homes</p> <p>Assuming the 2.3 people per household this is additional 1,840 people in total based on the initial 800 homes. The subsequent 400 homes would have potential increase of 920 people which totals 2760 individuals, however this is outside of this planning period.</p> <p>The plans recognise that Retford has a relatively high proportion of older people (aged 65+) and the highest number of residents aged over 75 in the District (10.6%). Ordsall South provides a significant opportunity to make provision</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Your recommendations on health and health facilities and their requirements have been updated as part of the revisions to the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan where necessary.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South		<p>for this age group, so that they can 'age well in place'. The Carr Hill Formulae that is used to calculate payment of GP contracts uses a Carr hill weighting to certain cohorts to factor the increased demand on primary care, the elderly population are weighted in this formula as it is acknowledged they need greater care from primary and community health services. Infrastructure identified: a convenience shop, land for a primary school, a health hub, and community facilities including outdoor sports pitches. The CCG commits to work with BDC to understand the intent of the health hub, the comments from local people about health service provision and services that may potentially be included. It should be noted if this includes primary care services any building space would be rented and therefore subject to reimbursement unless delivered through S106 contributions or delivered up for ownership in public sector as part of the overall development. The CCG has further committed to meet and discuss this further with the planning team before the end of July 2021.</p> <p>Primary Care Supporting Ordsall South:</p> <p>Retford and Villages form one PCN, primary care services in the main town are delivered by three GP practices, Riverside Health Centre delivered by Riverside Health Partnership and located close to the town centre, Kingfisher Family practice and Crown house Surgery are based at the Retford primary care Centre located just outside of the town centre on the hospital site. Riverside Health Centre have branch sites at Harworth, Misterton and Gringley. There are two further practices located at North Leverton and Tuxford, however it is not likely that these practise will be affected and Tuxford, as indicated above, has benefited from an extension recently. Riverside Health Centre is a training practice, which is pivotal to ensuring that GP workforce is strengthened to ensure there is an increase in GPs in Bassetlaw to deliver services to a larger population base. The practice is currently at capacity in terms of space at their main site which impedes on the space available to progress trainee GPs and increase in local population may impact on ability to access health services. Kingfisher and Crown House are located in a LIFT building; any additional space requirements would lead to reconfiguring the internal space available. Increase in patients from smaller housing developments in Retford may be able to be absorbed, (consideration of accumulative effect will need to be accounted for) however larger developments such as this will definitely require investment to increase capacity in primary care. The space referred to above relates only to the primary medical care services and does not consider developing a more holistic approach to health and care integration, delivering a wider scope of services that promote wellness and reduce the burden of ill health on some of the most vulnerable within our communities. The PCN serving the area would be Retford and Villages PCN. The PCN has five GP practices across 8 different sites. The total number of patients registered at Retford and Villages PCN is 52,615 as at June 2021. The Healthy Urban Development Unit (HUDU) has developed and maintains a model to calculate indicative health contributions arising from development proposals which is in widespread use. The model uses a range of assumptions based on the most up to date information available from ONS and other sources. This model indicates that costs to primary and community health in terms of space requirements indicates £610 per dwelling. For acute services, based on a formula which projects increases in attendance at hospital, pro rata for a per capita population, the cost per dwelling is £69. Therefore capital cost requirements would be £679 per dwelling.</p> <p>This funding could be used for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alterations and extensions to existing facilities and sites from which health and community services are delivered, including primary and secondary care services, to accommodate increased patient numbers; • Sites for the development of facilities from which health and community services will be delivered; • Construction costs of new facilities from which health and community services will be delivered; • Contributions towards the provision of additional spaces and capital developments to deliver health services; • Other building provision at existing medical centres or other community provisions where this releases additional capacity. 	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>Using standard NHS cost and floor space requirements for the various facilities, the model is able to quantify the impact in terms of physical space and subsequent cost, enabling an estimate of cost per dwelling based on the future expansion of the population. As indicated above the CCG will work with BDC and NSH England to agree what this may look like.</p> <p>In the interim, known information from Department of Health and NHS Digital can be applied:</p> <p>On average 1 x WTE GP is required per 1,800 patients. Guidance dictates that rooms used for treatment and/or consultation should be no less than 16m² (as per HTM). It should be noted that the current NHS England space estimator only allows for primary medical services and does not include provision for colocation/integration or primary care network workforce proposals which would increase the physical space or capital investment required, nor does this tool incorporate the additional outpatient services and community care service provision that would need to be delivered so this would need to be factored into the equation.</p> <p>Health Building Note 00-08 provides additional information and guidance on town and country planning. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/414138/hbn08-addend2.pdf</p> <p>It is recognised that 90% of patient interaction is within primary care. The average GP to patient ratio is 1800 patients per GP, however this is historic based on patient attendance being on average 4 appointments per year and does not include the admin support and other clinical professionals input that would be required ie community nursing team, mental health community teams, pharmaceutical services. If the numbers of people moving into the area is 1840* this is potentially an increase in demand for GP appointments of 11, 040 based on average 6 GP visits per year, and clearly at the average of 12 minute appointments would require an additional 2,208 additional GP hours. Full time GP would usually work 9 sessions of 4 hours 10 minutes per session. GP sessions would usually be made up of 7 clinical sessions and 2 non-clinical front facing. Each session would deliver up to 20 appointments. It is evident therefore that up to two additional primary care staff may be required and would suitable consultation space from which to deliver services.</p> <p>*Does not include the additional 450 homes after 2037.</p> <p>There is indication of extra care housing – this may indicate additional primary and community services demand as referenced above. Wi-Fi/connectivity to enable remote health care management is key in the current new ways of working and essential in some circumstances. It is important in respect to ill health prevention and wellness promotion that we also support our residents who are lonely or socially isolated (whatever age) to remain as connected as possible to supportive networks which may often be through digital channels of communication.</p> <p>As per earlier consultation on overall plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a healthcare provider and commissioner of services we obviously welcome the inclusion of the areas identified in the Healthy Communities section of the plan to optimise healthy living opportunities. • Clearly the strategic objectives are aligned to those of local NHS organisations; and sustainable economic growth and education opportunities should positively impact on recruitment and retention of the NHS workforce. 	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
REF071	Rotherham MB Council	1250 dwellings and a new Local Centre are proposed on this site, with emphasis on provision for older people. Further information on the quality of bus services at the two shown stops will be needed to ensure sustainable transport connections to Retford town centre and beyond. As Bassetlaw does not benefit from any Green Belt allocation, care should be taken to ensure that Ordsall South and Bassetlaw Garden Village do not risk excessive sprawl and coalescence, which could potentially lead to the two becoming closer together over time. It is noted however that the area surrounding this site has been allocated as a Green Gap which will provide protection to the wider open countryside and this is supported.	Thanks for your comments
1820985	Resident	Too many houses already for the road and transportation links. Schools already too busy and pollution would be increased due to lack of local jobs	<p>The Council undertook a Transport Assessment which assessed both the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford and the potential impact that the new development would have on it. The existing traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. Where development has a direct adverse impact, then the development is expected to implement the necessary mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p> <p>The Council has been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required as a result of the proposed development at Ordsall South. The County Council have confirmed that there would be a need for a new 1-form entry Primary School to be provided onsite. The Local Plan has therefore safeguarded land on the site for education and community use and this provision will be delivered through the development of the site.</p>
1821092	Resident	I am against these plans as the infrastructure in Ordsall is not capable of sustaining such a large housing development. I currently live on Ordsall Road and already at peak times of the day it is very difficult to get off your drive due to high volumes of traffic. During school term traffic is horrendous reducing much of the roads to single file. Families will have to travel to school due to the distance from this development with nowhere to park. The proposal does not mention anything about the academy schools in the area and if they have sufficient space for extra pupils. Based on the number of houses proposed this would be around 260 spaces required and a possible 260 extra cars onto Ordsall road just for schools, plus the extra vehicles for those commuting to work. Within the proposal there is no mention of road improvements to the roundabout at the end of Ordsall road or any suggestions about traffic congestion on the Worksop to Retford road which already sees traffic queuing for over a mile at peak times. The infrastructure and road network within Ordsall cannot sustain such a large housing development, and would create chaos. The road network within Ordsall, Retford and Eaton is not suitable. Consideration has to be given to the wider area and community and how this development will impact the local	<p>The Council has conducted a Transport Assessment that assessed both the existing traffic flows in and around Retford, and the impact that any new development would have on these. The assessments for the existing traffic flows were carried out during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified that a number of roads and junctions would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The proposed developments would implement these mitigation schemes where they had</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South		area.	<p>a direct adverse impact, and financial contributions will be sought to contribute towards wider improvement schemes where the impact is indirect.</p> <p>The Council has been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision would be required for the proposed development at Ordsall South. The County Council have confirmed that a new 1-form entry Primary School would need to be provide onsite. The Local Plan has safeguarded land on the site for education and community use and this will be delivered through the development of the site.</p> <p>An appropriate level of residential and visitor off-road car parking space will be provided in line with the County Council Parking Standards. The ratio for these standards is related to the number of bedrooms per property.</p>
1822709	Resident	<p>The very idea of developing this site without improving the road infrastructure in the area is ridiculous. Your PLAN talks of improvements to roundabouts how inadequate. I believe when the Persimmon Houses were built at Ordsall the mini roundabout was meant to be improved. However this was changed why??? This proposed Ordsall South development seems to ignore the fact that the roads leading to London Road from this site are totally inadequate. High Street at Ordsall is usually full of parked cars as the houses there do not have off road parking. The other road that goes past the cricket ground is a narrow road where cars frequently park and it can be difficult to travel along safely due to impaired vision where the road bends. Any development of this site will see vehicles using Eaton Village as a 'rat run' to access London Road. The bridge over the River Idle in the village is only suitable for one vehicle to pass over it. Over the years there have been several accidents here and damage to the bridge.</p> <p>Any improvements to the mini roundabout at Goosemoor would be very welcome as again there have been many accidents here over the years. Why the 30 mile an hour speed limit was not extended to the average speed cameras remains a mystery to me. Lastly I think it is time Bassetlaw Council got its finger out and sorted their Local Plan. I am sick of being consulted about it. As a result of not having one the district is open to being taken advantage of by speculative developers and houses being built in totally inappropriate places. So please get your act together and get a plan put in place. We need a road infrastructure that can cope with all these houses and new health surgeries and schools.</p>	<p>The Council's Transport Assessment has assessed the impact that any new development would have on the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford. The Transport Assessment measured traffic flows across the town during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline.</p> <p>The level of new development and the proposed locations for development were then applied to the transport model to see what impacts the new development would have on those existing traffic flows. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas.</p> <p>Where development has a direct adverse impact, the development will be expected to implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p> <p>The Council's Transport Assessment identified a small rise in traffic volume through Eaton as a consequence of the proposed development at Ordsall South. This</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
			impact can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures which are listed in greater detail within the Transport Assessment.
1822766	Resident	<p>It is unrealistic to believe that future residents of the new development will not drive through Eaton village (even with the suggested road narrowing measures / changes in traffic priority). To travel to Markham Moor from the top of Lansdown Drive is 5.6miles via the A1 but only 4.3miles via Eaton village. The proposed development will have a dreadful impact on Eaton village and would undoubtedly be detrimental to highway safety due to the single width bridge (offering little forward visibility of approaching vehicles) and minimal pedestrian facilities in the village. During nice weather the area around the river in Eaton already gets incredibly busy with parked cars and visitors. The proposed roundabouts to access the development sites are welcomed. It is requested that vehicular access to the development should only come from these (not from existing roads) in order to avoid confusion for highway users and to protect residential amenity. For informaion, there may be a ransom strip at the end of Lansdown Drive?</p>	<p>The Council's Transport Assessment has identified a small rise in traffic volume through Eaton as a consequence of the proposed development at Ordsall South. However, the Transport Assessment indicates that these impacts can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures, the specifics of which can be found in the Transport Assessment itself.</p>
1828681	Resident	<p>I oppose to the new revised plans for Ordsall sound. Retford and Ordsall can not take this amount of people. Our doctors are full and struggling to see patients. Our dentists have 2 and a half year waiting lists. Our schools are at maximum capacity as it is. Traffic is bad at the best of times. We are a small market town and a small village. If there was to be a potential more housing built to this scale. There needs to be dentists, doctors, schools (primary & secondary) built before the house get built to accommodate for the families that will most likely move in. It's a farce and unfair on the locals here already to not think about how this will affect day to day like for them!</p>	<p>The Council has been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there would need to be a new 1-form entry Primary School provide onsite. The Local Plan has therefore safeguarded land on the site for education and community use and this will be delivered through the development of the site.</p> <p>In addition, a new "health-hub" facility will be created so that new health services can be provided on site. It is likely this will form part of the Local Centre for the development which will become a focus for shops, community facilities and transport services.</p>
1828715	Resident	<p>I have no objection to more houses people have to have somewhere to live. What I do have objection to is that you have no idea what this area needs. The roads are too small to take to amount of traffic a new estate will bring the schools and doctors in Retford are already full but you say we don't need a new school before the houses are finished. It should be built alongside the houses ready to accommodate the new children the houses will bring. The only people benefitting from this development seem to be the builders and the council. The people of ordsall have already told you what they think to this plan so if you keep having consultations does this mean you will go on until you wear us down and then get your own way</p>	<p>The Council's Transport Assessment assessed the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The proposed new development was then applied to this transport model to see what impacts the new development would have on the existing traffic flows. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation strategies to resolve these in certain areas.</p> <p>The delivery of some areas of infrastructure, such as the Primary School, will come through the mid stages of the development. The delivery strategy of the school is the responsibility of Nottinghamshire County Council, who are the education authority, who will</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
			reach an agreement on the delivery of the school with the developer(s) during the planning process.
1831129	Resident	I am very concerned that the BDC Planning Committee seems determined to pass new proposed housing numbers in Bassetlaw, way in excess of those actually required by law. I especially note the new additional 450 houses planned for Ordsall. I live in the area and traffic is already congested around the limited local amenities and at two of the three closest access points, West Carr Road, where it crosses the railway line and the very narrow and awkward bridge over the river at Goosemoor Lane. Much of the housing in the area was built when cars were not a consideration so these are now parked on the highway, further limiting safe driving conditions and negating the possibility of cycle lanes to keep cyclists safe.	<p>The volume of development is closely linked to its viability and the provision of infrastructure necessary to support the sustainable development of the community. A development of this scale needs to be phased so that the housing and infrastructure are delivered in a sustainable way throughout the lifetime of the development. The Local Plan proposes that the first 800 homes will be delivered before the end of 2037. A further 450 homes will be delivered thereafter.</p> <p>The uplift in the number of homes from November 2020 was undertaken for two reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To comply with the National Planning Policy Framework and its policy on the effective use of land; and 2. To provide a viable development that can support the delivery of necessary infrastructure to support a sustainable development for the community. <p>The Council's Transport Assessment assessed the impact that the new development would have on the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford. This was achieved by measuring the traffic flows during peak times and outside of school holidays and then adding the proposed developments to see what impacts they would have on those existing traffic flows. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas to resolve this.</p>
1837498	Resident	Many residents of the new development will surely work and regularly travel in to retford. What will be done to manage this significant traffic increase in the town? Also will safe cycle routes be provided from Ordsall South to Retford town centre?	The Council's Transport Assessment has assessed the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford. The traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The level of new development and the proposed locations for development were then added to the transport model to see what impacts the new development would have on those existing traffic flows. The assessment

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
			<p>identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas in order to respond to this. Where new development has a direct adverse impact, then the development would be expected to implement the necessary mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p> <p>The development of Ordsall South will provide the opportunity to provide new and enhance existing public transport infrastructure. This will include the provision of enhanced bus services to and from the site to Retford Town Centre, and enhancements to the footpath and cycle network into Retford and the surrounding countryside. A new network of footpaths and cycle routes will also be provided on site so that residents can easily access the green spaces and local services. Where new roads and cycle ways are provided, these will be segregated or form part of a shared space for cyclists and pedestrians.</p>
1841370	Resident	<p>Where will children go to school until/if a primary school is built on the site? Local schools are already at or near capacity. Similarly local health provision eg GP surgeries are already over capacity.</p> <p>'Traffic management' schemes in Ordsall and particularly Eaton, the only 2 routes through to south Retford and southern villages, will not mitigate the already untenable traffic problems in those areas. Both places will be ruined by increased traffic flow and both have bridges which have weight limits. A few green corridors and a small area of 'country park' will not make up for the loss of hectares of green land and habitat destruction.</p>	<p>New and enhanced facilities will be provided on and off site. The development will trigger the need for a new Primary school on site and a health facility.</p> <p>Before these are available, contributions towards existing provision will be appropriate.</p>
1841587	Resident	<p>The Retford Transport Assessment identifies and accepts that a development of the proposed Ordsall South size will bring an inevitable increase in traffic and as a resident of Eaton, I'm extremely concerned that a few token traffic calming measures will do little to 'discourage' through traffic from using Eaton (when there are very few alternative routes) or indeed slow traffic down. The road through the village is narrow, there are limited footpaths and any further increase in traffic will pose a real danger to pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders who regularly use the village. Furthermore, increased pollution and noise levels will substantially reduce the quality of life for village residents. I strongly object to this development.</p>	<p>Although there will be an increase in traffic movements, it would not lead to an unreasonable increase. However, measures are recommended within Eaton to discourage non-village traffic from using this route.</p>
1841717	Resident	<p>With regards to transport comments in relation to impact to the Ordsall South proposal do not take into account the significant amount of traffic that would transit from Goosemoor lane and up high street. Currently is not possible to have dual flowing traffic due to parked vehicles and often has to operate on a one way one vehicle at a time basis. Increased traffic here would enormous impact to residents in this area.</p>	<p>The Transport Assessment identifies the need for mitigation at Goosemoor/ London Road in order to safely accommodate the increase in traffic volumes.</p>
1843425	Resident	<p>This development is not wanted or needed in Ordsall, as a resident of Ordsall we have already seen phenomenal growth within the area, congestion on the roads and around the local shops, and a complete impasse around the junior and secondary schools.</p>	<p>Thanks for your comments</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
1843701	Resident	<p>Local road networks and school networks are not suitable for additional housing.</p>	<p>The Council has produced a Transport Assessment which assessed both the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford and the impact that the proposed new development would have on these. The existing traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas such as Eaton village.</p> <p>The Council has been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision would be required for the proposed development at Ordsall South. The County Council have confirmed that a new 1-form entry Primary School would need to be provided onsite. The Local Plan has safeguarded land on the site for education and community use and this will be delivered through the development of the site.</p>
1843721	Resident	<p>I am very strongly opposed to the development proposed for Ordsall South. My objection is based on the following:</p> <p>1 Government policy does not require Bassetlaw in general or Retford in particular to build the very large number of houses proposed. The decision to build Ordsall South is a local one based mostly on political preferences. If it is argued that growth in employment requires the number of houses proposed, clear evidence of the sectors in which employment will be increased, the number of jobs that are expected to be created within each sector, the rate of increase and the location of new employment sites is required. That evidence is lacking and the consultant's report about future employment attached to the first draft of the plan was incredibly optimistic. It was most certainly not a document justifying 1200 plus houses in Ordsall.</p> <p>2. My last point is compounded by the lack of community facilities to support the people who will live in Ordsall South. No community facilities or, for that matter, any infrastructure, are guaranteed. How will Retford's health service (it already takes 10-14 days to book a telephone call with a GP) cope with more than 2,000 extra patients? As far as I can tell, no clear planning about school numbers has been completed. There is a lack of information about local shops and other required facilities. The development should not go any further without guaranteed, extensive infrastructure to support residents.</p> <p>3. The situation is more serious than indicated in Point 3. Anybody who knows the roads linking Retford and Ordsall should realise that they simply cannot take the increase of traffic following the building of the development. London Road cannot take the extra cars. A new road leading to London Road is all well and good but does not solve the problem of greatly increased traffic on that road towards town, not least at the traffic lights by the Old King Edward's School. Extra pressure will consequentially be placed on the whole of the Ring Road. The two roads from Ordsall to Babworth Road cannot accommodate the large number of additional cars created by the proposed development. One has two very narrow sections; the other leads to a roundabout that joins a busy road, already blocked from Retford Oaks School to the roundabout at the ring road on every school day of the week – and at other times. It is also important to note that the appeal to build on the Bigsby Road site was refused partly because of concerns about</p>	<p>The level of growth for the District has been decided based on local housing and employment need. The level of jobs should be balanced against the number of homes. The location of growth across the District is a local discussion which is informed by local evidence and community consultation since 2016.</p> <p>A new "health-hub" facility will be provided on the site so that new health services are available for both new and existing residents. It is likely this will form part of the Local Centre for the development which will become a focus for shops, community facilities and transport services. The Council has also been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there is a need for a new 1-form entry Primary School to be provided onsite. The Local Plan has safeguarded land on the site for education and community use and has been included within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and is a policy requirement for Ordsall South.</p> <p>The Council has conducted a Transport Assessment that assessed both the existing traffic flows in and</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South		<p>the implications for traffic on the ring road. The Ordsall South development would be likely to have a very similar, greater effect. I find no evidence that adequate attention has been given to the consequences for the proposed development for traffic growth and flow. Neither do I think any real attention has been given to the effects of extra traffic on Ordsall residents. They will experience greater pollution and noise as well as a much greater number of vehicles travelling through their area.</p> <p>4. I am very keen to see Bassetlaw publish a Local Plan. It is essential. The Ordsall South development is flawed and there is huge resistance to it amongst Retford's residents. Why then continue with it when an adequate number of houses will be built on other sites? Why delay a final local plan with such a flawed proposal?</p>	around Retford, and the impact that any new development would have on these. The assessments for the existing traffic flows were carried out during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified that a number of roads and junctions would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The proposed developments would implement these mitigations schemes where they had a direct adverse impact, and financial contributions will be sought to contribute towards wider improvement schemes where the impact is indirect.
1844226	Resident	<p>I don't agree with any of the plans for the development in Ordsall and the plan to build the planned houses by the Golf Course and Eaton area. The village doesn't have the infrastructure to support the number of planned houses (which has changed and increased since the last planning submission), the traffic and through traffic at present is congested and with more traffic on the roads would increase the possibility of an accident, which is going to happen sooner rather than later! There is no confirmation a school would actually be built and I doubt it would, therefore putting further strain onto already oversubscribed schools. We moved to the area due to the green spaces within close proximity and that we could walk into the countryside. I am a regular dog walker and walk in the fields that are planned for this housing development both by Glen Eagles and Eaton, I think it's disgraceful that you wish to develop on this land losing the natural habitats of wildlife in these areas. I don't believe you'll develop the land to include the wildlife/ natural park and I don't want a place that I walk for tranquility to be destroyed by developers that really are only thinking of their pockets. It's not going to bring any local business or money to our area as people would travel away and again increase the traffic flow to what is already poorly maintained roads, highways and footpaths! Lastly, these proposed areas do flood (and local flooding has increased over the last few years) so in turn would result in further flooding to the area as well as the surrounding areas. I understand developments need to be considered but Ordsall is not suitable for this type of development!</p>	<p>The Council's Transport Assessment assessed the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The projected additional traffic flows from the proposed new developments were then applied to the transport model. This assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic, which this plan has aimed to mitigate. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p> <p>The Council has been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there would need to be a new 1-form entry Primary School provided onsite. The Local Plan has therefore safeguarded land on the site for education and community use and this will be delivered through the development of the site. The delivery strategy of the school is the responsibility of Nottinghamshire County Council, who will reach an agreement on the delivery of the school with the developer(s) during the planning process.</p> <p>All major developments are required to provide at least a 10% net gain in biodiversity. The land at Ordsall South is currently utilised for intense agricultural purposes and is therefore not particularly supportive</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			<p>for wildlife habitats. The new development at Ordsall South will deliver a significant level of green infrastructure, such as new trees, green space, and a country park, which will provide space for wildlife enhancement and offer a greater degree of biodiversity</p> <p>The Council has produced a detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment for all relevant sites across the District. For Ordsall South, surface water flooding is the main risk where water runs off the fields into the existing developments in periods of high rainfall events. The Flood Risk Assessment has stated that new (on-site) water storage facilities will help reduce the risk of surface water run-off into the new development and in to the existing development in Ordsall. Onsite urban drainage systems are also required and these will likely form part of the developments Green Infrastructure provision.</p>
1849082	Parish Councillor (Garnston)	<p>Following access to the proposed developments in the Retford area I wish to make the following specific comments about the Council's Local Plan's in relation to proposed plans affecting my immediate area: As a resident and a Parish Councillor of Eaton I am extremely concerned yet again about this proposed development NOW even though it is not due to commence until 2027.</p> <p>I appreciate that Bassetlaw District Council is being encouraged by the Government to provide an enormous amount of new housing in the next 16+ years. However I consider that this rate is almost double what is required using the Government's recommended method of calculation. This is supposedly justified by employment growth which is expected to result in substantially increased inwards migration. I am also dismayed to see that the local Council has buckled under Government pressure to accept that a further 450 houses should be built on this site in addition to the 850 homes in the 20/21 Plan. I understand that this is an openly political move from homes being built in city areas to the backwater of a rural constituency and local Council.</p> <p>I have reservations about the scale of the increase in employment planned for and I consider that it is enormously over-ambitious.</p> <p>The scale of house-building proposed in the Ordsall South proposal seems excessive and I suggest that this whole proposed site of potentially 1250 homes should be totally abandoned. Furthermore I have considerable reservations about this development in terms of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enormous amount of additional traffic It would produce an enormous amount of additional traffic putting local roads under even more stress than at present. There is limited scope to improve the existing road system and progressively to accommodate the upgrading of these routes. There are 2 old bridges at Ordsall and Eaton which are very narrow and cannot cope with the amount of traffic passing through each village/settlement in 2021. Recently Notts Highways/Via have been involved in devising and enhancing existing traffic measures in Eaton following instances of speeding and antisocial behaviour. Even with recent improvements introduced this has only had a negligible impact in terms of controlling the speed and volume of vehicles using the village as a 'cutthrough' from major 'A' roads. The mini-roundabouts at the north end of Ordsall and at Whitehouses are even now exceptionally congested with no opportunity to make alternative new/enhanced roadways for the proposed Ordsall South development. - Cyclist and pedestrian usage Improvements for cycle traffic may be difficult to achieve without restricting much- 	<p>The level of development at Ordsall South is linked to its viability and the provision of much needed infrastructure. The increase in the number of homes from the November 2020 Draft Plan was undertaken for two reasons. Firstly, to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework and its policy on the effective use of land, and secondly to provide a viable development that can support the delivery of necessary infrastructure to support a sustainable development for the community.</p> <p>The Council has conducted a Transport Assessment that assessed both the existing traffic flows in and around Retford, and the impact that any new development would have on these. The assessments for the existing traffic flows were carried out during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified that a number of roads and junctions would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South		<p>needed kerbside parking. As there is only a very small area with a pavement, anybody walking in or through Eaton has to negotiate an increasing number of dangerously driven vehicles cannot walk in the village. There is no way that this situation could be improved as the existing road through the village is so narrow.</p> <p>- Additional facilities If the Ordsall development goes ahead, there must be arrangements in place to secure the funding and provision of all the additional retail, health and community facilities. I understand that the proposed school as mentioned in the original Plan was abandoned thus putting much pressure on existing school provision becoming overloaded and disrupted whilst further expansion takes place. This appears to have been brought back into the Plan.</p> <p>Usually the health, educational, infrastructural facilities appertaining to a new residential site are not built until the housing programme is well-developed so yet again existing residents would have to suffer with over-used facilities and services until Bassetlaw Council provides the supporting services. Over a period from 2027 to 2038 this could result in absolute chaos.</p> <p>- Protection of Rural countryside In proposing this Ordsall South development it strikes me that Bassetlaw Council is more prepared to satisfy Government targets than to ensure that the residents of Ordsall and such villages as Eaton and Gamston enjoy healthy and pleasant lives in areas of open countryside and agricultural land. Therefore if the scale of house-building in the Retford and District part of the Draft Plan as a whole was reduced, perhaps there would be no need for the original 800 houses proposed to be added to Ordsall. Therefore this development would become a blot on the surrounding countryside causing immeasurable challenges to local road networks, services and most importantly the indigenous population.</p> <p>I appreciate that some local communities have to suffer in order for major residential developments as suggested in this Draft Plan.</p> <p>However it would be MORE SENSIBLE in my opinion for the Council to increase the number of houses to be built in the Bassetlaw Garden Village as the infrastructure would already exist and could be tied in with the proposed development. This would be preferable to tagging a huge residential development on to the southern area of Retford where there are insufficient services and an unviable road infrastructure.</p> <p>It brings to mind the following sayings that the Ordsall South development would be</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) 'Like a carbuncle on the face of an old friend!' Quote from the Prince of Wales 2) As Planning should be community-led, green-led and levelling-up led, too many communities are being treated like 'foie gras geese with endless housing shoved down their gullet!' Quote from a Tory MP 	<p>The Council's Transport Assessment has also identified a small rise in traffic volume through Eaton as a consequence of the proposed development at Ordsall South. However, the Transport Assessment indicates that these impacts can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures, the specifics of which can be found in the Transport Assessment itself.</p> <p>The Council has been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there is a need for a new 1-form entry Primary School to be provided onsite. The delivery strategy of the Primary School is the responsibility of NCC and the developer(s) who will reach an agreement on how it is to be delivered. It is likely that it will come through the mid stages of the development. The Primary School has been included within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and is a policy requirement for Ordsall South. A new "health-hub" facility will also be provided on the site so that new health services are available for both new and existing residents. It is likely this will form part of the Local Centre for the development which will become a focus for shops, community facilities and transport services</p>
1849104	BDC Councillor	<p>Area HS13 Ordsall South</p> <p>Para. 2 Mix of Uses</p> <p>(b) (iii) 5% Wheelchair standard market housing is not sufficient and needs to be increased.</p> <p>The reason for recommending an increase is because many disabled and older people in Ordsall still live in unsuitable homes that prevent them living independent and dignified lives.</p> <p>Area HS13 Ordsall South.</p> <p>Para.3 Green</p> <p>Infrastructure and biodiversity (a) (i)</p> <p>In the 23 ha country park on the western boundary a residents' and visitors' car park, with electric charging points for vehicles, with cctv coverage, should be considered. There is an opportunity also to encourage cycling in the estate by providing a cycle hub in the country park that could be used by residents and visitors of all ages. These suggestions are made to help reduce motor vehicle movement and congestion through the estate and lower emissions.</p>	<p>There will be a significant number of assisted and specialist homes on site to accommodate for local housing need. These homes will be of a good standard in line with Government Policy.</p> <p>In addition, the safety of new open space is important and is a factor within the design of the site.</p> <p>New cycling opportunities will be provided around the site and its public open spaces.</p>
1851472	Resident	Oppose the development of Ordsall South on the grounds that 1250 possible dwellings in an area of natural beauty. The number substantially affects the green gap with Eaton and covers land in flood zones. The golf club provides recreation for golfers and walkers and the openness and strategic views will be severely impacted. BDC already has a deliverable supply of housing which amounts to a 100% surplus in 5 years. This amount of over development is changing the nature of our rural agricultural town and villages.	Due to its edge of settlement location, the development of Ordsall South will need to be carefully designed so that it doesn't have a negative impact on the surrounding landscape. The Council has produced a Landscape Character Assessment which details the local and important landscape features (such as views,

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South		<p>Oppose the development of HS13 the proposal is will permanently change the prime agricultural landscape. The size of the development will impact on the natural beauty and openness of the outskirts of Ordsall as mentioned in the Green Gap Study. No amount of landscaping will replace the strategic views that walkers cyclists riders and golfers have. This area should be preserved for its contributions to nature and wellbeing. Wild animals habitats will be destroyed and prime agricultural land will be lost along with mineral safeguarding of clays and the archaeological contribution the crop marks provide. Housing development of this size will increase transport in the rural village of Eaton and Ordsall significantly along side noise and light pollution generated. BDC has shown that the 5 year housing target set by the government has been met and a 100% surplus deliverable. We do not want or require this substantial over development in our small quaint market town. BDC needs to rethink the extent of the expansion and what it is doing to the landscape of Retford surroundings.</p>	<p>trees, watercourses and topography) and provides recommendations on how to restore, reinforce, create or conserve the areas landscape quality.</p> <p>The Council has undertaken an assessment (sustainability appraisal) on all reasonable alternative locations to accommodate growth around Retford. The priority to reuse brownfield land formed a large part of this assessment and the local plan has identified brownfield land for development where is considered available and suitable within Retford, such as on the Former Elizabethan School off North Road. However, there is not enough suitable or available brownfield land in Retford to accommodate the level of proposed growth required to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework and to provide a viable development site that can support the delivery of necessary infrastructure improvements. Therefore, some greenfield land is needed to support Retford's growth over the plan period and beyond.</p>
1853010	Resident	<p>I would like to raise the following observations of the Ordsall South Concept plan. The Community Uses plan only covers potential development ie Medical centre, School, Playing Fields what guarantee will the developers have to enter into with the council to comply with the proposal. General extent of the development again everything is classed as potential. Where will the money come from to fund the medical centre, school, playing fields etc Brecks Rd is shown as the route onto the development and one other access on Ollerton Rd both of these are unsuitable for the amount of traffic that the development will generate.</p> <p>The development extends onto the preferred site from the previous consultation but the plans show that all the community facilities will be situated on the main development. The plans that the Council have asked the community to comment on are unacceptable they lack the road names, the legend is very misleading the whole proposal hasn't had any thought put into it an absolute disgrace. I expect more from my council.</p>	<p>A new "health-hub" facility will be provided on the site so that new health services are available for both new and existing residents. It is likely this will form part of the Local Centre for the development which will become a focus for shops, community facilities and transport services. The Council has also been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there is a need for a new 1-form entry Primary School to be provide onsite. The Local Plan has safeguarded land on the site for education and community use and has been included within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and is a policy requirement for Ordsall South.</p> <p>There will be a minimum of 27ha of public open space, sports and woodland on site. This reflects the Local Plan evidence base, the local community aspirations and the need to provide a net-gain in local biodiversity. New community facilities will also be provided so that there is space for local events, gatherings and community groups.</p> <p>The Council's Transport Assessment has identified a small rise in traffic volume through Eaton as a consequence of the proposed development at Ordsall</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
			South. However, the Transport Assessment indicates that these impacts can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures, the specifics of which can be found in the Transport Assessment itself.
1856045	Resident	The present roads through the proposed site are already at full capacity and any suggested improvements will clearly only be a paper exercise as they will not be viable to implement. The views south towards Eaton across the Idle Valley will not be maintained as houses will obstruct the view and these will be detrimental to the currently existing natural environment. The wording of the proposed plan does nothing to convince me this is a viable proposition and it is very clearly a poor attempt to paint a pretty picture of a ill-conceived idea.	<p>The Council's Transport Assessment assessed the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The projected additional traffic flows from the proposed new developments were then applied to the transport model. This assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic, which this plan has aimed to mitigate. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p> <p>Due to its edge of settlement location, the development of Ordsall South will need to be carefully designed so that its impact on the surrounding landscape is mitigated as much as possible. The Council has produced a Landscape Character Assessment which details the local and important landscape features (such as views, trees, watercourses and topography) and provides recommendations on how to restore, reinforce, create or conserve the areas landscape quality.</p>
1856195	BDC Councillor	I want to register concerns about the Retford transport assessment given the recent ruling about the development of homes on Bigsby road. The team will have access to the details set out by informed individuals te highways offered by barristers in rejecting this planning application Re highways, traffic flow across Retford and the blockages in the system already. How will be sure that the NCC highways will meet any obligation stated in The plan? Concerns already raised about Eaton village used as access to A1 from Ordsall, how will the plan ensure that cats do not use that route when they are aware that the small bridge and access out of Ordsall would be London Road?	The Council has been working closely with Nottinghamshire County Council highways on the Transport Assessments and they have fed into its recommendations. The Retford Transport Assessment details the identified impacts from growth and provides a set of recommendations for how those issues on the network can be mitigated. Traffic calming measures have also been recommended for Ordsall and Eaton.
1856859	Resident	4. Social and community facilities c) states land to accomodate a school yet you are telling people that a school is agreed. No such agreement is in place. a) and b) Nothing is planned for other facilities just space allocated yet you continue to tell people these are agreed. Retford Traffic Assessment 2021 is still based on 800 homes not 1250. Traffic through Ordsall and over Ordsall bridge is not being considered. 5 a) ii 3 talks of improvements to Whitehouses roundabout but no consideration for this additional traffic over	The Council has been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there is a need for a new 1-form entry Primary School to be provide onsite. The Local Plan has safeguarded land on the site for education and community use and has been included

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South		Ordsall Bridge. There needs to be proper infrastructure included not just space allocated. It needs proper access roads otherwise there will be over a decade of construction traffic through Ordsall as well as doubling of household vehicles using local roads and services. It needs an access road East to London Road and an access road West towards Morton or Babworth. This is a very ill-conceived proposal.	within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and is a policy requirement for Ordsall South. The exact delivery of the school is set to be decided through an agreement between Nottinghamshire County Council and the developer(s) during the planning process. A new Transport Assessment has recently been undertaken to reflect in the increase in housing numbers. This assessment looks at all planned development within Retford and makes recommendations for mitigation where appropriate.
1856996	Resident	Overall there will be the possibility of another 3000 cars using the current highway infrastructure around the Retford area. I cannot see where on these plans that more roads are being developed prior to any building work beginning? Where is the sustainable energy solutions? Are we all going over to electric hybrid cars soon? So where are the electric car charging points? Empty promises from a contractor and when finished there will be no additional roads or services to be seen! It's a nightmare during peak times through Retford as it is without more cars trying to get to the same supermarkets, schools, nurseries, GPs etc. This place is going to look like concrete city with houses stacked up next to each other with barely any way around anything. I am not against new housing and I realise we need that, but I would like to see new roads built first, and the new services promised to be delivered. You must have an alternative route into the new estate other than the existing roads available. Also a few football pitches, a shop is again small tokenistic facilities that will hardly assist the current resources! A new supermarket, a new gym, a petrol station, a restaurant are all things that need to be built as people will pile into town for, so why not allow the opportunity for these to be built near the new estate? Let's remember that companies do the bare minimum they want profit and it's for the people and those who represent us to ensure that promises are fulfilled, people are held accountable and the right amount of services and roads go hand in hand with this mini village being built! I would ask our counsellors who have Retford and it's people in their best interests to ensure that these are protected alongside the need for more housing. As once the houses are built they will argue that there is no need for what they first promised...classic well known story!	The Council undertook a Transport Assessment which assessed both the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford and the potential impact that the new development would have on it. The existing traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. Where development has a direct adverse impact, then the development is expected to implement the necessary mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes. All new homes will be required to have the capable infrastructure for installing EV charging points.
1857048	Resident	I strongly oppose the building of 1250 houses on the proposed Ordsall site. Not only will it abolish a vast green space and eco system of our great British wildlife (has an environmental Survey been completed to check for endangered species) but it has not been taken into account the catastrophic effect it will have on our local community, amenities and especially Ordsall primary school and Retford Oaks Academy. If a third of the proposed house's has one child, that's approximately 416 school places that need to be found in our already oversubscribed schools. Has a survey been published on how the current infrastructure of gas, electricity and water will support another 1250 houses and what effect it will have on the current resident's? And Finally how much is the Labour Government receiving in 'party donations' to push such a crippling estate against local residents concerns.	All major development must provide, at least, a 10% net gain in biodiversity. The existing land at Ordsall South is currently utilised for intense agricultural purposes and therefore less supportive for wildlife habitats. The new development is proposed to deliver a significant level of green infrastructure, such as new trees, green space and a country park, which will provide space for wildlife enhancement and greater biodiversity than currently present. The Council has been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there is a need for a new 1-form entry Primary School to be provided onsite. The Local Plan has safeguarded land on the site for

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
1857342	Resident	<p>I am not clear at all on what is being proposed. There is very little detail. I can see there will potentially be a new shop, school and medical centres but how many houses are being proposed to be built? What will happen with the roads are new roads being built as the traffic is already a nightmare? Can more detail be provided on: Number of houses Any improvements to roads</p>	<p>education and community use and this will be delivered through the development of the site.</p> <p>New utilities infrastructure will be provided to the development at a cost from the developer.</p> <p>A development of this scale will need to be phased so that the housing and infrastructure are delivered in a sustainable way throughout the lifetime of the development. The Local Plan proposes that 800 homes will be delivered before the end of 2037 with a further 450 homes will be delivered thereafter for a total of 1250 homes.</p> <p>The Council has conducted a Transport Assessment which examined the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford. These traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The new developments were then applied to the transport model to see what impacts they would have on those existing traffic flows. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas.</p> <p>Where development has a direct adverse impact, then the development would be expected implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p>
1857556	Resident	<p>I responded to the previous plan in some detail, addressing points such as existing infrastructure, flooding, employment and impact on nature. The response of the council with the amended plan seems to have been to ignore the largely negative responses to the consultation and not only press ahead but to add an additional 400 plus houses to the plan. In the same spirit I propose to repeat the objections made previously and add some more.</p> <p>1. The principle</p> <p>The reality here is that Ordsall in particular and Retford more generally does not need a development of this size or nature. I accept entirely that it is national government setting local targets for development and house building and amending planning regulations. It is however the local government which is setting out these plans and therefore to blame "the tories" alone is somewhat disingenuous. I very much doubt the government have even heard of Retford let alone Ordsall. The argument seems to be that we have to have a local plan and that if we don't, those nasty developers will cover all the land with houses. So the plan to stop this? To cover the land with our own houses. It's a bit like saying the only way to stop someone cutting off your arm is to cut it off yourself. The net effect is the same, that the land is covered by houses. One of the few positive comments in the response to the previous plan was that it would provide more accommodation for the elderly. This is of course correct, as it will also at the "affordable" end of the scale (I'll ignore the implication that what is not affordable is by definition unaffordable). Both of these are admirable. However it is not a binary decision- it is not either no housing for the elderly or a massive development</p>	<p>The need to plan for development is a Government directive, but the location of development across the District is a Council decision. The Local Plan process has to, in line with National Planning Policy, plan for new growth in suitable and sustainable locations. A Sustainability Appraisal is undertaken to look at all options and their impact on the local area.</p> <p>The Council has conducted a Transport Assessment that assessed both the existing traffic flows in and around Retford, and the impact that any new development would have on these. The assessments for the existing traffic flows were carried out during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified that a number of roads and</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South		<p>featuring some housing for the elderly. There is some middle ground to develop essential housing without fields upon fields of 4 and 5 bed executive homes.</p> <p>2. Infrastructure</p> <p>Roads</p> <p>It was apparent in the previous consultation response that an area of significant concern for residents is road access to the proposed development. As I set out in my previous response, there are only 4 ways into it. One comes over the very narrow Goosemoor bridge and up a heavily parked High Street, one comes up narrow, unlit country lanes from the A1 and Eaton, one is heavily subject to double parking and features significant traffic calming measures and one comes past a busy primary school which is virtually impassable at 850am and 330pm. None of these roads are in any way suited to the inevitable increase in traffic caused by between 850 and 1250 new houses. The local authority proposes to enhance various junctions. Well that may assist with traffic flow at the junctions themselves (unless there's a problem on the A1 in which case the whole area will be even further gridlocked than currently when that happens), but it doesn't have any impact on the roads themselves which are not even suitable for the current levels of traffic let alone the significant increase proposed. This area simply does not have the access to cope with such a development irrespective of junction improvements</p> <p>Schools</p> <p>I understand that the local primary school would not have the room to cope with the increased numbers that would follow the development. Ha, I hear you say, there are plans for a new school. As I see it, the plans are for space for a new school, and a general and rather woolly statement of intention to build one. The reality is that building schools isn't as profitable as building houses and comes some way down the development shopping list. The school needs to be in place in the early stages of any development.</p> <p>Health</p> <p>The current medical resources in Retford are stretched to the limit, as anyone who has tried to book an appointment with a GP will know. The plan as it stands does not adequately consider the immediate and medium term impact on local provision of services, which will make them worse than they currently are. We are talking about a massive development here which will have a significant impact on service users in the area,</p> <p>3. Flooding</p> <p>Currently the fields in question are prone to flooding. As I type this is it 28 degrees and there has been no rain for some time, however in my previous winter-based response the top fields were saturated and had standing water. Concreting over these fields will cause significant water runoff down the hill and into the Idle, almost certainly increasing the risk of flooding to Goosemoor and into the town itself.</p> <p>4. Employment</p> <p>There seems to be an assumption that the people who will live in these houses will draw employment to Retford. This "build it, jobs will come" expectation is pie in the sky. There has not been a significant increase in new local jobs following the significant developments on Bridon or off the Oval, the much vaunted Northern Tower development seems to have replaced a convenience store with a supermarket. The reality is that whoever lives in these houses will work elsewhere and will commute there when they aren't working from home, significantly increasing traffic at the pinchpoints as discussed earlier.</p> <p>5. Impact on nature</p> <p>Pushing the boundaries of any development inevitably pushes back the natural world and the proposed development will clearly have that effect here. In the immediate local area I have seen deer, birds of prey, a variety of smaller mammals and amphibians, all of whom will be affected by the development. I have grave reservations about the proposed "country park" element of the development, more so on the basis that the local council have indicated that they would not adopt it. My fear is that within a short space of time it would just be fields with some paths, which ironically is what we currently have, but without the large development and associated problems.</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>I do not believe that the proposed development brings sufficient positives to Ordsall or Retford to justify the significant negatives that will go with it for the local population.</p>	<p>junctions would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The proposed developments would implement these mitigations schemes where they had a direct adverse impact, and financial contributions will be sought to contribute towards wider improvement schemes where the impact is indirect.</p> <p>The Council has been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there is a need for a new 1-form entry Primary School to be provide onsite. The Local Plan has safeguarded land on the site for education and community use and this will be delivered through the development of the site. The delivery strategy of the school will be decided by Nottinghamshire County Council who are the education authority and an agreement on the delivery of the school will be made between NCC and the developer(s) during the planning process. The school has been included within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and is a policy requirement for Ordsall South. A new "health-hub" facility will also be provided so that new health services can be provided on site. It is likely this will form part of the Local Centre for the development which will become a focus for shops, community facilities and transport services.</p> <p>New residential and employment are not always located next to each other or on the same site. The housing is often located where there is a need and employment where it has access to that particular market. In some cases, local employment and smaller industry can be accommodated through mixed use schemes.</p> <p>The Council has produced a detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment for all relevant sites across the District, including Ordsall South. This assessment identifies the type and frequency of flooding and states the necessary type of mitigation required to help reduce the threat of flooding. For Ordsall South, the main risk of flooding currently occurs when surface water runs off the fields into the existing developments in periods of high rainfall events. The Flood Risk Assessment has stated that new (on-site) water storage facilities will help reduce the risk of</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			<p>surface water run-off into the new development and also to the existing development in Ordsall. Onsite urban drainage systems are also required and these will likely form part of the developments Green Infrastructure provision</p> <p>The proposed Country Park will provide a 22 hectare site for both wildlife and recreation. It will also include significant tree planting and a network of paths and spaces for people to enjoy. It is a significant asset which will provide benefits to residents and the wider area.</p> <p>All major development must provide, at least, a 10% net gain in biodiversity. The existing land is currently used for intense agricultural purposes and therefore less supportive for wildlife habitats. The new development at Ordsall South will deliver a significant level of green infrastructure, such as new trees, green space and a country park which will provide space for wildlife enhancement and recreation opportunities for residents.</p>
1857600	Resident	<p>Sentence 4c - Safeguard land to accommodate a 2 Form Entry primary school - If provision is to be made for a two-form entry Primary School (which, while small, is still a substantial expansion of local primary school places), has consideration been given to how the funding will be secured for this? (i.e. will this be undertaken through a Free Schools competition? Who will coordinate?) Also - These children will grow up and on a development this size, that will likely have an impact on PAN for local secondary schools. There is no consideration made of this in the document and there will be an impact on already oversubscribed local secondary schools.</p> <p>Sentence 4b - 'Incorporate space for a health hub' - What is a 'health hub'? If it includes provision for qualified doctors and nurses (i.e. a GP's surgery), then the LA will need to consider the substantial challenges involved with recruiting GPs in our local area and to work with the local CCGs/NHS to account for how this would be resourced. If it does not, then a development this size would represent unacceptable pressure on local GPs in Retford.</p>	Funding for education and health on site will come via developer contributions. NHS recruitment is a matter for the NHS, but the Council are comfortable that any new facility on site can be managed appropriately.
1857618	Resident	I strongly oppose the building of 1250 houses on the proposed Ordsall site. Not only will it abolish a vast green space and eco system of our great British wildlife (has an environmental Survey been completed to check for endangerd species) but it has not been taken into account the catastrophic effect it will have on our local community, amenities and especially ordsall primary school and Retford Oaks accademy. If a third of the proposed house's has one child, that's approximately 416 school places that need to be found in our already oversubscribed schools. Has a survey been published on how the current infrastructure of gas, electricity and water will support another 1250 houses and what effect it will have on the current resident's? And Finally how much is the Labour Government recieving in 'party donations' to push such a crippling estate against local residents concerns?	<p>The proposed site is a strategic urban extension and therefore has to be planned carefully. The impact on the countryside and wildlife can be mitigated on site through the provision of new green space and infrastructure. The existing land is used for intense agriculture and therefore has little wildlife value. The development must provide, at least, a 10% net gain in biodiversity which will be delivered through over 24 hectares of green space and woodlands.</p> <p>New infrastructure such as a school and health centre is required on site to support the additional growth.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
1857775	Resident	<p>Only 20% of this development being affordable housing isn't enough. Young people are struggling to find homes. This percentage needs increasing. Furthermore, there needs to be appropriate infrastructure to support this development in Ordsall. E.g. a confirmed school from NCC. Otherwise, it isn't fit for purpose and I wouldn't be supportive of it.</p>	<p>The 20% threshold is based on the Districts affordable housing need.</p> <p>The Council has been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there is a need for a new 1-form entry Primary School to be provided onsite. The Local Plan has safeguarded land on the site for education and community use and this will be delivered through the development of the site. It has been included within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and is a policy requirement for Ordsall South.</p>
1857803	Resident	<p>I wish to oppose to the planning on this site There are 3 of us in the same household that are apprised to this.</p>	Thanks for your comment?
1857876	Resident	<p>The excessively high number of houses planned will mean approx. 2000 more cars using the 2 routes into Retford: 1) Westhill road-Ordsall road-hospital road 2) London road-Arlington Way School children walk and cycle along route 1) to get to Retford Oaks, Ordsall Primary, St Josephs, and Elizabethan. The stretch on Ordsall road is supposed to be 30mph but most speed. Pavements and the road is narrow, not room for 2 cars and a bike to pass. The additional traffic from the Ordsall would make the road busier and more pedestrians and it already feels dangerous walking that stretch with my young daughter in the morning. All children from the new development will be going this way to attend secondary school. Your plan does not provide a single cycle lane which these children could use to get to Retford Oaks or the Elizabethan secondary schools. This will cause congestion due to the road width, and put cyclists at risk</p> <p>The excessively high number of houses planned will mean approx 2000 more cars using the 2 routes into Retford: 1) Westhill road-Ordsall road-hospital road 2) London road-Arlington Way School children walk and cycle along route 1) At rush hours and school run times traffic currently queues from Hallcroft roundabout, along Hospital road, Babworth road, up to the Babworth mini roundabout. As all in the new development would also commute to school/town along this route it would create severe congestion at peak times. The minor junction improvements would not fix this and there is no mention of finally fixing the Hallcroft roundabout which is the bottleneck.</p> <p>The excessively high number of houses means many primary school aged children coming to the area. The local primary schools are already over-subscribed. No new school is planned until the second stage after 2037. Houses built before then, where will the children go to school?</p> <p>I have little confidence in the documents we are being provided with for this consultation. The initial Ordsall plan consultation document on BDC website had Ordsall and Retford the wrong way around on their map. The current plan website states: PLEASE NOTE: Our Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan focussed document contains 30 pages of information and maps. This document is currently not in an accessible format (limited access to the internet). If you require information contained within the plan or any documents associated with the plan, please contact thebassetlawplan@bassetlaw.gov.uk or call 01909 533 533 and ask for Local Plan when prompted. Why hasn't it been made accessible? There is some repetition in the document of Ordsall south development under 7.14, and under policy 29. This means people do not know which section to comment against</p>	<p>The Council's Transport Assessment assessed the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The projected additional traffic flows from the proposed new developments were then applied to the transport model. This assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic, which this plan has aimed to mitigate. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p> <p>A new network of footpaths and cycle routes will be provided on site so that residents can easily access the green spaces and local services, whilst footpath and cycle routes in to Retford will also be enhanced. Where new roads and cycle ways are provided, these will be segregated or form part of a shared space for cyclists and pedestrians. Any alterations to existing cycle ways are likely to be improvements to the existing infrastructure such as new surfacing or better lighting.</p> <p>The Local Plan protects existing employment sites and allocates other areas for new employment over the plan period. The type of employment varies and an objective of the plan is to encourage a range of employment to diversify local skills.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>The employment opportunities for the 1250 new houses will be non existent. Why has sufficient employment not been planned in close to the site?</p> <p>The previous plan for 800 houses was roundly criticised in the responses for the burden it would have on transport and schools infrastructure. The council have not only not listened to previous feedback, they have submitted a plan with more houses and still no significant infrastructure improvements. How can you ignore feedback to this extent, and still call this a consultation? what a sham. The message I get from bassettlaw dc is: Tell us what you think, we will ignore you. Complain and we will make it worse</p>	<p>The Local Plan is a technical document and is required to provide all the necessary information which is why it is a large document.</p> <p>During the consultation, The Council put on a number of online events for the public to attend and ask questions about the proposals. A leaflet was distributed within the area and a direct phone line was made available for people to contact the council about the Local plan.</p>
1857989	Resident	<p>1250 dwellings no suitable infrastructure in area.</p> <p>Junction improvements and cycle ways on already narrow and busy roads are not the solution.</p> <p>Environmental impact has not been assessed fully nor have the transport and highways situation.</p> <p>Flooding impact and damage to the area is not a sustainable project nor is only promises for a school etc. No such plans from NCC so the builder is paying for everything then? New school at 4.6 million?</p> <p>I strongly object to these proposals and the Plan appears to me to be based on foolhardy and unrealistic/untruths.</p>	
1857992	BDC Councillor	<p>I welcome the reference to cycle routes on the site and connecting to Retford town centre. I would hope that these would be separate from the road way -2m wide cycle paths – perhaps shared with pedestrians if space is limited but ideally separate from footway.</p> <p>A really important opportunity here, with this site and with the garden village site, is to connect the two developments with a safe cross country active travel/cycle route between Worksop and Retford. Planning gain monies should be allocated to fund the linking routes between the sites and into the town centres.</p>	<p>A new network of footpaths and cycle routes will be provided on site so that residents can easily access the green spaces and local services, whilst footpath and cycle routes in to Retford will also be enhanced.</p> <p>Where new roads and cycle ways are provided, these will be segregated or form part of a shared space for cyclists and pedestrians. Any alterations to existing cycle ways are likely to be improvements to the existing infrastructure such as new surfacing or better lighting.</p>
1858008	Resident	<p>I do not consent to the above proposed housing allocations. I believe that the council have not taken adequate account of the following items</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Highways safety issues beyond the sites, but in the locality • The sites' current value in relation to biodiversity • The sites' agricultural value • sites' current contribution to recreation for residents as an open space <p>Highways safety issues beyond the sites, but within Ordsall</p> <p>Ordsall has already seen major housing growth in recent years. Without any corresponding improvements to road access or traffic calming measures to accommodate the resulting increased vehicle movements. The road network in and around Ordsall was not designed to cope safely and efficiently with the current volume of traffic, without any further increase which would result from the development of these 2 sites. All of the residents of Ordsall that I have spoken to have strong concerns about the potential increase in road safety issues, especially for mobility scooter users, cyclists, and for pedestrians (particularly those with pushchairs) in areas where pavements are narrow or nonexistent.</p> <p>I believe that the Council's highways must take into consideration the following access routes that will be impacted by this development. The areas of particular concern include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goosemoor Lane Bridge 	<p>The Council's Transport Assessment assessed the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The projected additional traffic flows from the proposed new developments were then applied to the transport model. This assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic, which this plan has aimed to mitigate. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p> <p>All major development must provide, at least, a 10% net gain in biodiversity. The existing land at Ordsall South is currently utilised for intense agricultural purposes and therefore less supportive for wildlife</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>This is inadequate for today's traffic, recent improvements have made it safe for pedestrian however the carriageway is barely adequate for the number of vehicles using it with restricted views of oncoming vehicles when approaching from All Hallows Street and Goosemoor Lane.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wellbeck Rd Shops <p>This area is often congested, with vehicles parked on pavements on Welbeck Rd, Ollerton Rd, and Wharncliffe Rd. Additional safety issues are created by this area being a bus route and also an HGV route to the West Carr Rd industrial estate. Vehicles reversing onto Ollerton Rd can also be a hazard. Further housing development in Ordsall would lead to increased vehicle activity in this already congested area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Westhill Rd <p>At the beginning and end of the school day, the main road in and out of Ordsall (West Hill Rd) is reduced to single-line traffic due to parked cars. This is a difficult road to negotiate at these times of day, and the problems would be likely to become more acute if traffic volumes increased.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High St <p>The number of residents parking on High St mean that it is effectively a single-lane road along much of its length. This leads to difficult driving conditions in both directions, and the road appears to be unsuitable for increased volumes of traffic. I have recently seen it completely blocked in both directions due to the number of parked cars on both sides making it difficult for drivers to foresee whether they can pass oncoming traffic that is also passing parked cars. This is supported by the fact that BDC has refused permission for premises on Ordsall High Street to be used as a pharmacy due to concerns about traffic congestion,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West Carr Rd <p>The main concerns on this road are the railway bridges, one of which has a blind summit with narrow pavements. High volumes of traffic use this road, including commercial vehicles using the industrial estate. This route is used by large numbers of pedestrians (Particularly school children) in the mornings and afternoons.</p> <p>Biodiversity</p> <p>The following species have been recently seen on and around the proposed sites Barn owls; tawny owls; skylarks; corncrakes; house martins; buzzards; kestrels; hawks; bees; damsel flies; dragonflies; grasshoppers; many varieties of butterflies and moths; hedgehogs; bats; newts; toads; and frogs. An ecological survey for the above species, and for associated species which might reasonably be expected to cohabit with these, undertaken prior to allocation for development, may identify constraints which are significant enough to prevent development. I believe such a survey should include important areas adjacent to the site, in particular Marsh Lane to the south, which may be impacted by 'edge effects' of any development. (NB Marsh Lane is a track bordered on two sides by large, ancient hedgerows in good condition and containing standard trees). A Section 106 Agreement could enable adoption of the buffer strips and walkways as habitats in public ownership to be managed and improved for wildlife with hedgerow maintenance and restoration etc. There would be opportunity for partnership involvement with members of the local community and wildlife and countryside organisations.</p> <p>Open space</p> <p>The sites are bordered and intersected by approximately half a mile of public footpaths which currently have panoramic views of the open countryside to either or both sides. The footpaths are extremely well used and appreciated by large numbers of residents and visitors for taking walks for recreation, health, and wellbeing. These</p>	<p>habitats. The new development is proposed to deliver a significant level of green infrastructure, such as new trees, green space and a country park, which will provide space for wildlife enhancement and greater biodiversity than currently present.</p> <p>All existing footpaths will be retained. However, it maybe that some are moved or redirected depending on the layout of the scheme.</p> <p>The Council has produced a detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment for all relevant sites across the District. For Ordsall South, surface water flooding is the main risk where water runs off the fields into the existing developments in periods of high rainfall events. The Flood Risk Assessment has stated that new (on-site) water storage facilities will help reduce the risk of surface water run-off into the new development and in to the existing development in Ordsall. Onsite urban drainage systems are also required and these will likely form part of the developments Green Infrastructure provision.</p> <p>The Council undertook an assessment (sustainability appraisal) on all reasonable locations to accommodate growth around Retford, with a priority on reusing brownfield land. The local plan has identified brownfield land for development where is considered available and suitable within Retford, such as on the Former Elizabethan School off North Road. However, there is not enough available or suitable brownfield land in Retford to accommodate the level of proposed growth in the local plan. Therefore, some greenfield land is needed to support Retford's growth over the plan period and beyond.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South		<p>form part of a wider network of longer walks between Ordsall and surrounding areas. Parts of the walks which fall within the sites are accessible and easy to negotiate by all, including those with limited health and mobility; these walks also feel safe.</p> <p>On the Nottinghamshire County Council definitive map, showing public rights of way, the footpath called "East Retford FP 2" crosses the sites in a south easterly direction from High St, via Southgate, towards Marsh Lane ("East Retford FP 64"). This right of way is well established and cannot be rerouted without greatly reducing the public amenity it provides in its current form. Also, the public right of way known as "East Retford FP 3" runs due south from High St before turning southwest. This footpath currently avoids traffic for its entire length, but would be bisected by two roads which pedestrians would have to cross if the development is permitted. This would have a detrimental impact on the public amenity it currently provides.</p> <p>Flooding</p> <p>The footpath between the fields and the existing estate already floods regularly to the extent that both the path and the pavement where it joins High street cannot be passed by pedestrians unless they are wearing wellingtons (I have photographs of this). During periods of heavy rain high Street can become impassable to pedestrians even if they walk in the middle of the road. This is without the extra burden of the additional housing proposals.</p> <p>Alternative Proposals</p> <p>I understand that if I disagree with the proposed housing allocation it would be helpful if I 'provide realistic alternative proposals'. I do not feel confident about doing this, especially as I am less familiar with other areas than with my immediate neighbourhood.</p> <p>However I believe that plans could possibly be revisited, with a focus, in particular, on brownfield redevelopment;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Brecks Rd garage site; <p>I believe that there are sizeable brownfield sites in the West Carr Road industrial area that have been out of use for many years:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The area at the corner of West Carr Rd and Stirling Rd I understand this has been out of use for over thirty years. A derelict factory stood there for a long time, and was subsequently demolished and the site (approximately 7000 sq metres) was cleared and fenced. 2) Site adjacent to UPJ Motorcycles, formerly the Market Hotel (opposite the above site) 3) There is a large area of disused land between West Carr road/Jubilee Road/West Carr Road. Potential access points are from Silver Street, Manvers Road, Stirling Road or Ordsall Park Drive. This area appears to have no current use whereas the proposed sites are currently used for agriculture. <p>It would be preferable for any new housing to be built on brownfield, rather than greenfield, sites.</p>	
1858065	Resident	<p>I have already submitted my objections I just wanted to add my concerns over schooling. I know of a family that recently moved into Ordsall with primary aged children, they were told there were no primary school places available not just in Ordsall but the whole of Retford. How is it proposed to accommodate the extra children that a further 800 houses will bring between now and the second phase in 2035?</p>	<p>The Council has been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there is a need for a new 1-form entry Primary School to be provide onsite. The Local Plan has safeguarded land on the site for education and community use and this will be delivered through the development of the site. The delivery strategy of the school will be decided through an agreement between NCC and the developer(s) during the planning process.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
1858079	Resident	<p>Regarding - Mini roundabout junction of A638 Goosemoor Lane / London Road at Whitehouses</p> <p>This mini roundabout in my view cannot be improved without increasing its footprint or changed to traffic lights. The speed with which significant numbers are road users approach this roundabout, and the Grove Road roundabout is staggering. I see daily 'near misses' this would only increase if over 1250 properties worth of cars were inflicted on this area. Limited number of people use public transport, walk or cycle and additional infrastructure won't, in my view, promote greater use of public transport. In short it's dangerous. There are a number of new developments in the area of this roundabout, Blossom Grove and Bacopa Drive are very close and there are homes almost directly on the mini roundabout who residents would suffer increase noise levels.</p> <p>Overall I am against the development at South Ordsall.</p>	<p>Goosemoor Lane / London Road at Whitehouses – has been proposed for signalisation rather than any widening of the existing space within the Retford Transport Assessment.</p>
1858084	Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Infrastructure. Over the past 35 years or so Ordsall has have many hundred dwellings - Schools - Ordsall Primary not able to take all of the students from the proposed development. Many hundreds of children are already placed in schools that are at opposite ends of the town to their siblings. The proposed development will surely add to this situation. The result of this situation is that there is excessive traffic causing bottle-necks for an hours - Highways The roads into and out of Ordsall have had various previous planned mitigations which have been repealed at planning appeal or reapplication stage. I would urge planners to take steps to make any necessary highways mitigation BEFORE any new developments take place, not years after or not at all as has been the case of late. - Size of development for the size of the village - the proposed 1,250 dwellings is far out of character with the village and will cause even more issues than the developments that have taken place over the past 35 years or so. For this reason I would urge planners to rethink their proposal and reduce the proposed number dramatically. - Not listening appropriately and adequately to the voice of local people - almost 500 residents voiced their objections and constructive criticisms to the previous proposal of 800 dwellings in Ordsall South - BDC have come back with in excess of 50% extra size in the current plan. In addition, very few consultation events have been held in this current consultation period. I am astounded that more time hasn't been given to the consultation and that other face-to-face methods of consultation have not been used. - Employment - How many real jobs will there be by 2037? What type of jobs will there be? Where will the jobs be? Bassetlaw District Council have not appropriately addressed this issue with 'aspirational' rather than actual projected figures. Even as a BDC councillor I have not been shown the statistical modelling that brings about real jobs and compares these to the actual number of dwellings that these real future jobs will need. 	<p>The Council has been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there is a need for a new 1-form entry Primary School to be provide onsite. The Local Plan has safeguarded land on the site for education and community use and has been included within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and is a policy requirement for Ordsall South. The exact delivery of the school is set to be decided through an agreement between Nottinghamshire County Council and the developer(s) during the planning process.</p> <p>Any identified mitigation as part of the schmem will be phased with the development of the site. Some will be upfront such as the access and public transport, but others will come via the various stages of the development.</p> <p>The scale of the development means that it will also provide new and enhanced infrastructure for the local community. This includes a new school, parks, a local centre and a health facility on site.</p> <p>The Council undertook a number of online events where members of the public could attend and ask questions to the planning officers. These events were spread over the consultation period and had a number of residents attend. Other material was published on the Councils website, via posters and leaflets to the community.</p> <p>The proposed growth for the District includes a number of new jobs located on existing sites or newly allocated sites across the District. The employment development is located close to the relevant markets.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
1858117	Resident	I am all for the extra housing. There was absolutely nothing in the area when we looked for over 2 years! More housing for family's!!!	Thanks for your comments
1858119	Resident	I welcome this plan for Ordsall. We are in desperate need of more housing for the elderly there have been no provisions on the last two developments for Ordsall. I would like to see more housing for the older generation on all future developments too.	Thanks for your comments
1858123	Resident	We vote for this new housing development and welcome housing specifically for the disabled.	Thanks for your comments
1858125	Resident	The proposal for 800 additional houses is not acceptable unless clear and guaranteed improvements to amenities are first agreed. This is not clear to be the case. The decision to further increase the projected number of houses to 1250 exacerbates this further. It is unclear why such a large proportion of the total Bassetlaw requirement is set for this one site given all the issues that the village of Ordsall has faced in recent years given the number of new houses already erected. The school is full; the two key shops on Welbeck rd have created dangerous traffic conditions with the recent new builds; the key roads to move in and out of Ordsall (high street over Goosemoor bridge, through Eaton over the one way humpback bridge, Welbeck rd with the congested junction, Ordsall rd with tiny roundabout) are inadequate for 800 not even 1250 new dwellings. The transport and communication plan is not linked as operated by different councils with different political masters - none of this conducive to a complete solution to enable this plan to succeed. Internet and mobile connectivity in the Ordsall area is already poor with a reliance on very old cabling - such an increase of population will slow down systems and speeds further making new post covid hybrid ways of working less accessible.	The Council is proposing to allocate a sustainable urban extension to Retford which, due to its scale, will require new and enhanced infrastructure. 1250 homes will support the delivery of a new local centre where local shops and services will be based, a new primary school, a health facility and 24 hectares of public open space. Offsite mitigation and enhancements to existing infrastructure is also required.
1858132	Resident	The excessive number of dwellings planned is far too many to be integrated into Ordsall. It would significantly and negatively impact the environment for the current residents of Ordsall. This area is not a "significant opportunity to make provision for the older age group" as the housing would be several miles from the centre of Retford and its shops, services and transport hub. The development would impinge on the Ordsall-Eaton "green gap" because of its position and the number of residents it would introduce to the area. The traffic on the surrounding lanes would increase markedly, particularly through Eaton village. A biodiversity net gain of 10% would be much too small and unambitious for a development of this size and should be set at least at 30% or higher. There are only vague and general aspirational details how the target would be achieved and measured. There is no consideration of the increase in flood risk from the runoff from hard landscaping and standpipes built in a development as large as this. The flood risk would be transferred to current housing along the banks of the Idle in Ordsall, Thrumpton, Retford and downstream. The increase in traffic generated by this development would have a significant impact on the quality of life of the current residents of Ordsall and Eaton.	The provision of elderly homes on site is considered appropriate because of the development of public spaces, health facilities, new public transport and the provision of local shops and services. The Council has produced a Transport Assessment which assessed both the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford and the impact that the proposed new development would have on these. The existing traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas such as Eaton village. The Transport Assessment identifies that Eaton will likely see a small rise in traffic volume as a result of the proposed development at Ordsall South, but that this impact can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures. The Transport Assessment details the type of measures proposed for Eaton.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
			<p>The 10% biodiversity net gain is a minimum percentage as set out by the Government, the development itself may achieve more than this.</p> <p>The Council has produced a detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment for all relevant sites across the District. For Ordsall South, surface water flooding is the main risk where water runs off the fields into the existing developments in periods of high rainfall events. The Flood Risk Assessment has stated that new (on-site) water storage facilities will help reduce the risk of surface water run-off into the new development and into the existing development in Ordsall. Onsite urban drainage systems are also required and these will likely form part of the developments Green Infrastructure provision.</p>
1858165	Resident	The infrastructure of the roads in and out of Ordsall will need to be upgraded, GP cover for everyone will not be sufficient you can't get an appointment now Hospital and emergency services cover again they are overstretched Ordsall cannot cope with any more housing etc we need green spaces not concrete everywhere we look No economy for these houses, no social activities for people young or old to do anymore	<p>The Council's Transport Assessment assessed the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The projected additional traffic flows from the proposed new developments were then applied to the transport model. This assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic, which this plan has aimed to mitigate. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p> <p>A new "health-hub" facility will be provided so that new health services can be provided on site. It is likely this will form part of the Local Centre for the development which will become a focus for shops, community facilities and transport services.</p>
1858166	Resident	Ordsall infrastructure cannot cope with more housing	Thank your your comments.
1858170	Resident	In response to the ordsall build I object to the number of builds.	Thanks for your comments
1858192	Resident	1. Ordsall has not got the infrastructure to support any more housing never mind the 1250 being mooted under this planning application. To start with Ollerton Road already has issues with width, speed, being used as a short cut by drivers wanting to avoid the choked up town centre and a main point of it being used as a diversion whenever there are problems on the A1. 1250 new properties with at least one car each is going to make Ordsall a nightmare for those already living here. The community hub already here (Ollerton/Welbeck Rds) is bursting at the seams now trafficwise, imagine another 1250 cars trying to park in 15 spaces, it's an accident waiting to happen already. There is	The Council has conducted a Transport Assessment that assessed both the existing traffic flows in and around Retford, and the impact that any new development would have on these. The assessments for the existing traffic flows were carried out during the peak times of the day and outside of school

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South		<p>1 private nursery and 1 infant/junior school in Ordsall, places are tight now, imagine what it would be like with 1250 more houses ! There are no healthcare facilities in Ordsall, no doctors and no clinics. Imagine the residents of 1250 more houses having to drive into Retford for medical care - more traffic congestion. There are limited leisure amenities in Ordsall, where are all these new people going to go to play for example: bowls, tennis, football, where are the young going to get their sport & exercise ?</p> <p>2. The noise & dirt from these developments will impact on local residents for years to come. Many people moved to Ordsall to escape the ambience of towns and cities, to enjoy peaceful surroundings that Ordsall has to offer. This will change dramatically for years to come. There will be increased heavy traffic from the construction of these 1250 new properties, causing noise and pollution.</p> <p>3. As the British population continues to rise at an astonishing rate, pollution causing all kinds of problems, would it not be better for us to conserve the arable/grazing land we have. This will help to lessen the need for importation of staple foodstuff and meat. Especially when there is vacant land to be had especially at the old colliery site at Bevercotes. Surely there are get rich quick farmers away from Ordsall who are more than happy to sell their land to the highest bidder.</p> <p>4. The Concept Plan is all well and good when drafted out by other people who have nothing to do with Ordsall. The developers must think we're stupid to believe that these things on this draft will ever happen. Woodland areas, ponds, tree lined avenues, sports pitches, community hubs, allotments, etc all pie in the sky.</p> <p>5. Please do not allow this development to happen or it will spoil our village of Ordsall for ever.</p>	<p>holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified that a number of roads and junctions would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The proposed developments would implement these mitigations schemes where they had a direct adverse impact, and financial contributions will be sought to contribute towards wider improvement schemes where the impact is indirect.</p> <p>A new "health-hub" facility will be provided so that new health services can be provided on site. It is likely this will form part of the Local Centre for the development which will become a focus for shops, community facilities and transport services. The Council has also been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there is a need for a new 1-form entry Primary School to be provided onsite. The Local Plan has safeguarded land on the site for education and community use and this will be delivered through the development of the site.</p> <p>Conditions may be put in place for the developers regarding the potential for disruption to be caused through the construction process of the development. This would be done through the standard planning process.</p> <p>The Council has undertaken an assessment (sustainability appraisal) on all reasonable alternative locations to accommodate growth around Retford. The priority to reuse brownfield land formed a large part of this assessment and the local plan has identified brownfield land for development where is considered available and suitable within Retford, such as on the Former Elizabethan School off North Road. However, there is not enough suitable or available brownfield land in Retford to accommodate the level of proposed growth required to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework and to provide a viable development site that can support the delivery of necessary infrastructure improvements. Therefore, some greenfield land is needed to support Retford's growth over the plan period and beyond.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
1858233	Resident	<p>Ordsall South. Dear sirs, I object vehemently to this proposal. Having resided in Ordsall and Retford since 1983 I have seen the lovely village and town ruined by overdevelopment and a lack of reinvestment in the village and facilities.</p> <p>1) The road infrastructure cannot take anymore vehicles with regular gridlocks in and around the town/village.</p> <p>2) Excessive flooding for which this land is needed for.</p> <p>3) There is no policing and with potentially 10,000 more people coming in, more crime and violence will ensue.</p> <p>4) Schooling is at full capacity already and with a shortage of teachers the next generation will not be educated well</p> <p>5) Medical facilities are full locally with no vacancies at doctor or dental surgeries</p> <p>6) Bassetlaw hospital is not large enough for an expanding populous</p> <p>7) we are a village/market town not a metropolis like Nottingham, we live here because of its quaintness and do not excessive and unnecessary development.</p> <p>8) there is a shortage of employment opportunities in Retford/Ordsall so all the traffic will be commuters thus increasing pollution and going against the Government green policy.</p>	<p>There will be a minimum of 27ha of public open space, sports and woodland on site. This reflects the Local Plan evidence base, the local community aspirations and the need to provide a net-gain in local biodiversity. New community facilities will also be provided so that there is space for local events, gatherings and community groups.</p> <p>The Council's Transport Assessment assessed the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The projected additional traffic flows from the proposed new developments were then applied to the transport model. This assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic, which this plan has aimed to mitigate. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p> <p>The Council has produced a detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment for all relevant sites across the District. For Ordsall South, surface water flooding is the main risk where water runs off the fields into the existing developments in periods of high rainfall events. The Flood Risk Assessment has stated that new (on-site) water storage facilities will help reduce the risk of surface water run-off into the new development and in to the existing development in Ordsall. Onsite urban drainage systems are also required and these will likely form part of the developments Green Infrastructure provision.</p> <p>The Council has been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there is a need for a new 1-form entry Primary School to be provided onsite. The Local Plan has safeguarded land on the site for education and community use and this will be delivered through the development of the site. A new "health-hub" facility will also be provided so that new health services can be provided on site.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
1858237	Resident	<p>object to the proposed development od 1200 houses in the Ordsall area as outlined in the proposal. There is no case made either economically socially or environmentally for any such major development in this area as the infrastructure of roads, social, leisure and commercial facilities, employment and schools are either in place nor likely in the foreseeable future in Redford and Ordsall. I believe this proposed development should be rejected.</p>	<p>The Council has conducted a Transport Assessment that assessed both the existing traffic flows in and around Retford, and the impact that any new development would have on these. The assessments for the existing traffic flows were carried out during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified that a number of roads and junctions would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The proposed developments would implement these mitigations schemes where they had a direct adverse impact, and financial contributions will be sought to contribute towards wider improvement schemes where the impact is indirect.</p> <p>A new "health-hub" facility will be provided so that new health services can be provided on site. It is likely this will form part of the Local Centre for the development which will become a focus for shops, community facilities and transport services. The Council has also been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there is a need for a new 1-form entry Primary School to be provide onsite. The Local Plan has safeguarded land on the site for education and community use, this has been included within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and is a policy requirement for Ordsall South. New community facilities will also be provided so that there is space for local events, gatherings and community groups.</p>
1858243	Resident	<p>As a resident of Eaton, I have serious concerns about the resulting increase in traffic through Eaton from a development of 1250 dwellings to the south of Ordsall. The narrow, single-file bridge has been damaged by vehicles twice in the past five years. In January 2018 it was closed for 4 weeks for repairs causing significant disruption to residents, and it then had to be repaired again in 2019 following an incident which resulted in a vehicle crashing through the bridge wall and ending up in the river. The bridge was simply not built for the volume of traffic that now exits the A1 at the Elkesley bridge, travels down Jockey Lane and through Eaton towards Retford, or that travels through the village to and from Ordsall. Counts of traffic by residents in 2019 showed an average of 113 vehicles travelling through the village between 8 and 9am, and 117 between 4 and 5pm. Currently, a large number of people who live in Ordsall and the surrounding areas commute to work outside of Retford with the preferred route to the A1 southbound being through Eaton to get on the A638 to Markham Moor. Any increase in traffic from the proposed development will further exacerbate this problem, which will not be mitigated by measures such as improving bus routes or upgrading roundabouts on other roads. Not only is the bridge unsuitable for the volume of traffic, but also the road through the village. There are no footpaths alongside the road through the majority of the village, and with</p>	<p>The Council has produced a Transport Assessment which assessed both the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford and the impact that the proposed new development would have on these. The existing traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas such as Eaton village. The Transport Assessment identifies that Eaton will likely see a small rise in traffic volume as a result of the proposed development at Ordsall South, but</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South		<p>vehicles often parked alongside it, pedestrians have no choice but to walk into the path of the traffic. I do not allow my children to walk unaccompanied through the village for fear of an accident. It is also difficult for emergency services to travel through the village when cars are parked alongside the road, as evidenced by the tragic fatal incident in the river at Eaton this weekend which required an air ambulance to be called out. I understand from attending a consultation event that traffic calming measures are in scope for Eaton should the proposed development be approved but I am concerned whether this would be sufficient to reduce the significant increase in the volume of traffic what would result from the development. I am also concerned about what measures can actually be put in place. Mention was made of widening footpaths, but there are few to be widened! The response to my comment at the previous consultation the Ordsall South development was that preventative measures in Eaton will mean that the majority of traffic heading South will access the A1 at Elkesley rather than Markham Moor, but I have yet to see anything in the revised plans that evidences this assertion. The response to the question that I asked at the consultation event also made clear that officials from BDC have yet to visit Eaton or talk to residents to observe the issues at first hand.</p>	<p>that this impact can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures. The Transport Assessment details the type of measures proposed for Eaton.</p>
1858246	Resident	<p>As a resident of Eaton, I am very concerned about the impact of the Ordsall South development on the volume of traffic through the village. There is no mention of this in the plan, which seems to take the view that people will only travel locally. However given the current high volume of traffic through the Eaton, we know that many people who live in Ordsall use the road through Eaton to access the A638 to travel to Markham Moor to access the A1 for work or other purposes (including to go to McDonalds as evidenced by the volume of takeaway litter along the road through Eaton and along Ollerton Road). This is currently the fastest route for Ordsall residents to access the A1 southbound rather than the Elkesley Bridge or Apleyhead junctions. This will be exacerbated if a further 1250 dwellings were to be built to the south of Ordsall, not only with regard to the number of people with cars travelling to and from the development, but also the volume of deliveries to residents. The road and bridge are too narrow to accommodate any increase in levels of traffic, and the issue is made worse given that there is no path through the main part of the village meaning that pedestrians have to walk along the road. I am already worried about this for my young children and have serious concerns that the problems will get far worse if the proposed development is approved. The local infrastructure simply cannot cope with a development of this size, and the small village of Eaton will be particularly impacted. This does not appear to have been given full consideration in the plan and the voice of residents in Eaton has so far been ignored given that the response to the concerns that we have previously raised about 800 dwellings has been to increase the number by more than 50%!</p>	<p>The Council has produced a Transport Assessment which assessed both the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford and the impact that the proposed new development would have on these. The existing traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas such as Eaton village. The Transport Assessment identifies that Eaton will likely see a small rise in traffic volume as a result of the proposed development at Ordsall South, but that this impact can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures. The Transport Assessment details the type of measures proposed for Eaton.</p>
1858617	Resident	<p>Page 16: There is currently excessive traffic in Ordsall with very narrow roads such as All Hallows Street, Goosemoor, Betty's Bridge and High Street. West Hill Road is also very and busy, and Ordsall Park road is increasingly being used as a "rat run". The policy mentions that junction improvements are required but I do not see how this will make these narrow roads less busy or safer which is the current problem. The volume of traffic will only increase. Ordsall is not built for the traffic numbers that 1250 houses will generate. The vast majority of people living in these new houses will need to travel in to Retford to work. I do not think enough consideration has been given to sustainable transport options such as a safe and fully segregated bicycle network in to the centre of Retford. It is naïve and irresponsible to place this development on the edge of Retford which had very poor transport infrastructure.</p>	<p>The Council's Transport Assessment assessed the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The projected additional traffic flows from the proposed new developments were then applied to the transport model. This assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic, which this plan has aimed to mitigate. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
1858617	Resident	<p>Page 14: It is mentioned that the loss of 5,3Ha of golf land will be mitigated by improvements to the golfing facilities. This is all well and good but this would only benefit a small majority of people. Is there any way that a wider proportion of the local population could benefit such as with increased funding to Retford Leisure Centre which will surely be impacted by the massive influx of residents. The current leisure centre is poorly equipped, with only a fraction of the facilities that the previous leisure centre used to provide (squash courts, multiple sports courts including a much larger hall, cricket nets etc). The developer should be obliged to provide a more diverse range of sports facilities.</p>	<p>There is an identified local need for some additional sports and recreational facilities in the Ordsall area. As such, there will be a minimum of 27ha of public open space, sports and woodland on site. This reflects the Local Plan evidence base, the local community aspirations and the need to provide a net-gain in local biodiversity. New community facilities will also be provided so that there is space for local events, gatherings and community groups.</p>
1859360	Resident	<p>I am a resident of Eaton village, I have grave concerns about the infrastructure not being adequate to support another 1200 homes in this position. Traffic in Eaton is already bad as any use the village as a cut through, the bridge in Eaton has already been damaged twice in the last few years by vehicles hitting it. Speeding is also an issue through the village with some 25% of traffic exceeding the 30 mph limit. The other bridge at Ordsall is also not suitable for an increase in traffic. It has been suggested that some traffic calming would be employed to mitigate the increase. On one of the other replies to our concern it was said that some calming was already in place in Eaton, if that's true where is it? And what form does it take? It is certainly not visible to residents or indeed motorists. The thought of another perhaps 2000 plus vehicles and of course the extra deliveries that would take place would cause significant damage to the lives of residents in all the surrounding villages, if we wanted to live in a city we would have moved to one. Please planners think again!</p>	<p>The Council has produced a Transport Assessment which assessed both the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford and the impact that the proposed new development would have on these. The existing traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas such as Eaton village. The Transport Assessment identifies that Eaton will likely see a small rise in traffic volume as a result of the proposed development at Ordsall South, but that this impact can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures. The Transport Assessment details the type of measures proposed for Eaton. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p>
1859337	Resident	<p>I am opposing plans for the development for South Ordsall. I do not think that Ordsall or Retford have the infrastructure to cope with the amount of houses proposed. I am also confused as to why the number of houses proposed has increased by 50% from the initial consultation. I moved to Ordsall in Nov 2020 - Ordsall Road is struggling to cope with the amount of current traffic (I constantly struggle to get on/off my driveway due to the amount of traffic). I am also concerned that there is only 1 primary school and 1 secondary school in the vicinity and this will not cope with the amount of new residents that are being proposed. I understand there are plans to build a new school but this will not be ready before the houses are ready. As far as I am aware Ordsall does not have a GP or dentist facility to house current resident let alone to cater for more people. I feel that the 2 main roads out of Ordsall struggle to cope with the current levels of traffic - Ordsall Road is in a bad state of repair and has flooding issues (near the roundabout) that have not been addressed despite the fact that money should be available to do so due a newish housing estate near there. Where are the occupants of the new houses going to work? There is little employment in the local town as it is.</p>	<p>The volume of development is closely linked to its viability and the provision of infrastructure. A development of this scale will need to be phased so that the housing and infrastructure are delivered in a sustainable way throughout the lifetime of the development. The Local Plan proposes that the first 800 homes will be delivered before the end of 2037. A further 450 homes will be delivered thereafter.</p> <p>The uplift in the number of homes from November 2020 was undertaken for two reasons. Firstly, to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework and its policy on the effective use of land, and secondly to provide a viable development that can</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			<p>support the delivery of necessary infrastructure to support a sustainable development for the community.</p> <p>The Council's Transport Assessment assessed the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The projected additional traffic flows from the proposed new developments were then applied to the transport model. This assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic, which this plan has aimed to mitigate. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p> <p>The Council has been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there is a need for a new 1-form entry Primary School to be provided onsite. The Local Plan has safeguarded land on the site for education and community use and this will be delivered through the development of the site. A new "health-hub" facility will also be provided so that new health services can be provided on site.</p>
1859307	Resident	<p>I object to the development in its current volume & its lack of amenities. Allowing it to go ahead will have a catastrophic impact not only on Ordsall but on the whole of Retford.</p> <p>1. To put even the initial 800 houses in this one location will have harmful consequences. Even if it is possible to develop the infrastructure needed, and that seems at best fantastically aspirational & with no indication that NCC will commit to provision, the result will be disastrous. Hundreds and hundreds of houses with no real improvement of access roads except for a new roundabout,</p> <p>2. There appears to be no commitment by NCC to provide a school until perhaps beyond completion of the first phase i.e 2037. Where will the projected 170 children be educated until then? Most of Retford primary schools are near capacity and recent anecdotal evidence suggest that Secondary schools throughout Bassetlaw are unable to offer even in this current year, places to all children progressing through their education.</p> <p>3. No employment opportunities appear to be included in this new plan. These roads, a school and employment land were mentioned in the initial Plan but anything meaningful has all but disappeared from the June 2021 document along with health care facilities and any other necessary amenities.</p> <p>4. 800 new homes bringing a potential 3,500 to 4,000 new residents. A large majority of these will not be existing residents of the town which is not of itself a bad thing but with none of the employment appearing in the plan that is potentially 1,500 to 2,500 extra cars spilling on to the minor roads from the development to go to their employment outside of the town. The traffic from the 198 homes built during recent years on Fairways Park has already had a very noticeable impact on traffic on Ordsall Road. Those of us who live with it day to day know the reality of the increase. Such is the increase it has</p>	<p>The site is required to provide a new primary school on site and a health hub which will provide health services. These are detailed within the Policy for Ordsall South and have been identified within the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>The Council has produced a Transport Assessment which assessed both the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford and the impact that the proposed new development would have on these. The existing traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas such as Eaton village. The Transport Assessment identifies that Eaton will likely see a small rise in traffic volume as a result</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South		<p>already become difficult at certain times of day to attempt to turn right on to Ollerton Road to travel towards its junction with Babworth Road. This development would potentially add up to 4 times that last increase in traffic. Local roads in residential areas were not built to accommodate anything like these levels of increase.</p> <p>5. 7.14.15 Is this proposal for a full roundabout or for a mini roundabout which would be unlikely to 'slow traffic on the approach to Ordsall'?</p> <p>7.14.16 What is the ingenious proposal that will provide sufficient traffic management in Eaton, a settlement of 6 properties at the last available count, to mitigate the extra traffic when it might become a busy short cut for these hundreds of extra cars travelling between the A638 and Ordsall? What strategy can there possibly be that will 'manage traffic' on High Street without having a detrimental effect to the people who live there? Goosemoor Lane & Whitehouses/London Road are already impacted by hundreds of new houses at The Brambles development. Local people already know well the dangerous nature of these locations without adding so many more cars to Retford's road network.</p> <p>6. This Plan is apparently to 'satisfy Bassetlaw's housing needs'. I would suggest that it is not that need that is being satisfied by the thousands of houses being built and proposed all over Bassetlaw. Is it not to satisfy the needs of the population being priced out of the south of the country by bad national housing policy, who then migrate north? I am 100% in favour of building to provide good, genuinely "affordable" housing especially to cater for the needs of younger generations but would ask how many of those living currently in sub-standard houses in our towns will really benefit from all of these developments.</p> <p>7. Councillors & planners should band together, cross party, with other like councils and reject Government housing targets for our towns. Instead of which they are pushing the various versions of this Plan with which they are actively installing chaos in Bassetlaw. This development whether it be 1250 or even 800 houses, should not be allowed to proceed any further.</p>	of the proposed development at Ordsall South, but that this impact can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures. The Transport Assessment details the type of measures proposed for Eaton. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.
1859172	Resident	I have now been an Ordsall resident for nearly a decade. I understand the need for new housing as the demand for it grows. I myself are looking to purchase a property and haven't yet due to the costs of local properties being over inflated in comparison to wages. I would love to buy in Ordsall and thus this housing development would be perfect for myself. That being said, I fully oppose this development for the sake of the community. I enjoy walks around Eaton with my dog and see the local wildlife flourish in peace. Children and families enjoy exercising in the area and although at times traffic can be busy it's mostly manageable. The location of the proposed development is reckless and ill thought through. It will be utterly detrimental for the community and I hope it doesn't go through. Common sense and respect for Ordsall must prevail.	Thanks for your comments
1859127	Resident	Without these fields that you want to build houses on, where are the fields gonna go when we need food. Without farmers and fields we wouldn't have food. Taking jobs away from the farmers which means less money for them and their family, you really wanna take that away. Yes we need houses, but in the country-side! Why not build more houses in Elksley village.	The Council has undertaken an assessment (sustainability appraisal) on all reasonable alternative locations to accommodate growth around Retford. The priority to reuse brownfield land formed part of this assessment and the local plan has identified several brownfield sites for development where is considered available and suitable within Retford, such as on the Former Elizabethan School off North Road. However, there is not enough suitable or available brownfield land in Retford to accommodate the level of proposed growth. Therefore, some greenfield land is needed to support Retford's growth over the plan period and beyond.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
1858913	Resident	<p>(Page 18) Inadequate care for the environment, reduction in habitat for wildlife, buildings will also impact water run off into the river idle, more waste.</p> <p>(Page 18) No date provided for when primary school will be built, existing schools are already overwhelmed by new housing developments. This has a significant impact on the quality of education provided to young people.</p> <p>(Page 18) Health hub - what is this? GP surgeries and other health services are already overwhelmed. Where will funding come from for the health hub? I oppose cuts to existing services which are already chronically underfunded.</p> <p>(Page 18) The roads around Retford are already too congested with inadequate cycle routes and public transport. More houses will only add to confection as well as pollution. I oppose this.</p> <p>(Page 19) Further concrete buildings will only increase surface water run off into the nearby dykes and river idle - these already flood bankside gardens and goosemoor bridge. Building more houses will only exacerbate this problem and those that live further downstream.</p> <p>What jobs are the people who live in these houses supposed to do?</p>	<p>All major development are required to provide at least a 10% net gain in biodiversity. The existing land at Ordsall South is productive for intense agricultural purposes and therefore less supportive for wildlife habitats. The new development would deliver a significant level of green infrastructure, such as new trees, green space and a country park which will provide space for wildlife enhancement and a greater degree of biodiversity.</p> <p>The Council has been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there is a need for a new 1-form entry Primary School to be provide onsite. The delivery strategy of the Primary School is the responsibility of NCC and the developer(s) who will reach an agreement on how it is to be delivered. It is likely that it will come through the mid stages of the development. The Primary School has been included within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and is a policy requirement for Ordsall South.</p> <p>A new health hub will be delivered on site. This will come through developer contributions towards the creation of the hub.</p> <p>The Council conducted a Transport Assessment on the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The projected additional traffic flows from the proposed new developments were then applied to the transport model. This assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic, which this plan has aimed to mitigate. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p> <p>The Council has produced a detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment for all relevant sites across the District. For Ordsall South, surface water flooding is the main risk where water runs off the fields into the existing developments in periods of high rainfall</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
1858785	Resident	<p>I would like to object to the proposed development at Ordsall on the parliamentary boundary of Bassetlaw/ Newark ie Ordsall /Eaton. The amount of land covered by the development would contribute to even more flooding not to mention the traffic congestion and incapacity for the schools to cope with the influx of children of school age.</p>	<p>events. The Flood Risk Assessment has stated that new (on-site) water storage facilities will help reduce the risk of surface water run-off into the new development and into the existing development in Ordsall. Onsite urban drainage systems are also required and these will likely form part of the developments Green Infrastructure provision.</p> <p>The Council has produced a detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment for all potential development sites across the District, including for Ordsall South. Surface water run-off in periods of high rainfall is the main flooding risk for Ordsall South. The Flood Risk Assessment has stated that new (on-site) water storage facilities are required to help reduce the risk of surface water run-off into the new development and into the existing development in Ordsall. Onsite urban drainage systems are also required and these will likely form part of the developments Green Infrastructure provision.</p> <p>The Council has conducted a Transport Assessment which examined the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford. These traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The new developments were then applied to the transport model to see what impacts they would have on those existing traffic flows. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas.</p> <p>The Council has been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there would need to be a new 1-form entry Primary School provide onsite. The Local Plan has therefore safeguarded land on the site for education and community use and this will be delivered through the development of the site.</p>
1858781	Resident	<p>7.14.1 Retford has seen a massive increase in development over the last few years. The development in Ordsall is too many in one area. Traffic in the town is a nightmare and at certain times of the day during school times it can take ages to get across town. A particular area of concern is the mini roundabout at Ordsall road end. I have been along there at around 8.15 in the morning and traffic cues out towards Babworth. This mini roundabout is a nightmare, and to propose increasing traffic at this point can only show a lack of understanding of the problems. We understood that alterations were to be made and paid for by the developers, who have now turned round and refused to undertake responsibility. Will developers take the same stance and as soon as the site is complete walk</p>	<p>The Council has conducted a Transport Assessment that assessed both the existing traffic flows in and around Retford, and the impact that any new development would have on these. The assessments for the existing traffic flows were carried out during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South		away? I am in favour of a Local Plan as it stops developers coming in and building where they like what they like, but 1200 houses are far to many. Bassetlaw needs to look at other areas and try to shift development to outlying sites and take pressure off the town.	assessment identified that a number of roads and junctions would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The proposed developments would implement these mitigations schemes where they had a direct adverse impact, and financial contributions will be sought to contribute towards wider improvement schemes where the impact is indirect.
1858863	BDC Councillor	<p>Concerns remain with regards to flooding. Parts of Retford have been subject to heavy flooding, with standing water remaining on the fields at Goosemoor approaching Ordsall for a considerable amount of time. Paragraph 7.14.13 states that flood risk should not be increased - however with the changing climate, how can this be guaranteed with the addition of new homes? Sufficient drainage should help to manage this, but will this impact other parts of town? Earlier this year, the Idle flooded at Ordsall. What will it be like with fields upstream developed on? Goosemoor Lane is subject to flooding which can cause traffic chaos - adding potentially another 2000 cars to this furthers the chaos. Sites for traffic calming measures have been identified. However, the main A620 is to remain the principle route across Retford. It should be pointed out that this is not a route used by everyone, with several preferring to use Goosemoor Lane to access town and the supermarkets. There are issues on Ordsall Road with speeding, and traffic problems. Highways have suggested lights at the Ordsall Road/Babworth Road junction, but the road is narrow with no room for filter lanes. There is also a nearby bus stop, and this is also where pupils cross to access the only pavement on the road to Retford Oaks. Pupils need to be safeguarded. When the A1 is closed, chaos is caused along Ordsall Road with traffic diverting. This could give an idea of what could happen with additional cars from the new development. The roads around Ordsall Bridge are narrow and residents park on the road. Tailbacks to Whitehouses are not unusual and large vehicles can have problems on the bridges. I feel highways need to address these issues and the impact of additional traffic. Page 8 states land is safeguarded for a two form entry primary school. Safeguarding the land is not a guarantee the school will be built. If this school is not built until after the first 800 houses, where will pupils from those homes be accommodated? They will likely need to be transported by car across the district to a school with space. While recognising homes are needed, is this appropriate for the village? Transport mitigation is necessary (potential loop road), as well as further detailing on flood protection, not just for this development, but for Retford in general.</p>	<p>The Council has produced a detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment for all relevant sites across the District. For Ordsall South, surface water flooding is the main risk where water runs off the fields into the existing developments in periods of high rainfall events. The Flood Risk Assessment has stated that new (on-site) water storage facilities will help reduce the risk of surface water run-off into the new development and into the existing development in Ordsall. Onsite urban drainage systems are also required and these will likely form part of the developments Green Infrastructure provision.</p> <p>The Council has also conducted a Transport Assessment which examined the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford. These traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The new developments were then applied to the transport model to see what impacts they would have on those existing traffic flows. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas.</p> <p>The delivery of some areas of infrastructure, such as the Primary School, will come through the mid stages of the development. The delivery strategy of the school is the responsibility of Nottinghamshire County Council, who are the education authority, who will reach an agreement on the delivery of the school with the developer(s) during the planning process.</p>
1858658	Resident	<p>Page 14- This policy with a revised (increased) number of houses ignores responses to the previous consultation. The previous consultation had 800 homes. If this upwardly revised housing allocation is passed then it shows that the plan is not consultative as it is required to be.</p> <p>Page 14- The Green Gap is not guaranteed. The gap actually falls beyond the boundary of the District. The plan cannot claim to maintain a green gap</p> <p>Page 14- Ordsall South claims to be green but fails to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EV charging provision - Solar panels 	<p>The uplift in the number of homes from November 2020 was undertaken for two reasons. Firstly, it was important to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework and its policy on the effective use of land, and secondly it enabled the delivery of necessary infrastructure, such as a new school, to support the sustainable development of the community which</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South		<p>- Cycle ways to the town centre and station</p> <p>Page 17- The traffic management for the new development is inadequate. The present traffic management in Ordsall is not sufficient and this will overload the roads. It should fail at inspectorate. None of the transport improvements are practically going to deliver the capacity needed. A new road connection to London Road to the South of Retford is needed as a minimum. Retford has seen tragic deaths due to schools, the plan will see traffic diverted past Ordsall Primary School which increases the risks of death</p> <p>Page 14- The housing allocation for Bassetlaw is incorrect. I understand that other responses will highlight this. Many in the town are accusing the planners of protecting other areas of the district, possibly to save votes, by adopting a "scorched earth" policy for Ordsall. Firing all houses at Ordsall, with a misguided number of homes, is set to invalidate the entire local plan at inspectorate stage.</p> <p>Page 14- The plan fails to provide adequate statistical analysis of the consultation feedback made on Ordsall South by residents. This is essential to understand how popular/unpopular the allocation is.</p>	<p>would not have been possible with lower housing numbers.</p> <p>Whilst located within a Green Gap, the careful design of the development through a masterplan will help to minimise any adverse impacts on the landscape whilst maximising the protection or enhancement of important natural features.</p> <p>All new homes will be required to have the capable infrastructure for installing EV charging points.</p> <p>Solar energy has the potential to be accommodated through the design of new buildings.</p> <p>The Council has also conducted a Transport Assessment which examined the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford. These traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The new developments were then applied to the transport model to see what impacts they would have on those existing traffic flows. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas.</p>
1859136	Resident	<p>This submission is firstly based on the 'Draft Bassetlaw Plan Ordsall South Focussed Consultation 9 June to 21 July 2021; namely under 'Just some of the key features of the site include' heading. Housing: 800 homes with a further 450 houses to follow. This breaches the Core Strategy Plan as per Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan January 2020 at 5.1.2.2 and 5.1.2.2.3 et al. This clearly states that the Retford area only has 528 spaces for additional dwellings.</p> <p>The scale suggested as per the following: 20% of homes delivered will be affordable housing, 20% will be designed for older people and 5% will be designed for wheelchair access. The delivery of such types of housing under Section 106 or such a plan requires a synergy of relationships of which fostering and funding would be core issues. These are in fact unsustainable in the present restrictions of funding, planning and finance for any social housing provider whereby their own limitations would thus not guarantee an availability to deliver on this scale. Therefore, this promise would only result in very limited numbers of affordable housing and would not be able to deliver as proposed.</p> <p>Community and Environmental Features: 'The development will benefit from a Local Centre, including a convenience shop, land for a primary school, a health hub, and community facilities including outdoor sports pitches.' Spaces for possible are not factual benefits and the County Council will not provide a school for an area where there is already sufficient provision. However the cost of approximately 4.6 million would be required by the developer to build a primary school as indicated. It appears all that is being offered is land on a provisional basis hence proposals with absolutely no substance or secured funding, for everything mentioned. Empty promises yet again. 'It will also include a 23 hectare Country Park on the western boundary next to Whisker Hill, creating more space for wildlife and community woodland. In addition, Four hectares of high quality, open space will be created across the site for recreation, children's play and facilities for young people.' The area outlined for development already has stunning wildlife, trees and recreational areas which lead to the River Idle and the stunning village of Eaton. Therefore destroy to replace is not ecologically or environmentally friendly and is sacrilege to such an already</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South		<p>natural beauty spot. Hence common sense needs to prevail. Finally the subheading of Infrastructure Features Whereby a 'A green buffer around the site will help protect the privacy of residents' Will this also protect the residents already in Ordsall from the dust, disruption and general pollution from HGV's and construction traffic for many years? 'Flood management measures will deal with surface water run off on the site so that existing residents are not impacted. This could include sustainable drainage such as ponds and wetlands.' The proposed site is already where the natural flood planes are so in effect Eaton village will carry the brunt of additional flooding which it appears is an oversight. 'New footpaths and cycleways across the site and to Ordsall, improvements to the public rights of way.' Ordsall roads are narrow to the point that no obstruction can be passed without waiting for other traffic to stop. These same roads can also not be widened due to the extent of properties already occupying these narrow B roads. Therefore, yet again this statement is an unsubstantiated fallacy. 'A new bus service into the site providing links to Ordsall and Retford' and Two new traffic management schemes will be delivered to help improve traffic flow and safety for people and cyclists in Ordsall Old Village and Eaton Village.' As per previous comments the road widths alone do not support such plans and the increase of village traffic by a third will certainly only cause further congestion let alone with alleged 'traffic management' in place. 'Improvements will be made to nearby road junctions including, but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priority T junction of Ollerton Road and West Hill Road • Mini roundabout junction of A620 Ordsall Road / Babworth Road • Mini roundabout junction of A638 Goosemoor Lane / London Road at Whitehouses' <p>These types of road improvements at junctions were promised previously with for example, the Persimmon development at Fairways Park. However, once the 190 houses were built suddenly the road junctions were 'adequate' and this part of the planning permission was permitted to be omitted. Further to which, it appears that the County Council has no information concerning plans for a 1250 development let alone outline consideration of road upgrades which the area would need. To consider merely upgrading junctions is again a narrow perspective whereby the reality is that millions would need to be spent by the developer even before building began. This area lacks any infrastructure that could carry this amount of traffic safely and efficiently.</p> <p>To conclude these plans are not going to be a 'cheap build' for a developer nor is it going to be of any benefit but only detriment to the area itself and the village of Ordsall. This type of development needs strong transport links where adequate provision is available to support this level of development. Ordsall is definitely not that place and as highlighted by my responses to these general cherry picked provisions that are attempting to sell it to us Ordsall residents.</p>	
1822604	Resident	<p>The village of Ordsall and Retford as a whole cannot sustain such a huge number of new houses nor should it need to given the number of new housing developments already approved or underway. Once again Retford is being used as a cash cow for Bassetlaw, no thought given to the impact due to lack of jobs or infrastructure to support this number of houses. With only 1 Road in and out of Ordsall to both Eaton and the A1 the level of traffic is already ridiculous and at peak times reaches dangerous levels for students going to and from local schools. The green areas of Ordsall have been systematically been built on and these developments leave less areas for children and adults to enjoy natural, rural spaces. Lack of spaces in schools, full doctor and dental practices, outdoor community spaces lacking are all going to be made worse by this ill thought out plan. The local nursery and shopping area are already busy beyond belief at certain times of the day and the level of traffic and parked cars is dangerous. This will be exacerbated by more housing developments in the Ordsall area. Whichever developer builds these developments will have an eye on profits and will not be thinking about what is in the best interests of the local community. Despite the fact that there are promises to invest in more infrastructure I have lived in the local area long enough to know that in Bassetlaw these are likely empty promises and Retford is always likely to lose out in preference to Worksop.</p>	<p>The Council has conducted a Transport Assessment that assessed both the existing traffic flows in and around Retford, and the impact that any new development would have on these. The assessments for the existing traffic flows were carried out during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified that a number of roads and junctions would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The proposed developments would implement these mitigations schemes where they had a direct adverse impact, and financial contributions will be sought to contribute towards wider improvement schemes where the impact is indirect.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
1858281	Resident	<p>Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan July 2021 I am a resident of Eaton who feels that while the document has merit and the team have consulted with many parties there appears to be a lack of acceptance to fully listen to people's views. I do accept that like my comments some of them are emotional and may not have a sound planning footing but to deliver such a plan consideration must be given to those who may not have the experience, but they have a much better understanding of their local area and its short falls. This appears to be the case in Eaton the single most potentially affected rural community in the whole plan.</p> <p>Ordsall South You state National Policy requires efficient use is made of any land greenfield or brownfield this is open to interpretation as spaces for wellbeing, activities and improvements to quality of life can all be deemed to qualify as efficient use as you express the growing need to achieve this so therefore it is within your powers to allocate more land to this while reducing the amount for housing. Why do you need to include the additional 450 houses in the current draft plan as they you have stated these are to be delivered in the next plan period therefore this is not to be consulted on as it forms a starting point for a future plan.</p> <p>With regards the density of housing is it not the job of the planning department to allocate sites suitable for residential or commercial development, considering how an area would be affected and would it be able to cope and what must be provided to ensure your plan would work in that location. Would it not be the developer to submit a plan of building to be decided through the correct channels and decided at future planning meetings The use of language within the consultation is very much written in a way to suggest that the general public can indicate where items might go before the plan has been approved thus given a false hope or confirming many details have been agreed.</p> <p>The transport study in my opinion is flawed and while you have always informed people this is down to other to decide. The use of roundabouts will reduce speed coming into the new built up area however the flaw is the ability to accept the huge increase in traffic over the 2 bridges at Eaton and Ordsall, not to mention the strain on both High St in Eaton and Ordsall will be dangerous . There has to be a moral responsibility by the team to accept the current infrastructure is not suitable for such a large development at this site and work with Highways and local residents to find a solution should the site be accepted. If you consider the development of 170 houses of Bigsby Rd was refused due to a junction issue which are both wider roads there has to be further discussions to be had before the site can be adopted .</p> <p>General Comments / Points</p> <p>The desire to improve links with other areas such as Goosemore recreation area and Retford Town is commendable but it shows no methodology of how this could be done and Improvements for cycle traffic and pedestrians To meet the above statement it is clear that the plan need to upscale the amount of properties required from the outset and the life of this plan and cut back on other larger developments giving those area time to integrate and develop strategies to cope with increasing numbers? The plan shows that the route down Mansfield road will be altered to slow traffic down by sending it through the new Garden Village. What plans have been made to cope when the A1 has to be shut as happens at least twice a year ?</p> <p>Would a large area be allocated for parking with in the area for visitors to the country park at Whisker Hill as you indicated you would like this to be a destination point with Bassetlaw and has consideration been given to the effects of the incoming traffic on the local roads and suitable parking allocation.</p>	<p>The Council has been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there is a need for a new 1-form entry Primary School to be provide onsite. The Local Plan has safeguarded land on the site for education and community use and this will be delivered through the development of the site. A new "health-hub" facility will also be provided so that new health services can be provided on site.</p> <p>The volume and delivery of development is closely linked to its viability and the provision of necessary infrastructure. A development of this scale will need to be phased so that the housing and infrastructure are delivered in a sustainable way throughout the lifetime of the development. The Local Plan proposes that the first 800 homes will be delivered before the end of 2037. A further 450 homes will be delivered thereafter. The additional 450 homes are included in this plan, despite them not commencing until the next plan period, as combined with the first 800 homes at Ordsall South they allow the delivery of much needed infrastructure and services that would otherwise not be possible.</p> <p>The Local Plan has been through a long public consultation process. This has explored the various options for development around the District.</p> <p>The Council has produced a Transport Assessment which assessed both the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford and the impact that the proposed new development would have on these. The existing traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas such as Eaton village. The Transport Assessment identifies that Eaton will likely see a small rise in traffic volume as a result of the proposed development at Ordsall South, but that this impact can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures. The Transport Assessment details the type of measures proposed for Eaton. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South		<p>I also believe the following points need work on would it not be a better buffer if you consider moving the country park on HS13 to wrap round both the West and South Boundaries ensuring a softer break between agricultural land and Development ?</p> <p>You have addressed parking for non residential development however following the experience of the complete lack of sufficient parking per household the development at Bridon which has caused issues with emergency services being unable to get can you ensure this is included in the masterplan.</p> <p>At What point in time do you consider any traffic calming / management in the village of Eaton be it traffic lights at the narrow bridge or development of calming measures along the length of Main St to be in place</p> <p>Could you request from your partners White Young and Green to explore the possibilities, If this development was to go forth in its current format a feasibility study as to the merits of building a new road down Marsh lane and across to or London road to ensure your wish of a safe route to Retford town centre could be made by all users. At what time in the process of this plan would you expect to see plans being put forward to improve the traffic using Ordsall High St along side pedestrians and cyclists</p>	<p>schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p> <p>An appropriate level of residential and visitor off-road car parking space will be provided in line with the County Council Parking Standards. The ratio for these standards is related to the number of bedrooms per property.</p> <p>There will be parking provision at the Local Centre for shoppers and at the Country Park for visitors.</p>
REF057	Resident	<p>I am totally against this massive plan to increase the housing by such a large amount. The Local Plan is going to ruin the area in which I have lived for the last forty years. Over the passed years Ordsall has had more than it's fair share of housing developments, which has already increased the housing capacity a great deal.</p> <p>These are my main objections and concerns:-</p> <p>The amount of proposed houses is far to high. Ordsall does not have the infrastructure to withstand this amount of development. The increase in the amount of traffic. It will cause more congestion and will not be safe for children mainly when travelling to and from school. The roads are already under pressure at certain times now, so will be even worse with this development. The road access to area is inappropriate, causing even more problems with traffic. The proposed area has an abundance of wildlife. It will take away their habitat and endanger more species of animals. Flooding is a concern. The area is prone to flooding at times.</p> <p>From past experiences the promises of extra schools, health centres, open spaces etc., never do materialise, they are just 'Empty Promises' I am very disappointed with this plan. I urge everyone to reconsider how this will have a negative and overwhelming effect on the community. The land for the site is perfectly good farm land and should remain so.</p>	<p>The Council has conducted a Transport Assessment that assessed both the existing traffic flows in and around Retford, and the impact that any new development would have on these. The assessments for the existing traffic flows were carried out during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified that a number of roads and junctions would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The proposed developments would implement these mitigations schemes where they had a direct adverse impact, and financial contributions will be sought to contribute towards wider improvement schemes where the impact is indirect.</p> <p>All major development must provide, at least, a 10% net gain in biodiversity. The existing land at Ordsall South is currently utilised for intense agricultural purposes and therefore less supportive for wildlife habitats. The new development is proposed to deliver a significant level of green infrastructure, such as new trees, green space and a country park, which will provide space for wildlife enhancement and greater biodiversity than currently present. There will be a minimum of 27ha of public open space, sports and woodland on site. This reflects the Local Plan evidence base, the local community aspirations and the need to provide a net-gain in local biodiversity. New community facilities will also be provided so that there is space for local events, gatherings and community groups.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			<p>The Council has produced a detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the proposed Ordsall South development, as well as all relevant sites across the District. This assessment identifies the type and frequency of flooding and states the necessary type of mitigation required to help reduce the threat of flooding. For Ordsall South, the highest flooding risk occurs when high rainfall events result in water running off fields in to existing developments. The Flood Risk Assessment has indicated that new on-site water storage facilities will help reduce the risk of surface water run-off into both the new development and existing development in Ordsall. Onsite urban drainage systems are also required and these will likely form part of the development's Green Infrastructure provision.</p> <p>A new "health-hub" facility will be provided on the site so that new health services are available for both new and existing residents. It is likely this will form part of the Local Centre for the development which will become a focus for shops, community facilities and transport services. The Council has also been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there is a need for a new 1-form entry Primary School to be provide onsite. The Local Plan has safeguarded land on the site for education and community use and has been included within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and is a policy requirement for Ordsall South.</p>
REF042	Resident	<p>A couple of years ago the little bridge in Ordsall was closed for a few months and the traffic noise on Ollerton Road was horrendous. And that wasn't permanent. The High Street always has parked cars so imagine 1000+ more cars along there. The shops in the village are an accident waiting to happen with cars parked all over the place. I can't imagine the residents of Eaton being very happy with thousands of cars speeding through their quiet village either. Eight hundred homes was bad enough but one thousand two hundred is horrendous. Are the residents oh Ollerton Road going to get any compensation for the traffic, noise and substantial disruptions to our daily lives? I think not. We often walk along the back lane looking over the fields to the A1 and it is truly beautiful. All this will be lost because of a lot of boxes being built.</p>	<p>The Council has produced a Transport Assessment which assessed both the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford and the impact that the proposed new development would have on these. The existing traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas such as Eaton village. The Transport Assessment identifies that Eaton will likely see a small rise in traffic volume as a result of the proposed development at Ordsall South, but that this impact can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
			<p>measures. The Transport Assessment details the type of measures proposed for Eaton. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p> <p>Due to its edge of settlement location, development at Ordsall South will need to be carefully designed so that it doesn't negatively impact the surrounding landscape. The Council has produced a Landscape Character Assessment which details the local and important landscape features (such as views, trees, watercourses and topography) and provides recommendations on how to restore, reinforce, create or conserve the areas landscape quality.</p>
REF012	Resident	I am writing to support the Draft Local Plan June 2021 Focused addition I have approved the 2 previous Draft Local Plans and I approve this version including the developments in Ordsall and the planned additional dwellings after 2037. I have one further comment to add. This is now the third draft, now is the time to move this out of draft and into full policy ASAP, so everyone knows where they stand. Until this is finalised we will continually have to fight off applications from cowboy developers wanting to make quick fortunes from totally unsuitable sites. This is stressful to residents and wastes the councils time and money. Now is the time to get this finalised.	Thanks for your comments
REF009	BDC Councillor	<p>There is a traffic rat run through Eaton Village at the moment. The situation will become much worse if the proposed development goes ahead. NCC are wrestling with the problem of speeding traffic at the moment , and how to reduce the speed to a safer level. The road through Eaton has a 90 degree corner , an ancient bridge serving as a chicane ,and another corner nearer to the Old Great North Road. The road through Eaton serves as a short cut to the A1 trunk via the Great North Road for the existing residential estates on the South West of Retford town. (The residential estates of Ordsall). The road through Eaton village is already very busy during computer hours especially. I consider an increase in this traffic , which will definitely take place with any additional development , as that proposed , to increase the dangers within Eaton to an unacceptable level. I genuinely believe that the village street will become an unacceptable danger to residents , and vehicle users. The road is narrow , with no room for a pedestrian pavement on the West side of the idle river within the village. There is not any opportunity to widen this road as existing residences are built close to the road.</p> <p>The area close to the river and on the bridge is used for recreation especially on hot summer days. People use the river for swimming and much as a resort on hot days. The bridge can be difficult to access by vehicles for the large number of people on the bridge at these times, and the access is single vehicle as the bridge is so narrow at any time. Retford Country Market Town: Retford is a traditional market town. The development proposed will change the character to primarily a residential commuter dormitory. There are likely to be few jobs created in, and to the East of Retford in the life of the plan. The residential urban area would be better situated nearer centres of growth, such as Doncaster , Rotherham and Sheffield where the jobs will be. This would allow Retford to retain its character to fit in with the desired growth of tourism within Bassetlaw, North Nottinghamshire, and the Tourism envisaged in the Bassetlaw plan. The Town centre of Retford will become congested and unattractive for shoppers to enter the Town, which was built for a smaller service community. The quality of life in and around the town will reduce, services will become stretched. Health services will become difficult to access. Promised and needed capacity as a result of the</p>	<p>The Council has produced a Transport Assessment which assessed both the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford and the impact that the proposed new development would have on these. The existing traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas such as Eaton village. The Transport Assessment identifies that Eaton will likely see a small rise in traffic volume as a result of the proposed development at Ordsall South, but that this impact can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures. The Transport Assessment details the type of measures proposed for Eaton. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South		<p>development required for health a education is unlikely to be delivered satisfactorily. Existing residents are likely to suffer difficulties accessing services at the level they are used to. The plan is forcing a unsustainable and environmentally unfriendly development , in what is still an attractive and rural area</p>	<p>The plan has been developed accruing to national planning policy and an evidence base accompanies its proposals. The community has been consulted on a number of development and growth options since 2016.</p> <p>Where development causes an unreasonable negative impact on landscape and infrastructure, then it must mitigate against those impacts. The Local Plan identifies where new or enhanced infrastructure is needed.</p>
REF017	Resident	<p>As an Ordsall resident, I am not against the proposed development of 1,250 homes to the south of Ordsall However there are several areas that concern me</p> <p>1. Cycle routes As a keen cyclists, I have not seen nor do I see in the future any planning nor budget for cyclists. The appointment of a cycling Champion seems to me as a Councillor without portfolio. Taking this into consideration, I will not waste mine or your time by detailing my views.</p> <p>2. Access to the site during development This development will be undertaken over a number of years. Access to the site is :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The A1 via Elkesley. The access to the A1 has be vastly improved but not the road into Ordsall b. From Whitehouses. You state the roundabout is to be improved. What is happening to the bridge over the River Idle which is still very tight, even after the recent work and blind at both ends c. Through Eton -another tight and blind bridge which is only one way d. From Babworth <p>3. Lorry traffic during the development of these new house</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. neither the Whithouse nor Eton access is suitable for an increase in lorry traffic b. The Babworth access is already crowded, especially at the beginning and end of the working day c. Ideally the road from Elkesley needs upgrading and developers need limiting to using this road only as part of the planning consent <p>4. The above also applies to the increase in car traffic once the houses are built, at 1.5 cars per household this is an increase of 1,875 cars</p> <p>5. Services before any development in new services are established. Nobody will be interested in starting a service or business until there is critical mass to make it economic. For a many years the new people will use the shops already established in Ordsall. The parking is already diabolical!</p> <p>There are numerous other area which need careful consideration such as a one way system up the high street and down all hallows street and limitations to on street parking to assist in traffic flow You may have taken all the above into consideration but I have seen little if any communication to inform Ordsall residents. Is it any wonder you get residence to more houses and Councillors resigning</p>	<p>The proposed development Ordsall South would provide new and enhanced footpaths and cycle networks into Retford and the surrounding countryside. A new network of footpaths and cycle routes will also be provided on site so that residents can easily access the green spaces and local services. Where new roads and cycle ways are provided, these will be segregated or form part of a shared space for cyclists and pedestrians. Any improvements to existing cycle ways will likely just provide improvements to the existing infrastructure such as surfacing or lighting</p> <p>The Council has conducted a Transport Assessment that assessed both the existing traffic flows in and around Retford, and the impact that any new development would have on these. The assessments for the existing traffic flows were carried out during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified that a number of roads and junctions would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The proposed developments would implement these mitigations schemes where they had a direct adverse impact, and financial contributions will be sought to contribute towards wider improvement schemes where the impact is indirect.</p> <p>Conditions may be put in place for the developers regarding the potential for disruption to be caused through the construction process of the development. This would be done through the standard planning process.</p> <p>The delivery of infrastructure will be phased alongside the development. The Council has produced an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which details the types of</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			infrastructure needed to support the growth across the District.
REF022	Resident	<p>Please can I submit my objection to the policy 29, Ordsall south focused consultation</p> <p>I feel that Ordsall has poor paths (unsafe, incomplete for prams/wheelchairs), new paths in the site are no good if access in Ordsall isn't possible as it is and needs improving first before any building</p> <p>Unsafe footpaths are potential risk to life and with more housing even more Ordsall residents will be in danger</p> <p>Unsafe roads with poor access e.g. for fire engines and ambulances more housing with more cars will make this worse. The road system is a major concern as is access to Ordsall, for example at Babworth mini roundabout I have reported flooding which has never been dealt with, just ignored by the council.</p> <p>Existing infrastructure needs making safe first before any new builds, endangering life and keeping residents safe is upmost priority NOT housing</p> <p>Employability will be minimal and only the same as if it was at the Bassetlaw garden village, cant see any difference to that site and Ordsall south site? What jobs will there be for these people?</p> <p>School places will be required in the first phase if not before</p> <p>As stated infrastructure needs to be complete and in place for now, and for future THEN house building can occur not the promise of this after which has no guarantee of being upheld</p> <p>The leaflet mentions more nature land which is a contradiction in terms as the nature land is already here, they aren't providing anymore nature land they are building on it and taking away.</p> <p>Existing public rights of way are not labelled correctly, these go across site and are walked 2x a year by myself and will cut the site of adjacent to Lansdowne drive in half</p> <p>Wild life such as oyster catchers, cuckoos, owls are on site I see no differences to wildlife objections as those of potential wildlife problems at Bassetlaw garden village.</p> <p>More residents with more pollution and pets such as cats to eat the existing wildlife are a consideration of reducing wildlife in the area.</p> <p>I would like to submit 2 videos of the site showing cuckoo and owls, please can you tell me who I should send this evidence to?</p>	<p>The proposed development Ordsall South would provide new and enhanced footpaths and cycle networks into Retford and the surrounding countryside. A new network of footpaths and cycle routes will also be provided on site so that residents can easily access the green spaces and local services. Where new roads and cycle ways are provided, these will be segregated or form part of a shared space for cyclists and pedestrians. Any improvements to existing footpaths or cycle ways are likely to be upgrades to the existing infrastructure such as new surfacing or better lighting</p> <p>The Council has conducted a Transport Assessment that assessed both the existing traffic flows in and around Retford, and the impact that any new development would have on these. The assessments for the existing traffic flows were carried out during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified that a number of roads and junctions would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The proposed developments would implement these mitigation schemes where they had a direct adverse impact, and financial contributions will be sought to contribute towards wider improvement schemes where the impact is indirect.</p> <p>The delivery of infrastructure will be phased alongside the development. The Council has produced an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which details the types of infrastructure needed to support the growth across the District</p> <p>All major developments are required to provide at least a 10% net gain in biodiversity. The land at Ordsall South is currently utilised for intense agricultural purposes and is therefore not particularly supportive for wildlife habitats. The new development at Ordsall South will deliver a significant level of green</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
			infrastructure, such as new trees, green space, and a country park, which will provide space for wildlife enhancement and offer a greater degree of biodiversity.
REF025	Sports England	<p>The development should be informed by evidence from a Sport England perspective is the Playing Pitch Strategy and the Emerging Built Sports Facilities Strategy. Both strategies should be able to answer the following questions ;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Can the existing sports facilities meet the demand identified? For example how is the demand for Rugby from this development being met given the close proximity of 2. If not, would investment in existing facilities enable them to meet some or all of the demand? 3. If not what is required on site to meet the demand which cannot be met elsewhere? <p>The impact upon the Golf Club should be fully assessed</p>	Both assessments have informed the need for public open space and sport facilities on the site. Where there is a direct impact, the site will provide new facilities otherwise improvements will come via financial contributions from development.
REF031	Resident	<p>We object on several grounds as set out below:</p> <p>Eaton Village We see that Notts.County Council have already confirmed that this is a major problem - their e-mail 04/12/20 refers. Narrow road, no pavement and narrow bridge. This is a short cut onto the A638 for Retford/Tuxford/Lincoln/A1 Your transport people have suggested priority vehicle signage. This will lead to standing traffic in both directions in the village. This in turn will cause noise/pollution for the residents. You will not stop traffic using this as a short cut.</p> <p>Ordsall Bridge Narrow roads with residents parked vehicles (High St). These in turn lead to a narrow bridge. This is also a bus route. Large vehicles including buses have problems on the bridge. Current island at Whitehouses will be swamped with more traffic. Causing tailbacks down Goosemoor Lane and over bridge, This will create pandemonium at this junction.</p> <p>Ordsall Road/Babworth Road Junction There is already problems on Ordsall Road with speeding. The local Police are already aware of this situation. There are a series of junctions and driveways along this road. Recently built housing estates also enter this road. So there is already increased traffic problems. Your transport people are suggesting traffic lights at the junction of Ordsll Road /Babworth Road. The roads at this junction are narrow. There is no room for any light controlled filter lanes so each road will have to be controlled separately which in turn will cause a delay on each road awaiting the lights to change. Also there is a bus stop within 75 yards of this junction on Babworth road approaching from Retford town. There is no room to move this bus stop which will coupled with the lights cause delay and a tail back of traffic, Pupils attending Retford Oaks Academy cross Babworth Road from Ordsall Road to get to the only pavement on that road, We assume the council would wish to safeguard these pupils whilst crossing this busy road.The only way would be to install some kind of light controlled crossing (pelican) Can you imagine the nightmare scenario of all this at this junction. There are 2 further islands Retford Oaks/Amcott Way leading onto Babworth Road so the problem would be magnified. When there is a problem on the A1 you will be aware of the traffic chaos caused by vehicles being sent along Ordsall Road. This will give you a picture of what will happen.</p> <p>We feel that the massive impact that this development will cause is a major cause of concern and should not be further considered.</p>	<p>The Council has produced a Transport Assessment which assessed both the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford and the impact that the proposed new development would have on these. The existing traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The Transport Assessment identifies that Eaton will likely see a small rise in traffic volume as a result of the proposed development at Ordsall South, but that this impact can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures. The Transport Assessment details the type of measures proposed for Eaton and other areas of concern. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
REF032	Resident	<p>Please accept this email as OBJECTION to the proposed plan to build 1250 dwellings in Ordsall South (HS13 on the map) My views remain the same as previously emailed to you in that High Street and Goosemoor Bridge barely copes with the traffic as it is. The majority of houses have 2 cars, another 1250 dwellings = the possibility of another 2500 cars using High Street and Goosemoor Bridge and in some cases the road to and through Eaton. Retford to Eaton Green Gap – there may well be some “green” land between Ordsall and Eaton but the road infrastructure cannot and will not cope with the extra volume of traffic, the possibility of up to 2,500 vehicles on narrow roads.</p> <p>Both the bridges at Eaton and Goosemoor are not suitable for such heavy traffic. Goosemoor Bridge is unable to cope as it is – there were 3 accidents in one week during the month of June on Goosemoor Bridge alone! Cllr. Jo White states “increasing the number of properties in the Ordsall South site was something we really didn’t want to do”. The plan was thrown out in 2014 to build on this land and the headline in the Retford Times from Jo White said something on the lines of “Ordsall South cannot cope with this amount of new housing” and now you are actually wanting to build hundreds more houses than was put forward in 2014 and November 2020.</p> <p>I appreciate that the Government puts local councils under pressure and apparently there is a shortage of housing, but you don’t have to look too far to find more suitable areas in Retford that have better road infrastructures than Ordsall South. How many more houses with their vehicles do you expect “old” Ordsall to cope with?</p> <p>I walked around a large area of the roads in Ordsall South last week, cars were parked most of the way on one side of High Street making it only passable for 1 car to drive either up or down at a time, therefore causing traffic to queue to get either up or down. Cars elsewhere parked half on the road and half on the pavement making it impossible for me as a pedestrian to walk on the pavement and having to walk on the main road. This is bad enough on the housing estates but when it’s occurring on Ordsall Road (the road where the rugby club is), it’s very dangerous. I can see if this plan goes ahead that it will be the same as other developments in Ordsall that have been built – the houses will go up but the roundabouts, traffic lights, green areas etc will be forgotten about. It’s too late once the housing has gone up and you realise the area cannot cope.</p> <p>What happened to the idea of a Garden Village?</p> <p>The fields at the bottom of Bankside frequently flood. High Street regularly floods when we have persistent rain as the drains cannot cope, if the farmland close by is built on, where will that rainwater go that would have drained into the fields? As I understand it, the main sewer that runs down High Street, and even though there have already been several completed housing developments, no changes to the main sewer have been undertaken. Surely building yet more houses on the fields will only lead to more flooding problems on High Street, the roads off and further into Retford and the surrounding villages further down the Idle Valley. The more fields that are built on, surely the more drainage problems we will have. If the plan goes ahead, and I fear it will, you say that Retford has a relatively high proportion of older people. If the plan gets the go ahead, will consideration be given to build bungalows for the older people on the smaller area of HS13 i.e. Hill View & River View, where there are already bungalows backing on to this area? My views in my last email dated 06 January 2021 Ref No. REF038 remain the same regarding Ollerton Road/Welbeck Road and West Hill Road. I do fear it will be fair accomplished but feel I must put my opinion across to the people in Bassetlaw Planning Dept.</p>	<p>The Council has produced a Transport Assessment which assessed both the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford and the projected impact that the proposed new development would have on these. The existing traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide the most accurate baseline. The assessment identified that several roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The Transport Assessment details the type of measures proposed for areas of concern. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p> <p>The Council has undertaken a Sustainability Appraisal to assess the impacts from the proposed growth and this helps to establish what mitigation is needed to accommodate the level of growth. The Council has also assessed other alternative locations around Retford through this process.</p> <p>The Council has produced a detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment for all relevant sites across the District, including Ordsall South. This assessment identifies the type and frequency of flooding and states the necessary type of mitigation required to help reduce the threat of flooding. For Ordsall South, the main risk of flooding currently occurs when surface water runs off the fields into the existing developments in periods of high rainfall events. The Flood Risk Assessment has stated that new (on-site) water storage facilities will help reduce the risk of surface water run-off into the new development and also to the existing development in Ordsall. Onsite urban drainage systems are also required and these will likely form part of the developments Green Infrastructure provision.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
REF033	Resident	<p>This response relates to the Ordsall South Housing plan ref ST29 HS13 and is in addition to my previous e-mail sent 6-1-21</p> <p>Having viewed the initial concept plan by the site promoter, William Barton I was admittedly rather surprised at the ratio of development land compared to land allocated for leisure/nature use which is indeed greater than you would normally expect for a housing development of this nature.</p> <p>However, this is a very large development concept and recent changes suggest that the initial number of houses proposed has since been increased from 800 to 1250 which if correct is quite simply bewildering and would effectively double the size of Ordsall which has already been overdeveloped in my view with inadequate infrastructure that simply cannot cope. Given these changes and the difficulty in finding genuinely honest and transparent intentions, I would be highly sceptical that any development would be kept within these parameters and the site would end up larger than implied at this early stage. It is for these reasons and environmental reasons outlined in my previous e-mail that I would oppose any development on this site but especially one as large as this one which is simply unacceptable on all levels, not least the huge increase in traffic on an already busy area with poorly planned roads lashed together from the succession of previous developments. Traffic calming is not the answer and speed bumps are awful for people living in the area which feel like a last resort and everyone has simply given up. I have heard arguments that government has already dictated the number of new properties an area must provide but I was of the opinion we lived in a democracy and that recent governments were promoting greater powers to local regions to decide how their neighbourhoods are to develop so I do not accept this either.</p> <p>Development of open land is taken far too lightly as though it is simply there for the taking. Additional housing should be much more evenly spread, utilising smaller pockets of land and primarily using all previously developed areas or repurposing urban land in view of the inevitable great changes we are facing. Instead of doubling the size of Ordsall we should be doubling the size of Sherwood Forrest and leave a legacy that may actually be positive for future generations rather than just blindly carrying on with the usual, predictable washed out formulas. Given the dire state of pretty much all aspects of current world affairs I am genuinely baffled at how intelligent people think this approach of relentless new development on open land is still acceptable and believe it is necessary for a radical rethink of how all humans consider their future with regard to living, working and leisure activities and unless we seriously look at these issues including managing sustainable population levels then I believe the future is looking very grim indeed.</p>	<p>The volume and delivery of development is closely linked to its viability and the provision of necessary infrastructure. A development of this scale will need to be phased so that the housing and infrastructure are delivered in a sustainable way throughout the lifetime of the development. The Local Plan proposes that the first 800 homes will be delivered before the end of 2037. A further 450 homes will be delivered thereafter. The uplift in the number of homes from November 2020 was undertaken for two reasons. Firstly, it was important to comply with the Government's National Planning Policy Framework and its policy on the effective use of land, and secondly it enabled the delivery of necessary infrastructure, such as a new school, to support the sustainable development of the community which would not have been possible with lower housing numbers.</p> <p>The Council undertook an assessment (sustainability appraisal) on all reasonable locations to accommodate growth around Retford, with a priority on reusing brownfield land. The local plan has identified brownfield land for development where it is considered available and suitable within Retford, such as on the Former Elizabethan School off North Road. However, there is not enough available or suitable brownfield land in Retford to accommodate the level of proposed growth in the local plan. Therefore, some greenfield land is needed to support Retford's growth over the plan period and beyond.</p>
REF035	Resident	I am writing to comment on the updated proposals to the Ordsall South plan. The thought of 800 new homes was horrific but the new proposal of 1250 homes is even more horrendous. Most households nowadays have at least one car if not two or even three. The roads around the proposed sites will not be able to cope with the increased traffic. I live in Eaton and it is already a 'rat run' for cars travelling from Ordsall. It is positively dangerous to try and exit Woodyard Lane even at 7 am because of poor visibility and cars ignoring the speed limit through the village. There is also the problem of people using the river bank near the bridge and beyond for recreational purposes, namely 'wild swimming' sunbathing, picnicking and dropping litter! There are cars parked on the road verges at any time of day from early morning to late evening. This makes driving over the bridge very dangerous especially as, again, the speed limit is often exceeded. If this is a problem now with the current population I dread to think what it will be like if the proposals for Ordsall South go ahead.	The Council has produced a Transport Assessment which assessed both the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford and the impact that the proposed new development would have on these. The existing traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The Transport Assessment identifies that Eaton will likely see a small rise in traffic volume as a result of the proposed

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
REF036	Resident	<p>I wish to register my strong objection to the proposal for 1250 dwellings (and other facilities) to be developed on Site HS13 Ordsall South on the grounds that this amounts to over-development, there is no supporting infrastructure (e.g. totally inadequate road network), it will be hugely detrimental to the countryside, it is unnecessary use of valuable greenfield sites and there are more suitable alternative sites in Retford and the surrounding area. This amount of new homes would bring unsustainable pressures on the road network which is unchanged since it served the village when it consisted of a handful of farms and a paper mill. Traffic levels are already at a very high level for such a small village, and demand on existing facilities such as shops and the primary school means there is no capacity for additional pressures that would emanate from this development. And no improvements will help deal with traffic and safety issues on roads like the High Street, which is already dangerous because of on street parking and no laybys to allow traffic to safely pass. Some years ago BDC turned down a planning application for a pharmacy on the High Street due to traffic/parking concerns, so how can a huge development in close vicinity to this location be permitted, in the knowledge that it will generate far more traffic and other pressures on the local infrastructure?!</p> <p>I am a Local Government Officer and in over 30 years of experience involving attendance at Planning Committees and viewing Planning Policy documents, I have never seen a more inappropriate proposal for site allocations as this, taking into account all of the potential harm it would have on the area and its residents. There would also be significant loss of public amenity if these fields are built on, and it would have a massively detrimental impact on the landscape character. These fields hold prominent positions within the landscape of the Idle river valley. They can be seen from the London Road going into Retford and there are beautiful views across the valley to and from these fields, both on the river Idle side and from Whisker Hill by the golf course on the other side.. If development was allowed here, it would represent 'urban sprawl' and encroachment into countryside which has significant landscape merit. These fields are the 'gateway' into the Idle Valley from the south of the village. It is an important area for local people to enjoy countryside walks, because it is unspoilt and has lots of rights of way open to the public. There are no other areas like this on this side of Ordsall. If these fields are lost to development, residents in the south of the village will no longer be able to access countryside walks from their doorstep. The landscape merit of the fields to the south of Ordsall has been grossly overlooked and development of these fields would ruin what is, for many residents in the village, the only truly beautiful and scenic area of countryside available within walking distance. This will have a detrimental impact on the health and wellbeing of residents, a factor which Planning Authorities are now being urged nationally to take into account when considering planning proposals. In my opinion, no amount of 'landscape-led design' or 'sensitive design and density appropriate to local context' will compensate for the hugely detrimental impact on the local landscape and greenspace amenity currently enjoyed by residents across this site by way of existing rights of way. It is laughable that the plan states that 'quality greenspace' will be provided, when it is clear that so much valuable greenspace will be lost as a result of this proposal.</p> <p>Furthermore, the soil tests previously commissioned by BDC show that these fields comprise 96% soil graded as Grade 2/sub grade 3a so this is high quality agricultural land, unlike the derelict factory sites just over the railway line off West Carr Road that have stood empty and disused for years. And there are many other brown field sites in the</p>	<p>development at Ordsall South, but that this impact can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures. The Transport Assessment details the type of measures proposed for Eaton and other areas of concern. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p> <p>The Council has produced a Transport Assessment which assessed both the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford and the projected impact that the proposed new development would have on these. The existing traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide the most accurate baseline. The assessment identified that several roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The Transport Assessment details the type of measures proposed for areas of concern. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p> <p>The Council has undertaken an assessment (sustainability appraisal) on all reasonable alternative locations to accommodate growth around Retford. The priority to reuse brownfield land formed a large part of this assessment and the local plan has identified brownfield land for development where is considered available and suitable within Retford, such as on the Former Elizabethan School off North Road. However, there is not enough suitable or available brownfield land in Retford to accommodate the level of proposed growth required to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework and to provide a viable development site that can support the delivery of necessary infrastructure improvements. Therefore, some greenfield land is needed to support Retford's growth over the plan period and beyond.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South		<p>Ordsall/Retford areas that would be suitable for accommodating future developments without the need to encroach into prized countryside and bring traffic to parts of Ordsall that can't cope with it.</p> <p>There would also be added risk of flooding if these fields are built on, as these fields are already prone to water logging and flooding as they are, let alone if they are covered in tarmac. Where would the run off from the site go to? It would lead to further flooding into the river valley heading east, which is precisely where all the rights of way lead to, so it would render all the walks for local people impassable. To even contemplate building within flood zones in these days of climate change and unpredictable weather patterns is tantamount to recklessness and totally irresponsible.</p> <p>I would suggest that the focus needs to turn to more appropriate locations in Bassetlaw district where such development would have far less of an impact on the local landscape in those areas than that proposed in the south of Ordsall.</p>	<p>Due to its edge of settlement location, the development of Ordsall South will need to be carefully designed so that it doesn't have a negative impact on the surrounding landscape. The Council has produced a Landscape Character Assessment which details the local and important landscape features (such as views, trees, watercourses and topography) and provides recommendations on how to restore, reinforce, create or conserve the areas landscape quality. The design of the scheme will be led by a masterplan. This plan will provide a detail on how the layout and density of the scheme responds to the existing landscape features in the area. The details of a masterplan will need to be agreed by the Council.</p> <p>The Council has produced a detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment for all relevant sites across the District, including Ordsall South. This assessment identifies the type and frequency of flooding and states the necessary type of mitigation required to help reduce the threat of flooding. For Ordsall South, the main risk of flooding currently occurs when surface water runs off the fields into the existing developments in periods of high rainfall events. The Flood Risk Assessment has stated that new (on-site) water storage facilities will help reduce the risk of surface water run-off into the new development and also to the existing development in Ordsall. Onsite urban drainage systems are also required and these will likely form part of the developments Green Infrastructure provision.</p>
REF037	Resident	<p>Retford needs quality employment so young people can buy quality housing, there is no point building houses which first time buyers can't afford in places with no employment.</p> <p>Bassetlaw planning seem to be cramming any spare space with houses.</p> <p>Jenkins—Houses Bridon—Houses Waterfields—Houses Spicers board mill—Houses</p> <p>High density housing with little or no garden and parked cars lining every road is no place for families to live. Where is the quality employment in south Retford.</p> <p>Roads are already too congested getting into Retford, and putting traffic calming measures on Whitehouse Road and in Eaton are not going to ease the problem. Traffic jams cause extra pollution and greenhouse gasses which are things we should all be trying to reduce.</p>	<p>The loss of previous employment land was subject to developers demonstrating that the land is not now needed for those employment uses. The majority of these sites were vacant for a long time and are considered brownfield land within an urban area. In addition, some of the locations for employment here historical and their location for economic use were not compatible to their largely central and residential location in Retford.</p> <p>The Council has conducted a Transport Assessment that assessed both the existing traffic flows in and around Retford, and the impact that any new development would have on these. The assessments for the existing traffic flows were carried out during the peak times of the day and outside of school</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
REF046	Resident	<p>I have heard that the plans to build 800 houses has been increased to 1250. I wish object to this. There has been a great deal of housing development in and around Retford – some large some small - Bridon, Rosedale, Blossom Grove, the old Normans Garden centre Site, Idle Valley, Tiln Road and the ‘just started’ North Road development. These developments have put additional pressure on our already congested roads. The Ordsall South proposal of 1250 houses will not only increase the congestion in Ordsall but will have a knock on effect throughout the Retford area. Also, we all know what happens with there is an accident on the A1 - traffic pours into Retford from every direction in a bid to avoid being stuck in long queues only to arrive in Retford in a queue. The road infrastructure in Ordsall is not good. On street parking on the High Street, All Hallows Road, Ollerton Road, Welbeck Road, Ordsall Road, West Carr Road. On street parking makes it difficult/dangerous to enter/exit junctions. Weight restricted bridges over the River Idle in Ordsall and Eaton, narrow one-way bridge and hump-back bridge over railway lines on West Carr Road. Many cars seem to be in a rush and exceed the speed limits despite speed bumps and relevant signage eg Westhill Road, Ordsall Road, Ollerton Road, West Carr Road. The path on All Hallows Road is very narrow and dangerous for those walking along . Also the path on the High Street ends at Church Road. People then have to cross the road and when reaching the Five Arches bridge cross the road at the busy T junction in order to reach the new footbridge. Perhaps this needs to be looked at.</p> <p>You have indicated that improvements will be made to the High Street, All Hallows Road, various junctions and mini-roundabouts. It is difficult to see how these can be improved. I and many other people would like to see details of the planned improvements and those of the proposed cycle paths. Also it would be good to be consulted on these before the go ahead is taken.</p> <p>I feel Retford has become a ‘commuter town’. We have lost many big employers like Bridon, Jenkins, and two power stations. I believe our biggest employers are Rampton Hospital, Bassettaw Hospital and Ranby Prison. People have to travel to work and therefore need to have a car. Mortages/rents are expensive with both partners needing to work and therefore usually requiring two cars. Young people also need transport to get to their place of employment. Public transport is not always suitable especially for shift workers, can take too long and often is unreliable. You put a lot of emphasis on the use public transport. How can you ensure that it meets the needs of the people, is reliable and operates after 5pm! People do work in the evenings.</p> <p>How can you ensure that the houses to be built have enough parking space? It is no good building 4 bedoomed family homes and only have 2 parking spaces. Young people are having to live at home for much longer and generally need a car to get to work. If parking spaces cannot be provided then the roads should be wide enough to allow parking on the road and still allow other vehicles (including emergency vehicles) to pass through. Surely the Planning Department can insist on this. Developers seem to want to squeeze as many houses on land as possible. Paths should not be used for parking cars on causing problems for people pushing prams and with young children, those with sight and physical disabilities, mobility scooters etc.</p> <p>How will the planning department ensure that there is enough parking for the proposed shop, possible medical hub, care home, School, football fields, country park? Parking at Ordsall Primary School on Ordsall Road and West Hill Road is a nightmare as is parking at the shops on Welbeck Road. Lessons should be learnt from these black spots. The developers for the Bridon Estate showed a play park on their original plans. This never materialised. How will you ensure that the plans for a medical hub (and what does this mean), school, shop, care home actually materialise?</p>	<p>holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified that a number of roads and junctions would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The proposed developments would implement these mitigations schemes where they had a direct adverse impact, and financial contributions will be sought to contribute towards wider improvement schemes where the impact is indirect.</p> <p>The Council has recently conducted a Transport Assessment that assessed both the existing traffic flows in and around Retford, and the potential impact that any new development would have on these. The Transport Assessment collected data for the existing traffic flows during peak times and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. Once the new developments were added to this. the assessment identified that a number of roads and junctions would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic created and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The proposed developments themselves would implement these mitigations schemes where they had a direct adverse impact, and financial contributions will be sought to contribute towards wider improvement schemes where the impact is indirect.</p> <p>An appropriate level of residential and visitor off-road car parking space will be provided in line with the County Council Parking Standards. The ratio for these standards is related to the number of bedrooms per property.</p> <p>Parking provision will be made for shoppers and visitors at the Local Centre and Country Park.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
REF049	Resident	<p>We are local residents to the proposed new housing development and would like to express our serious concern and dismay at the plans for any new development on Ordsall South, particularly to the scale and size of this one.</p> <p>We contest the proposal on the following grounds:</p> <p>1. Traffic is a huge safety concern in Ordsall anyway and the situation is already a serious accident waiting to happen.</p> <p>1.1 The development would impact and make busier the main roads through Ordsall which are already extremely congested at school drop-off times as well as other times during the day.</p> <p>1.2 It is not uncommon to see bus routes blocked and people parked all over especially around the shops and Ordsall primary school. I fear that one day the emergency services may struggle to access where they need to go. It is already dangerous to pedestrians, bikes and motorists - any new housing development which increases traffic to the area will worsen the problem. How long will it take to act, until someone dies?</p> <p>1.3 The small goosemoor bridge and high street is not suitable for the current traffic flow, never mind adding more. The bridge is already an area of immediate danger and since it would provide one of the main access points to the new development this is a concern. There is also a lack of parking on high street causing people to park on the road making it difficult to pass safely especially on a bike. Alternatively people may come through Eaton which is also not a suitable, safe route or fair on residents.</p> <p>1.4 You state that (undisclosed) improvements will be made to roads but this is impossible if you cannot reduce the number of vehicles wishing to travel on the road. It is not about who has right of way, it is sheer number of cars that is the problem - a new development will make this much worse.</p> <p>2. We have seen over many years the severe and inevitable flooding which occurs on the land you are proposing to build on. The land regularly becomes impassable and consequently floods the surrounding fields too. Currently this isn't too much of a problem as the water is able to drain and reduce naturally from there without flooding properties and no doubt saves further flooding down the river. If you build houses on this land it creates a further problem for where the excess flood water will have to go and I believe with some degree of certainty that the houses built close to the river will always be subject to flood risks. It is massively irresponsible to take this land and build housing developments on it.</p> <p>3. It will severely and negatively affect the residents of the Bankside and Riverside estates both from a noise perspective and a traffic and pollution perspective. Plus it is a huge loss of countryside, green areas and peace not to mention the potential de-valuing that may occur to house prices. The number of houses that has been proposed and the work continuing until 2037 is unfair, not justified and excessive - it will cause daily misery for local residents for a very, very long time. I would like you to publish facts about the housing requirements and shortages in the area as I don't believe these exist and if they do, it is likely to be affordable housing that is required.</p> <p>4. The plan states that the development will create 'more space for wildlife' - I'd like to highlight the loss to eco-biodiversity created by the development and how adding any additional areas does not create 'more' space but instead takes a lot away from our area. The green space is enjoyed daily by many walkers and lots of nature, this is one of the reasons we moved here. Please don't ruin another open space with too many houses.</p> <p>I hope that you give this consultation the consideration it deserves, the proposal covers a huge area and completely changes the dynamic of the village for many, many people.</p> <p>We ask that you do not further risk the safety of our village to make developers rich.</p>	<p>The Council has conducted a Transport Assessment that assessed both the existing traffic flows in and around Retford, and the impact that any new development would have on these. The assessments for the existing traffic flows were carried out during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified that a number of roads and junctions would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The proposed developments would implement these mitigations schemes where they had a direct adverse impact, and financial contributions will be sought to contribute towards wider improvement schemes where the impact is indirect.</p> <p>The Council has produced a detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the proposed Ordsall South development, as well as all relevant sites across the District. This assessment identifies the type and frequency of flooding and states the necessary type of mitigation required to help reduce the threat of flooding. For Ordsall South, the highest flooding risk occurs when high rainfall events result in water running off fields in to existing developments. The Flood Risk Assessment has indicated that new on-site water storage facilities will help reduce the risk of surface water run-off into both the new development and existing development in Ordsall. Onsite urban drainage systems are also required and these will likely form part of the development's Green Infrastructure provision.</p> <p>Noise and other issues arising from construction and site traffic can be conditioned through the planning process.</p> <p>All major development are required to provide at least a 10% net gain in biodiversity. The land at Ordsall South is currently utilised for intense agricultural purposes and is therefore not particularly supportive for wildlife habitats. The new development at Ordsall South will deliver a significant level of green infrastructure, such as new trees, green space, and a country park, which will provide space for wildlife enhancement and offer a greater degree of biodiversity</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
REF006	Resident	<p>Overall the plan misses an opportunity to put Bassetlaw at the forefront in responding to the climate emergency. There is an urgent need for radical action. I despair.</p> <p>Recycling - Retford's drive-in waste management facility in Hallcroft is so cramped and inadequate that it can only encourage fly tipping.</p> <p>Zero carbon housing - recent housing developments make no progress in this direction and there is no indication that developers will be forced to build differently. There is no excuse for building inefficient and polluting homes. It is laziness and short-term greed.</p> <p>Cycling - no safe usable network and no effort to provide one</p> <p>Walking - Ordsall needs facilities within 15 minute walking distance of homes. Can you induce a supermarket company to build one in the middle of the housing estates.</p> <p>Allotment gardens - how many new plots are planned per new house built. What is the strategy for encouraging people to grow plants to eat, for wildlife and for the environment.</p> <p>Planting schemes in the public realm - what specific plans are in place for effective and beneficial planting schemes that deliver benefits for wildlife and air quality i.e. who decides what species are planted and ensures that they are. Developers like planting yukkas and cordylines - what is the point or relevance of that?</p> <p>Public transport - no direct link from Retford to Nottingham, disjointed and inadequate bus services with a poor image</p> <p>Water, flooding and run off - requires a more aggressive approach - rainwater capture and re-use, permeable surfaces only, extensive wetlands</p> <p>Sewage processing - is the existing provision adequate? How many instances of discharge of unprocessed sewage from local facilities have there been in the last ten years? How will capacity be increased to meet the demand from new developments?</p> <p>Energy - reduction in demand via radically more efficient housing stock, local micro generation schemes, group heating schemes etc</p> <p>Private transport - 17000 people commute out of Bassetlaw to work. It is reasonable to assume that the majority of residents in proposed new housing will do the same, primarily by car. Whatever tinkering is done to the road network as it is now, congestion will only get worse and commuting's wasteful consumption of resources will increase. If the inevitably of continued reliance on the private car is accepted then housing developments need to make proper provision for parking i.e. roads or cycle lanes should not be seen as car parks.</p> <p>Protecting Eaton village - this is an obvious route out of Ordsall heading south, made more attractive by congestion caused by parked cars on High Street and the inadequacy of the river bridge onto Goosemoor Lane. How will Eaton village be protected from a further influx of through traffic?</p> <p>Lack of inspiration - do we have to create housing developments that are so devastatingly dull, unimaginative and dead?</p> <p>Etc...</p>	<p>The proposed development Ordsall South would provide new and enhanced footpaths and cycle networks into Retford and the surrounding countryside. A new network of footpaths and cycle routes will also be provided on site so that residents can easily access the green spaces and local services. Where new roads and cycle ways are provided, these will be segregated or form part of a shared space for cyclists and pedestrians. Any improvements to existing footpaths or cycle ways are likely to be upgrades to the existing infrastructure such as new surfacing or better lighting</p> <p>There will be space for allotments on site as part of the 24 hectares of greenspace.</p> <p>New development should be located where there is access to new and existing services, facilities and infrastructure. The development of Ordsall South will provide the opportunity to provide new and enhance existing public transport infrastructure. This will include the provision of enhanced bus services to and from the site to Retford Town Centre.</p> <p>The Council has produced a detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the proposed Ordsall South development, as well as all relevant sites across the District. This assessment identifies the type and frequency of flooding and states the necessary type of mitigation required to help reduce the threat of flooding. For Ordsall South, the highest flooding risk occurs when high rainfall events result in water running off fields in to existing developments. The Flood Risk Assessment has indicated that new on-site water storage facilities will help reduce the risk of surface water run-off into both the new development and existing development in Ordsall. Onsite urban drainage systems are also required and these will likely form part of the development's Green Infrastructure provision.</p> <p>The Council has also produced a Transport Assessment which assessed both the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford and the impact that the proposed new development would have on these. The existing traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The Transport Assessment identifies that Eaton will likely see a small rise in traffic volume as a result of the proposed development at Ordsall South, but that this impact can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures. The Transport Assessment details the type of measures proposed for Eaton and other areas of concern. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.
1858108	Resident	<p>I strongly object to the continuing inclusion of Site HS13 – Ordsall South in the Bassetlaw District Council (BDC) Draft Local Plan (Policy 29) I refer you to my comments submitted in January 2021 (REF178) when the proposal was for 800 houses. My objections from that earlier submission still stand. In addition, I add the following;</p> <p>Size and Scope of Development: The addition of a further 450 houses (an increase of 50%+) in the subsequent Plan Period takes the total allocation for Ordsall to 1,250 houses. I understand from BDC that there are currently 2,416 residential properties in East Retford South (aka Ordsall). An additional 1,250 houses effectively increases the size of Ordsall by over 50% This represents a huge expansion, both in terms of land surface development, but equally in the local population. The infrastructure and essential services required for the existing and future residents will be put under immense strain and I have no confidence that the mitigation measures outlined in revised Policy 29 are adequate to meet the needs of the expanded community of Ordsall. The revised Policy speaks of ‘at least 800’ by 2037, with the additional 450 coming later. This is unacceptably vague, and could result in houses in excess of the 800 limited suggested as being the upper limit in the earlier Plan Period being exceeded. BDC need to firm up the timeline to avoid excessive development in the earlier Plan Period.</p> <p>Type: (Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan – Focused consultation June 2021 p.14/15) 7.14.5/6 More clarity is needed as to the exact numbers of houses to be built within the specified demographics.</p> <p>Density: It is disappointing to see the density across the site increased to 15-30 unites per ha. Careful consideration ought to be given to not repeating the errors of the recent past which see Ordsall residents opening their front doors onto the bonnets of their neighbours cars.</p> <p>Employment: “The site will have good access to a range of employment and other local services within the wider planned development and Retford itself.” (Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan –Focused consultation June 2021 p.14) No it does not. Nor does it provide satisfactorily functioning transport links to employment beyond the immediate vicinity, either onwards into Retford or beyond. There is a mismatch between the housing allocation for Retford / Ordsall and the employment allocation locally. Further, the employment allocation across the District is overly ambitious and unrealistic in its likelihood of delivering the anticipated numbers of jobs. If a more realistic approach were taken towards the employment allocation then it is likely that the housing allocation could, and arguably should, be</p>	<p>The delivery of the site will be subject to a masterplan and a phasing plan due to its scale. The density of the site will vary depending on particular areas. A higher density will be focused around the shops and services, whilst a lower density will be located around the edge of the development and around the country park.</p> <p>Access to employment across the District is generally undertaken by car. This largely due to the type of employment locally being close to the A1 and the rural nature of the District. The Site will need to provide a new bus serve to and from Retford Town Centre. Other services to the wider area may also be enhanced due to the volume of new residents.</p> <p>The Site will provide a significant level of community infrastructure such as a new primary school, a health centre, parks and green spaces and local shops and bus services. Their delivery will be phased alongside the development. New footpaths to connect the site to Ordsall will be provided so that people can also access the existing services within Ordsall Village.</p> <p>Due to the uplift in development, the Council has undertaken a revised Transport Assessment for Retford which details the local road and transport issues and identifies where new or enhanced road and transport infrastructure is required. Development is only required to mitigate against its impacts and will not necessarily fix existing problems.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South		<p>reduced accordingly.</p> <p>Social and Community facilities: BDC Sustainability Appraisal June 2021 states:</p> <p>"The allocation of this site may help to maintain and enhance existing community facilities and services as the site is within 800m of a post office, and the Local Centre of Welbeck Road, which could be used by new residents subject to capacity. The site is also partly within 2km of a primary and secondary school, and Retford Town Centre. In addition, development will be required to contribute towards healthcare provision and public realm improvements in Retford Town Centre." It is immensely disappointing to see that the earlier proposal for public realm improvements to the Local Centre of Welbeck Rd, despite being acknowledged above as likely to be used by new residents (highlighted green), have been removed. Frustratingly, the contributions towards public realm improvements in Retford Town centre remain (highlighted Yellow). BDC ought to seek to ensure that the existing residents and users of the Welbeck Road Local Centre benefit from an appropriate uplift derived from the massive expansion of Ordsall South. The lag between the phased occupation of the proposed development and the establishment of its own Local centre will inevitably see an increase in the use of the Welbeck Road Local Centre. Parking in the immediate area is already inadequate and additional users from the Ordsall South development will likely add to this.</p> <p>The requirement to build a convenience store and other shops in the new Local Centre need to be conditioned as being required at an early stage of the development if the impact on the existing Local Centre is to be mitigated. The allocation of Land for Allotments is welcome but clarification is needed as to the long-term management and ownership of this facility. I note that 'space' for a Health Hub, 'land' for a two form primary School, and 'space' for a recycling 'bring' bank is included. These policy requirements are weakly worded and more robust conditions will be required to ensure delivery of the implied facilities. A clear time frame will be needed as at what the trigger point will be to initiate the delivery of the Primary School. The educational needs of the children moving into Ordsall South will need to be addressed as a matter of urgency.</p> <p>Transport:</p> <p>Junction Improvements – Despite the misnaming of Whitehouses Rd as 'Goosemoor Lane' at the mini roundabout junction with London Rd at Whitehouses (Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan consultation June 2021 p18) the recognition that other routes aside from the A620 will be required to accommodate additional vehicle traffic is a positive improvement from the November 2020 proposals. However, the proposals are inadequate in both scope and detail.</p> <p>Village Traffic Management Schemes – More detail of what exactly is envisioned by 'traffic management schemes' for both Ordsall and Eaton villages is required.</p> <p>In regards to Ordsall, a comprehensive scheme to compete the inadequate footpath network will be required. In particular, both High Street and All Hallows Street fail to offer pedestrians a continuous, passable route along either side of the carriageway.</p> <p>I would suggest that through traffic travelling via Eaton Village be actively discouraged. An 'village access only' scheme will be needed to prevent traffic travelling into Ordsall South from the A638 (London Rd) from taking the short cut through Eaton village to join Ollerton Rd north of Jockey Lane.</p> <p>The effect of deterring motorists from using Old Ordsall and Eaton Villages will inevitable result in increased traffic along Ollerton/WestHill/Ordsall Rds to and from the A620. It is imperative that measures be put in place to mitigate the negative impact this will have on the health, wellbeing and safety of the residents of these roads.</p> <p>Public Transport - a 'frequent' bus service is included in the Plan. This ought to include a requirement to cover both early mornings and late evenings to ensure an adequate coverage of provision that enables users to use Public Transport outside of the principle service times.</p> <p>Cycle routes – Although a worthy and laudable ambition, the retrospective imposition of cycle routes onto already congested and narrow roads which are heavily relied upon by residents for parking is an inadequate measure. In</p>	<p>A network of new paths and cycle ways will be provided on site and connections to existing paths will also be made to help improve connectivity within the wider area.</p> <p>New and enhanced public transport provision will be required via the new local centre. The bus providers will identify which services can be enhanced or whether new services will need to be provided.</p> <p>The Council's Transport assessment hasn't identified issues with traffic flow on Jockey Lane and NCC have not raised any concerns related to this particular area.</p> <p>New flood prevention and drainage infrastructure will be provided on site via increased onsite water storage and via a substantial SUDS scheme</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South		<p>addition, the Policy suggests a route from Brecks Rd to Ordsall Primary School but nothing onwards towards Retford Railway Station or Retford Leisure Centre. The incomplete nature of the proposed scheme will result in an ineffective network that fails to interconnect people with the locations they wish to access.</p> <p>Access routes to the A1 – The route to and from the A1 via Jockey Lane and Brickyard Lane is inadequate and needs upgrading. This route needs to be identified as the primary route for access/egress to the site and its status as such ought to be made a Condition of any Planning Permission.</p> <p>Flooding: The recognition that the site currently functions as a natural sponge and is therefore an critical element in retaining rain water away from the drainage system protecting properties down stream in Retford is welcomed. The designation of areas of the watershed as waterlands is also welcome.</p>	
1858211	Resident	<p>I am writing register my objections to the proposed development. Firstly, I have concerns about the consultation process. The foreword of BDC's Statement of Community Involvement (2020) states that 'One of the Council's priorities is to ensure that everyone in Bassetlaw feels more involved in their local community, and in the decisions that affect their neighbourhoods'. The document also states that 'after consultation has closed, officers will assess all of the representations received and make any necessary/appropriate changes to the draft plan'. Despite, the objections raised to the proposed development of 800 houses (Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan, Nov 2020) BDC has increased the proposed number of houses, by more than 50%, to 1250. This appears to be inconsistent with the community involvement priorities. Having looked at the draft plan I believe that the following have been underestimated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site's current contribution to recreation for residents as an open space • The site's current landscape value • The site's current value in relation to biodiversity • The site's contribution to green infrastructure • Sewerage and drainage issues • Highways safety issues beyond the site, but within Ordsall and neighbouring areas <p>OPEN SPACE The site provides a countryside setting, with access opportunities for local residents. The part of the site to the east of Ollerton Road is bordered and intersected by approximately 1 km of public footpaths which currently have panoramic views of the open countryside to either or both sides. The footpaths are extremely well used and appreciated by large numbers of residents and visitors for taking walks for recreation, health, and well-being. These form part of a wider network of longer walks between Ordsall and Eaton. Parts of the walks which fall within the sites are accessible and easy to negotiate by all, including those with limited health and mobility; these walks also feel safe. More consideration should be given to: a) how the existing footpaths would be protected; and b) the loss of amenity that would be caused if footpaths were not protected.</p> <p>LANDSCAPE VALUE I believe that the landscape value and sensitivity of the site has been underestimated. The proposed development undermines the landscape and natural environment, which is highly valued and appreciated by existing residents.</p> <p>BIODIVERSITY The site has not been appropriately surveyed in relation to important species and habitats. It has fallen within a proposed European Special Protection Area which is home to breeding populations of nightjars, woodlarks and honey buzzards. This should be carefully considered, especially as the British Trust for Ornithology has recorded buzzards on or very near the area of the site to the east of Ollerton Rd. I and/or other members of the community have seen the following species on and around this part of the site: Barn owls; tawny owls*; skylarks; corncrakes</p>	<p>During the past year, the Council has made every effort to engage with the community during these difficult times. Although we couldn't hold public events in person, the Council has held online events, leafleted the area and had a dedicated phone line to the team for people to ask questions. We have also held recent focused consultations for Ordsall South where the community could input to the changes proposed to the policy.</p> <p>All existing footpaths will be retained. However, it maybe that some are moved or redirected depending on the layout of the scheme.</p> <p>Due to its edge of settlement location, the development at Ordsall South will need to be carefully designed so that it doesn't have a negative impact on the surrounding landscape. The Council has produced a Landscape Character Assessment which details the local and important landscape features (such as views, trees, watercourses and topography) and provides recommendations on how to restore, reinforce, create or conserve the areas landscape quality. The design of the scheme will be led by a masterplan. This plan will provide a detail on how the layout and density of the scheme responds to the existing landscape features in the area. The details of a masterplan will need to be agreed by the Council.</p> <p>All major development must provide, at least, a 10% net gain in biodiversity. The existing land at Ordsall South is currently utilised for intense agricultural purposes and therefore less supportive for wildlife habitats. The new development is proposed to deliver a significant level of green infrastructure, such as new trees, green space and a country park, which will</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South		<p>(occasional visitors); house martins; buzzards*; kestrels; hawks; bees; damsel flies; dragonflies; grasshoppers; butterflies and moths (many varieties); deer; foxes; hedgehogs; (large) bats; newts*; toads; and frogs (NB * denotes sightings reported by others). I have seen species, other than those listed above, very close to site (e.g. herons and kingfishers at the river, approximately 300 metres from site H5). In addition, I have seen what may be water voles' burrows in the banks of the dyke/spring which is within the part of the site to the south of Ollerton Rd. The above species were all listed in the Local Biodiversity Action Plan for Nottinghamshire, prepared by Action for Wildlife in Nottinghamshire/ Nottinghamshire County Council. I believe bats and water voles are protected by additional legislation. An ecological survey for the above species, and for associated species which might reasonably be expected to cohabit with these, undertaken prior to allocation for development, may identify constraints which are significant enough to prevent development. I believe such a survey should include important areas adjacent to the sites, in particular, Marsh Lane (E. Retford FP 64) to the south, which may be impacted by 'edge effects' of any development. (NB Marsh Lane is a track bordered on two sides by large, ancient hedgerows in good condition and containing standard trees).</p> <p>GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE I consider that the site's importance in relation to Green Infrastructure has been underestimated: a) in terms of its existing features, which require protection; and b) potentially, in terms of design consideration, should allocation go ahead. Footpaths, hedgerows and water courses form an important part of a Green Infrastructure; the site contains these features (NB The species-rich natural spring/dyke within the part of the site to the east of Ollerton Rd is particularly noteworthy). It is important to note that part of the site is very close to the major green network corridor along the River Idle. Greater consideration of the above issues, in conjunction with the issues identified in the preceding sections (Landscape and Biodiversity), could show that the proposed development is likely to detract from or result in significant loss of Green Infrastructure.</p> <p>SEWERAGE AND DRAINAGE I have concerns regarding the current sewerage system's ability to cope with the additional foul water which would be generated from development. I understand that prior to development, Severn Trent would be consulted to determine whether development would result in additional necessary upgrading of the existing sewerage system. I also understand that there have previously been problems with build up of sewerage at the Goosemoor pumping station. A water cycle study commissioned by BDC in 2010 states: "There are known internal and external flooding problems downstream of South Retford...Where possible, it is recommended that housing and employment growth should be located at the downstream end of the wastewater network serving the town of village, thereby minimising the need to upgrade the existing network upstream and allowing connections to the larger pipes discharging to the Wastewater Treatment Works." It may prove impracticable to upgrade existing sewerage infrastructure sufficiently to accommodate development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SUDS I have additional concerns regarding drainage/water run-off from the sites. There are sink holes and natural springs on the sites. The fields become waterlogged after heavy rain. <p>HIGHWAYS SAFETY ISSUES BEYOND THE SITES Ordsall (East Retford South) has already seen significant housing growth in recent years. Little, if any, corresponding infrastructure development or traffic calming measures have taken place to accommodate the resulting increase in traffic. The road (and pavement) infrastructure in and around Ordsall was not designed to cope safely and efficiently with the current volume of traffic, let alone with the increase which would inevitably occur with the building of 1250 more houses. Ordsall residents have very strong concerns about the potential increase in road safety issues, especially for mobility scooter users and cyclists, and for pedestrians in areas where pavements are narrow or</p>	<p>provide space for wildlife enhancement and greater biodiversity than currently present.</p> <p>New and enhanced sewage and drainage infrastructure will be put in place as part of the development. Wider flood and surface water prevention measures will also form part of the design of the development. A drainage strategy is required as part of the development of the site.</p> <p>The Council has produced a Transport Assessment which assessed both the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford and the impact that the proposed new development would have on these. The existing traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The Transport Assessment identifies that Eaton will likely see a small rise in traffic volume as a result of the proposed development at Ordsall South, but that this impact can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures. The Transport Assessment details the type of measures proposed for Eaton and other areas of concern. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South		<p>nonexistent. The Council's highways engineers should give greater consideration to these areas, which are beyond the proposed sites, but which may be impacted by their development. The areas of particular concern include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goosemoor Lane Bridge <p>Even though the bridge has been altered, it is inadequate for today's traffic. The carriageway is too narrow for vehicles to pass safely, with restricted views of oncoming vehicles when approaching from All Hallows Street and Goosemoor Lane.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High St <p>As residents park on High St, it is effectively a single-lane road along much of its length. This leads to difficult driving conditions in both directions, and the road seems to be unsuitable for increased volumes of traffic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wellbeck Rd Shops <p>This area is frequently congested, with vehicles parked on pavements on Welbeck Rd, Ollerton Rd, and Wharncliffe Rd. Additional safety issues are created by this area being a bus route and also an HGV route to the West Carr Rd industrial estate. Vehicles reversing onto Ollerton Rd can also be a hazard. Further housing development in Ordsall would lead to increased vehicle activity in this already congested area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Westhill Rd <p>At the beginning and end of the school day, the main road in and out of Ordsall (West Hill Rd) is reduced to single-line traffic due to parked cars. This is a difficult road to negotiate at these times, and the problems would be likely to become more acute if traffic volumes increased.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West Carr Rd <p>The main concerns on this road are the railway bridges, one of which has a blind summit with narrow pavements. Quite high volumes of traffic use this road, including commercial vehicles using the industrial estate. This route is used by pedestrians (school children) in the mornings and afternoons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eaton <p>The development would lead to a significant increase of the road through Eaton Village. The bridge, in particular, would be inadequate for the traffic volume</p>	
1858219	Resident	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed housing allocation HS13.</p> <p>I believe that the following have been underestimated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The sites' current contribution to recreation for residents as an open space · The sites' current landscape value · The sites' sensitivity to biodiversity · The sites' contribution to Green Infrastructure · The sites' agricultural value · Sewerage and drainage issues · Highways safety issues · Process <p>OPEN SPACE:</p> <p>Open space adjacent to Lansdown Drive and Glen Eagles Way fit the definition of 'open space' and should therefore be protected. The sites are bordered and intersected by over 1 kilometre of public footpaths which currently have panoramic views of the open countryside to either or both sides. The footpaths are extremely well used and appreciated by large numbers of residents and visitors for taking walks for recreation, health, and wellbeing. These form part of a wider network of longer walks between Ordsall and surrounding areas. Parts of the walks which fall within the sites are accessible and easy to negotiate by all, including those with limited health and mobility; these walks also feel safe.</p> <p>Rights of way and other footpaths. Further detail is required regarding: a) how the existing footpaths would be protected; or b) the loss of amenity that would be caused if footpaths were not protected. On the Nottinghamshire County Council definitive map, showing public rights of way, the footpath called "East Retford FP 2" crosses the sites in a south easterly direction from High St, via Southgate, towards Marsh Lane ("East Retford FP 64"). This right of</p>	<p>Due to its location, the development at Ordsall South will need to be carefully designed so that it doesn't have a negative impact on the surrounding landscape. The Council has produced a Landscape Character Assessment which details the local and important landscape features (such as views, trees, watercourses and topography) and provides recommendations on how to restore, reinforce, create or conserve the areas landscape quality. All existing footpaths will be retained. However, it maybe that some are moved or redirected depending on the layout of the scheme.</p> <p>The site has been assessed for its biodiversity importance through the Council's Sustainability Appraisal and the Habitat Regulations Assessment.</p> <p>When looking for land to allocate for development, the Council prioritises the use of brownfield and has allocated a number of brownfield sites across the District. However, there is not enough brownfield land to accommodate the proposed level of growth and therefore some greenfield land is needed.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South		<p>way is well established and cannot be rerouted without greatly reducing the public amenity it provides in its current form. Also, the public right of way known as "East Retford FP 3" runs due south from High St before turning southwest. This footpath currently avoids traffic for its entire length, but would be bisected by roads which pedestrians would have to cross if the development is permitted. This would have a detrimental impact on the public amenity it currently provides.</p> <p>LANDSCAPE VALUE: The Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment states that "The land is in a less sensitive Landscape Character Area than other potential sites around Retford as identified in the Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment". This statement seems to ignore the inherent qualities of sites HS13. However, 'less' is a relative term, and the statement therefore suggests that the sites are in a sensitive landscape.</p> <p>LANDSCAPE SENSITIVITY: It would appear that the importance of site HS13 has not been fully appreciated with regard to wildlife. HS13 fell within the proposed European Special Protection Area (SPA). This proposed SPA is home to breeding populations of nightjars, woodlarks and honey buzzards. This should be considered, especially as the British Trust for Ornithology recorded buzzards on or very near site HS13 I and/or other members of the community have seen the following species on and around sites HS13 on many occasions: Barn owls; tawny owls*; skylarks; corncrakes (occasional visitors); house martins; buzzards*; kestrels; hawks; bees; damsel flies; dragonflies; grasshoppers; butterflies and moths (many varieties); deer; foxes; hedgehogs; (large) bats; newts*; toads; and frogs (NB * denotes sightings reported by others). I have seen species, other than those listed above, very close to site HS13 (e.g. herons and kingfishers at the river, approximately 300 metres from Lansdown Drive). In addition, I have seen what may be water voles' burrows in the banks of the dyke/spring which runs along the boundaries of HS13. The above species have all been listed in the Local Biodiversity Action Plan for Nottinghamshire, (List of Species of Conservation Concern in Nottinghamshire), prepared by Action for Wildlife in Nottinghamshire/ Nottinghamshire County Council. I believe bats and water voles are protected by additional legislation. An ecological survey for the above species, and for associated species which might reasonably be expected to cohabit with these, undertaken prior to allocation for development, may identify constraints which are significant enough to prevent development. Such a survey should include important areas adjacent to the sites, in particular, Marsh Lane to the south, which may be impacted by 'edge effects' of any development. (NB Marsh Lane is a track bordered on two sides by large, ancient hedgerows in good condition and containing standard trees). A Section 106 Agreement could enable adoption of the buffer strips and walkways as habitats in public ownership to be managed and improved for wildlife with hedgerow maintenance and restoration etc. There would be potential opportunity for partnership involvement with members of the local community and wildlife and countryside organisations. Footpaths, hedgerows and water courses form an important part of a Green Infrastructure. The previous Landscape Character Assessment, and my own observations, confirm that HS13 contains these features (NB The species-rich natural spring/dyke along the boundary adjacent to the side of Lansdown Drive is particularly noteworthy). NB "Green infrastructure provision occurring near to existing nodes or corridors should consider how they connect to district-wide network and/or the possibility of enhancing these instead of making on-site provision." This is particularly relevant to HS13 as it is very close (approximately 300 metres) to the major green network corridor along the River Idle. Development is likely to detract from or result in significant loss of Green Infrastructure. NB Stating that there will be "a net gain in biodiversity of 10%" does not take in to account the destruction of the breeding and feeding grounds and the mixed flora and fauna as mentioned above.</p> <p>AGRICULTURAL VALUE: Bassetlaw Site Allocations Issues and Options Consultation Paper (November 2011) states: "PPS7 recommends that the development of the best and most versatile agricultural land (i.e. grades 1, 2 and 3a) should be avoided but where development of agricultural land is unavoidable it should be focused on grades 3b, 4 and 5, which are seen as</p>	<p>Any impacts on sewage and drainage will be mitigated as part of the development. The Council is continuing to work with the water providers to make sure the necessary infrastructure is provided to accommodate the development.</p> <p>The Council has produced a Transport Assessment which assessed both the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford and the impact that the proposed new development would have on these. The existing traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The Transport Assessment identifies that Eaton will likely see a small rise in traffic volume as a result of the proposed development at Ordsall South, but that this impact can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures. The Transport Assessment details the type of measures proposed for Eaton and other areas of concern. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p> <p>The Local Plan has gone through various stages of public consultation since 2016. More recent consultations related to Ordsall has largely been during COVID-19 so there was limited means of attending local public events. The Council undertook various methods to engage locally, including leaflets, posters and Teams Meeting. Several of these were held and there was plenty of opportunity for people to attend. Not all were fully booked and if there were the demand then additional ones could have been provided. Other material was available on the website and there was a phone number for people to ring if they wanted more information or items posted to them during the consultation process.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South		<p>being of poorer quality. The information is not available to differentiate between grades 3a and 3b in Bassetlaw. Consequently, this assessment will consider all grade 3 sites as being of the same quality unless evidence to make this distinction is provided. Sites will be assessed against the following impacts: No impact on agricultural land - Green Impact on grade 3, 4 or 5 agricultural land - Amber Impact on grade 1 or 2 agricultural land – Red" (Policy 2.32) The above policy effectively downgrades any Grade 3a land to Grade 3b, thus downgrading 3a from 'Red' to 'Amber'. However, a study was subsequently commissioned, by BDC, from LDC Agricultural: Land Classification at Retford Site B, October 2013. This study deemed sites parts of HS13 to be predominantly Grade 2 and 3a (Grade 2:1.7ha (11%), Grade 3a: 12.5ha (85%), and 3b: 0.6ha (4%). Has BDC commissioned an ecological survey as well as a soil survey? However, I am pleased that 96% fall within the highest protection bracket suggested by national policy (PPS7). Despite PPS7 recommending that grades 1, 2, and 3a are afforded equal status, BDC now makes a policy distinction between Grades 2 and 3a, protecting Grade 2 sites elsewhere and allocating (predominantly) Grade 3a sites, sections of HS13, for development. I do not agree with this distinction between 2 and 3a, as it deviates from PPS7. In addition, the sites are eleven percent Grade 2 and warrant protection, even applying BDC's less stringent criterion. It is important to note that the Grade 2 area all falls within the Lansdown side of HS13. The proportion of this site which is Grade 2 is therefore far greater than eleven percent. The sites' development, through 'logical extension' could lead to further loss of agricultural land in the future, has consultation with Natural England, under Schedule 5 of the Development Management Procedure Order, been carried out?</p> <p>SEWERAGE AND DRAINAGE: There are concerns regarding the current sewerage system's ability to cope with the additional foul water which would be generated from the development. I understand from Severn Trent that there have previously been problems with build up of sewerage at the Goosemoor pumping station. A water cycle study commissioned by BDC in 2010 states: "There are known internal and external flooding problems downstream of South Retford...Where possible, it is recommended that housing and employment growth should be located at the downstream end of the wastewater network serving the town or village, thereby minimising the need to upgrade the existing network upstream and allowing connections to the larger pipes discharging to the Wastewater Treatment Works." It may prove impracticable to upgrade existing sewerage infrastructure sufficiently to accommodate development of HS13. SUDS have additional concerns regarding drainage/water run-off from the sites. There are sink holes and natural springs on the sites. The fields become waterlogged after heavy rain, and tractors get stuck. I have noted that document Site Allocations Selection Process For the Preferred Options Site Allocations Consultation Document February 2014 Bassetlaw District Council states that a SUDS scheme will be required of any development as 'greenfield run off rates must be maintained'</p> <p>HIGHWAYS SAFETY ISSUES: Ordsall (East Retford South) has already seen significant housing growth in recent years. Little, if any, corresponding infrastructure development or traffic calming measures have taken place to accommodate the resulting increase in traffic. The road (and pavement) infrastructure in and around Ordsall was not designed to cope safely and efficiently with the current volume of traffic, let alone with the increase which would inevitably occur with the building of 1250 more houses. Ordsall residents have very strong concerns about the potential increase in road safety issues, especially for mobility scooter users and cyclists, and for pedestrians in areas where pavements are narrow or non-existent. I would like the Council's highways engineers to consider these areas, which are beyond the proposed sites, but which may be impacted by their development. The areas of particular concern include; Goosemoor Lane Bridge: Whilst some changes have been made, it is still inadequate for today's traffic and is a precarious crossing for pedestrians, mobility scooter & wheelchair users & people with mobility issues or with pushchairs. The carriageway is still too narrow for vehicles to pass safely, with restricted views of oncoming vehicles when approaching from All Hallows Street and Goosemoor Lane. High Street: As residents park on High St, it is effectively a single-lane road along much of its length. This leads to difficult driving conditions in both directions, and the road seems to be unsuitable for increased</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South		<p>traffic volume. .</p> <p>Eaton: Eaton village experiences, at times, high levels of traffic as it is the most convenient route from Ordsall to London Road/A1. An increase of 1250 houses would see a massive increase in vehicles using roads such as the one through Eaton. This is not sustainable.</p> <p>PROCESS</p> <p>Having consulted with many Ordsall residents, the feedback was that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • having responded previously, they did not realise that they had to respond again- particularly as they may well be repeating themselves • being in the older age group, they were not comfortable using the internet for such complex issues • having tried several times to attend The Zoom meetings , they had simply given up trying. The reason for being unable to attend was that numbers were capped at approximately 12 residents. Considering that Zoom can host a minimum of 100 people, the cap appears to have excluded many residents • the number of papers, policies and plans which are expected to be cross referenced in relation to Local Plan Policy 29:Site HS13: Ordsall South, Retford is overwhelming eg ST6, ST11, ST14,ST15, ST54, ST56, ST58, ST60, Bassetlaw Local Plan November 2020, Retford-Eaton Green Gap: Policy ST40, Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan Evidence Base, to name but a few • the use of jargon, and unclear language, disempowers residents from understanding what is meant eg open book viability assessment, housing delivery is not expected to start on the wider site until at least 2027, green buffer, multifunctional green/blue infrastructure network, dual roundabout access to the wider site etc • whilst it is acknowledged that there have been some restrictions as a result of the Coronavirus epidemic, the lack of specific detail ie exact location of the planned roundabout, exact locations of the houses, expected start and finish dates of specific building works in specific areas of HS13 etc is not a result of the epidemic • the animation provided by an external organisation is both useless and patronising eg most people do not need a photograph labelled "a tree lined road". The images are not necessarily what will be created on HS13, therefore they are misleading. The fact that the council distances itself from the animation also indicates that it is of no real value. <p>BDC STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT:</p> <p>Foreword</p> <p>One of the Council's priorities is to ensure that everyone in Bassetlaw feels more involved in their local community, and in the decisions that affect their neighbourhoods, particularly by making sure that residents and businesses have a greater role in the policies and actions taken by the Council itself.</p> <p>Planning policies, neighbourhood plans and the decisions on individual planning applications, play a vital role in shaping the District and ensuring all residents enjoy a good and improving quality of life. Not only is it right that all those affected should have a say, but the comments and information the Council gets back can often help improve the outcome.</p> <p>1.2 The specific benefits of involving a wide range of people and organisations in the planning process include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More focus on priorities identified by the community; • Influencing the provision of local services; • An enhanced sense of the community contributing to the wider community; • Capturing local knowledge in order to achieve the right development in the right place; • Increased understanding of planning procedures and how policy is developed; and • Increased efficiency, helping resolve conflicts earlier in the process. 	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>FOLLOWING THE FIRST CONSULTATION, THE COUNCIL IGNORED THE MANY OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED BUILDING OF 800 HOUSES, AND INCREASED THE NUMBER OF HOUSES FROM 800 TO 1250 (AN INCREASE OF OVER 50%).</p> <p>I refer you to the STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT above!</p> <p>NB The Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan Focussed Consultation June 2021- Comment Form is not user friendly. It does not keep the formatting, and is hard to edit. Once again disempowering the user.</p>	
REF053	Nottinghamshire County Council- Planning Policy Team	<p>COMMENTS RELATE TO THE ORDSALL SOUTH PRELIMINARY CONCEPT PLAN</p> <p>Thank you for your email dated 9th June 2021 requesting strategic planning observations on the preliminary Ordsall South Concept Plan, which is one of three documents published as part of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan. I have consulted with the relevant colleagues who have the below comments to make on this document.</p> <p>Education</p> <p>As indicated within the Bassetlaw Local Plan Focussed Consultation document response, the development of 1250 dwellings on this site, as referred to under Policy 29 Site HS13, would generate sufficient primary pupil demand for this development to sustain a one form entry (210 place) primary school, based on pupil yield formula. Any new primary school should be accompanied with relevant nursery provision; for a one form entry primary school this would be a 26-place nursery. The County Council would require the developer to be responsible for funding this provision in its entirety; the estimated cost based on current DfE information is £4,936,648 (236 places x £20,918 per place). The delivery of a school on this site would be subject to the relevant DfE approval process at the appropriate time.</p> <p>Minerals and Waste</p> <p>The County Council does not have any comments to make on the proposed concept plan for the proposed allocated site at Ordsall South in relation to minerals and waste.</p> <p>As highlighted in the NCC policy response to the draft Bassetlaw Local Plan (published November 2020), this proposed allocation site (Policy 29: HS13) the Southern area of this proposed allocation falls within the MSA/MCA for brick clay. As per Policy SP7, any applications will need to demonstrate the need for non-mineral development and where this is shown, the applicant should consider the feasibility of prior extraction and so prevent the unnecessary sterilisation of the mineral resource.</p> <p>Strategic Highways</p> <p>As highlighted in the response to the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan Focussed Consultation document, Roundabouts are proposed to serve the site. The Highway Authority has had sight of the draft Retford Transport Assessment 2021 (RTA) being prepared in support of the allocation of sites in Retford, albeit for 800 dwellings on this site rather than the 1250 now included in the consultation. Comments have been provided with respect the content of the RTA separately. The RTA confirms that the roundabouts will have a 40m ICD. On balance that would be a reasonable choice of junction arrangement. However, there is no junction capacity assessment to demonstrate that the junctions would operate within capacity. Furthermore, the land available for the southern of the two roundabouts has necessitated the sharpening of the bend to the south of the boundary of the site and a tortuous northern junction exit as the roundabout is offset westwards from the Ollerton Road centreline due to land not being available on the east side. It must be demonstrated that this layout could be achieved in accordance with geometric standards. The acceptability of the proposed roundabouts is therefore not certain.</p> <p>The western parcel of land benefits from a junction with both proposed roundabouts. This could provide a convenient bus route through the site. However, the eastern parcel would only have one junction with Ollerton Road. Bus operators are generally reluctant to enter cul-de-sacs as this often necessitates a need to track back. Therefore, to facilitate a bus serving, the internal layout must be designed as a loop that picks up as much of the site as possible and which minimises the need to cover the same streets twice when returning to the wider road network. This should be reflected on the Ordsall Concept Plan Vision.</p> <p>The Highway Authority would expect an outline planning application to be supported by a Transport Assessment (TA). This must identify each junction that would experience capacity issues and propose a suitable scheme of mitigation. The agreed mitigation measures should then be secured by planning condition rather than financial</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Your recommendations for the Policy and the site have been included within our revised Local Plan where necessary.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>contribution. Whilst the RTA goes some way to demonstrate which junctions may have capacity issues following the development of 800 dwellings, this does not demonstrate how these capacity issues could be addressed. There therefore remains uncertainty as to whether the wider highway network could be suitably improved to address capacity issues should this site come forward, particularly as there could be another 450 dwellings above those currently included in the RTA.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, Eaton is unlikely to be subjected to such an increase in traffic that would then raise highway network capacity concerns. However, the route through the village is not considered appropriate for a material increase in traffic. Main Road is a single carriageway with limited footway provision and limited street lighting. Main Road is also narrow in places with reduced visibility. Furthermore, the existing bridge over the River Idle is only wide enough for one-way vehicular traffic. It therefore may be appropriate to seek a financial contribution in this instance towards measures to deter traffic from using Main Road as a through route and to discourage vehicle speed. It is likely that the introduction of any measures would be best done following engagement with the local community.</p> <p>Transport and Travel Services</p> <p>The development should be designed to facilitate bus access. The Preliminary Concept Plan includes a primary bus served road, a secondary road, the nearest bus stop, and includes the location of a potential bus stop and 400 metre access radii.</p> <p>Transport & Travel Services require new bus stop infrastructure to be installed on the bus served spine roads of the development through Section 38 and Section 278 agreements where appropriate.</p> <p>This includes the below standards at all bus stops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Real time bus stop pole & displays including associated electrical connections • Polycarbonate bus shelter • Solar lighting • Raised boarding kerbs • Enforceable bus stop clearway • Additional hard stand (if required) <p>Transport & Travel Services request that the proposed new bus stop locations and accessibility isochrones meeting Nottinghamshire Design Guidelines (part 3.1) are marked on all relevant plans going forward. The provision of detailed bus stop locations will mean that this information is in the public domain for comment from adjacent properties / prospective buyers, and therefore avoiding objections from residents about the location for new bus stop infrastructure.</p> <p>Until the spine loop road is completed, temporary bus turning facilities should be provided to support bus access to each phase of development. Transport & Travel Services request that any bus service and bus stop infrastructure are introduced throughout the build-out phases of the development to allow residents and employees to access public transport as early as possible, to help increase sustainability and reduce the use of the private car.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage			
REF015	Severn Trent	<p>Severn Trent are supportive of the importance placed on Flood risk and Drainage, we would however also recommend that this section references the Drainage Hierarchy, the utilisation of this hierarchy ensures that surface water is discharged to the most sustainable outfall, mitigating the impacts of surface water on the sewerage network which has a limited capacity. This approach is also more adaptable to the impacts of climate change reducing the risk of flooding in the future.</p> <p>It is however noted that policy ST54 part c bullet point 5 identifies the need to prevent surface water discharging into the sewer, we are supportive of this approach being outlined within Policy 54 we are also supportive of point 6 regarding the use of SuDS and that SuDS should be design to do more than just store water, we are also supportive of point 7 highlighting the need to utilise sustainable outfalls.</p>	Thank you for your comments.
REF029	BDC Councillor	<p>The District contains the Trent Valley and land surrounding the rivers Idle, Ryton, Meden, Maun and Poulter. It lies within the Humber River Basin District (as defined for the Water Framework Directive) and its catchments are covered by the Trent and Don Catchment Flood Management Plans. These recommend that opportunities should be investigated for storage or reduced conveyance upstream of urban areas; such as locations identified where flood attenuation ponds or wetlands could be developed with associated habitat improvement; returning watercourses to a more natural state; and resisting development which may adversely affect the flood management capabilities of green infrastructure. The Council will continue to work with the Environment Agency and developers to support the priorities of these plans, such as within the River Ryton Catchment for Worksop, where the Environment Agency are investigating the potential for a wider flood management scheme to help reduce the risk of flooding within Worksop and Worksop Central. A Flood Management Impact Zone at Worksop has been identified to combat the flooding issue of the Ryton, a tributary of the River Idle. This is good, but Retford too needs a similar Zone and Plan to deal with the recurring flood issues that houses and businesses face in Retford. The Plan currently suggests that SuDS will mitigate the Ordsall South. in the last 12 years the Idle basin around Retford has suffered repeated flooding - some of it as a likely consequence of extensive new build work off London Road – it is time that the BDC Plan promises a similar Plan for Ordsall South and Retford, and it must include the designed re-creation of lakes and wetlands in the Ordsall area and also in the riverside areas around Retford - not just the casual ones that now seem to occur every time it rains heavily for a few days.</p>	<p>The Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has not identified the need for additional storage capacity around Retford. However, the Environment Agency are currently updating the river modelling to the River Idle and Retford Beck which likely to be released in 2022.</p> <p>Ordsall South has to provide mitigation on site through flood storage capacity and SUDS scheme. This will help reduce on site and off surface water runoff and water pooling in the area. This is the advice from the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and the Environment Agency.</p>
REF059	Environment Agency	<p>Whilst we're really pleased to see "blue-green Infrastructure" referenced (ST6 – Point 6), after this first reference the text appears to go back to just "green infrastructure". We recommend that you amend the following references to highlight the importance of blue-green infrastructure;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood Risk and Drainage. 10.3.10 – "...including integration with green infrastructure..." • Flood Risk and Drainage. 10.3.11 – "...flood management capabilities of green infrastructure" • Policy ST54. C. 6) – "Maximise environmental gain through enhancing the green infrastructure...." <p>10.3.7:</p> <p>Whilst we fully support the reference to the climate change allowances (2019), we'd like to take this opportunity to highlight that, in a couple of days' time, we'll be releasing new guidance on climate change allowances and so this text will likely need updating to reflect the newer 2021 guidance.</p> <p>Policy ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage:</p> <p>We'd like to see the following amendments made to this Policy in order to increase the effectiveness, clarity and therefore soundness of the Policy;</p>	<p>Thank you for your response. Your recommendations have been incorporated into the updated version of the Local Plan and evidence base where appropriate.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage		<p>POLICY ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage</p> <p>A. All development proposals are required to consider and, where necessary, address mitigate the effect impacts of the proposed development on flood risk, on-site and off-site, commensurate with the scale and impact of the development. Proposals, including change of use applications, must:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment (where appropriate), to which demonstrates that the development, including the access and egress, will be safe for its lifetime, without increasing or exacerbating flood risk elsewhere and where possible will reduce flood risk overall; 2. Demonstrate that they pass the Sequential Test and if necessary the Exceptions Test in Flood Zones 2 and 3; 3. Ensure that where land is required to manage flood risk, it is safeguarded from development. <p>River Ryton Flood Management Impact Zone</p> <p>B. All developments within the River Ryton Flood Management Impact Zone, as identified on the Policies Map, will need to demonstrate that they will not prejudice the delivery of a future flood management scheme for the River Ryton catchment. Applicants will need to evidence that prior engagement has taken place with relevant authorities as part of their design and access statements.</p> <p>Surface Water Flood Risk</p> <p>C. Developments (where appropriate) should positively contribute to reducing flood risk. Sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) should be incorporated in line with national standards, and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Be informed by the Lead Local Flood Authority, Sewerage Company and relevant drainage board; 2. Have appropriate minimum operational standards; 3. Be managed in line with the Government's Water Strategy; 4. Have management and maintenance arrangements in place to ensure an acceptable standard of operation and management for the lifetime of the development; 5. Prevent surface water discharge into the sewerage system; 6. Maximise environmental gain through enhancing the blue-green infrastructure network, including urban greening measures, securing biodiversity gain providing a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain where possible, and securing amenity benefits along with flood storage volumes; 7. Seek to reduce runoff rates in areas at risk from surface water flooding, and that any surface water is directed to sustainable outfalls. <p>In terms of Biodiversity Net Gain, it's our opinion that the Bassetlaw Local Plan should be encouraging/requiring new 'major' developments to deliver a minimum Biodiversity Net Gain of 10% where possible. This can be measured by the Local Planning Authority using the latest version of the Biodiversity Metric Tool. We all know that a requirement to deliver a minimum 10% net gain is likely to be mandated in the forthcoming Environment Bill, so this Plan is the perfect opportunity to get ahead of the curve and catapult Bassetlaw to the forefront of delivery. Even if the measure is not subsequently mandated, we'd still encourage you to include this requirement in Policy as it aligns perfectly with some of the strategic objectives of the Plan in terms of environmental betterment and the desire to create a quality place to work and live.</p>	
REF071	Rotherham MB Council	Focussed Local Plan para. 10.3.7 - "By making an allowance for climate change, it will help reduce the vulnerability of the development and provide resilience to flooding in the future.". It is unclear what this is referring to.	This reference refers to the need to apply a 'climate change' allowance on top of the current modelling to allow for the increasing adverse impact to flooding from climatic events. This is now required by national planning guidance on Flood Risk Assessments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage			
1849104	BDC Councillor	<p>Area HS13 Ordsall South C.5. Prevent surface water discharge into the sewerage system by using the surface water in a grey water scheme in the dwellings. The benefits that if used for toilet flushing, a well designed and fully functional grey water system could potentially save a third of the mains water used in the home. Grey water can also be used for garden watering. The greater the proportion of grey water used, the less mains water will be needed which will ease the pressure on water resources</p>	Thank you for your comments.
REF052	Nottinghamshire County Council	<p>POLICY ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage</p> <p>Nottinghamshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has reviewed the document Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan, June 2021. No site-specific information has been submitted as part of POLICY ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage, therefore we have made some general comments on the information that we would expect see when the specific applications are submitted for approval.</p> <p>Given the proposed scale of the development to satisfy the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) further details would need to be submitted to support this application. Paragraph 163 fn.50 of the NPPF requires that applications in Flood Zone 2, 3 and in Flood Zone 1 over 1 hectare should be accompanied by a site-specific flood risk assessment, reviewing the potential flood risks to the development from all sources. An FRA is vital if the local planning authority is to make an informed planning decision.</p> <p>As LLFA we also require details of the proposed surface water drainage strategy for the development. Paragraph 165 of the NPPF states that major developments should incorporate sustainable drainage systems unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate. The LLFA advise that any proposed drainage strategy should be in accordance with CIRIA C753 and current best practice guidance. Any FRA or drainage strategy should include following information:</p> <p>With regards to acceptable surface water management schemes for the sites identified within this draft plan we would offer the following comments and recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence of a proven outfall from site in accordance with the drainage hierarchy the follows options should be considered, in order of preference; infiltration, discharge to watercourse, discharge to surface water sewer or discharge to combined sewer. • Justification should always be provided for the use or not of infiltration, including the results of soakaway testing, in accordance with BRE 365. • The maximum discharge should be set to the QBar Greenfield run-off rate for the positively drained area of development. • The site drainage system should cater for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100-year event including a 40% allowance for climate change. • For all exceedance to be contained within the site boundary without flooding any properties in a 1 in 100year+CC storm. • SuDS systems should be incorporated into the surface water management scheme for the site, preference should be given to above ground SuDS which provide multi-functional benefits. • Details of who will manage and maintain all drainage features for the lifetime of the development will be required prior to construction. <p>This is only a brief outline of the minimum information we would be expecting to see and not an exhaustive list. There are towns and villages within Bassetlaw that are subject to a considerable</p>	Thank you for your response. Your recommendations have been incorporated into the updated version of the Local Plan and evidence base where appropriate.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage		<p>flood risk with significant flood events having occurred in recent memory. Any schemes proposed in those areas will be expected to address those risks through site-specific flood risk assessments and drainage strategies. We would also expect that any proposed schemes take note and work with any ongoing flood mitigation schemes in those areas.</p> <p>Informative</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SuDS involve a range of techniques and SuDS methods can be implemented on all sites. SuDS are a requirement for all major development as set out within paragraph 165 of the NPPF. 2. The LLFA does not consider oversized pipes or box culverts as sustainable drainage. Should infiltration not be feasible at the site, alternative sustainable drainage should be used, with a preference for above ground solutions. 3. Surface water run-off should be controlled as near to its source as possible through a sustainable drainage approach to surface water management. Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) are an approach to managing surface water run-off which seeks to mimic natural drainage systems and retain water on-site as opposed to traditional drainage approaches which involve piping water off-site as quickly as possible. 	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST56: Transport Infrastructure and Improvement			
REF029	BDC Councillor	<p>The Focussed Paper then sets out what has been envisaged (across the whole of Bassetlaw) with mention of the various detailed items that hold a particular relevance to Ordsall South and Retford. The threadbare 'Retford' element of it is very clear to see on page 25, where the fifteen identified highway improvements are listed; the first ten are valuable and helpful interventions in Worksop and elsewhere in Bassetlaw, the final two are traffic management schemes in Eaton and Old Ordsall, and a mere three then remain as proposals to resolve the issues of a huge housing estate arriving at the southern end of Ordsall. It's not good enough, it's not detailed enough, it's not substantial enough and if the Planners really believe that improving two mini-roundabouts and creating a new junction along with some painted bike lanes will satisfy either the existing residents or the thousands more who are set to live in Retford then they are mistaken. It's no good postulating that these matters will be resolved with future discussion (if it was so, then why have those essential 10 been listed?) - vital and essential Road and cycleway infrastructure will not happen unless the Plan states it now as a requirement, and if it cannot be listed as a requirement then the volume of houses proposed for Retford needs to be re-assessed. Make no mistake – it will be good to see Retford grow, but not in the unbalanced way that this Plan promises. How can it be that those who conceived the Plan for a 1000+ proposed development lying about 3 miles from a national trunk road cannot see the merit and necessity of a much improved quality link road to the development?</p>	<p>An updated version of the Bassetlaw and Retford Transport Assessments have now been finalised following recent consultation. These updates include an updated list of proposed mitigation require to implement the proposed growth in the Local Plan. The Retford Transport Assessment also includes the proportionality of mitigation from each of the affected developments. This helps identify the various costs associated with the scale of different developments. The Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan has also been updated to reflect the latest evidence.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST56: Transport Infrastructure and Improvement			
REF034	Highways England	<p>In January 2021 Highways England provided comments on the draft version of the Local Plan, with a housing target of 10,013 dwellings and a minimum of 168 ha of land allocated for employment. Considering the large scale of growth in close proximity to the SRN, we expressed the need for a robust transport evidence base to assess the traffic impacts and suitably inform the development of the infrastructure delivery plan. With regard to the current focussed consultation, our review of the Worksop Central DPD notes that this aims to provide 660 dwellings by 2037, plus a mix of commercial, employment, and retail uses. The Worksop Central area is however limited to the town centre and aspires to make use of underused, vacant and existing buildings and to meet local needs. Although impacts from development proposals in such a location may not have severe impacts on the SRN, we would expect that as these sites progress through the planning process, they be supported by Transport Assessments to ensure that the likely traffic impacts are appropriately assessed. From review of the Ordsall South strategic site which proposes to deliver 800 dwellings by 2037 (with an additional 450 thereafter), we note that this is located approximately 5km to the east of the A57 / A1 / Blyth Road junction (Apleyhead junction) at Upper Morton. We note that the Bassetlaw Transport Study which is being developed will demonstrate the impacts of the cumulative growth plans across the Local Plan area on the transport network and propose effective mitigation. Our particular area of concern is the operation of the A1 in the vicinity of Retford and Worksop, as we note plans for Bassetlaw Garden Village, the proposed strategic employment site by the A1 Apleyhead junction at Upper Morton, and now the addition of Ordsall South. All of these sites are in close proximity to the A1. Therefore, as detailed in our Local Plan consultation response of 18 January 2021 we would expect the Bassetlaw Transport Study to provide a robust transport evidence base to consider the infrastructure improvements required.</p>	<p>The updated Bassetlaw Transport Assessment has included these changes and also assessed the cumulative impact of those development on the strategic and local road networks. It also provides mitigation options where necessary.</p>
REF043	Resident	<p>New and improved walking and cycling links: whilst identifying routes within the District's three main towns, potential links between them continue (except for Worksop – Garden Village - Retford) to be omitted. Given the intended life-span of this Plan and to correspond with national, regional and county policies, at least some outline of identified desire lines for longer-distance routes linking the towns listed in Policy ST14 (page 10) should be identified. The Government's new Transport Decarbonisation Plan (page 58) anticipates "a world-class cycling and walking network in England by 2040"; NCC's Local Transport Plan v3 has a vision and implementation plan to link towns and district centres by cycle routes; and the D2N2 LEP's Local Cycling and Walking Investment Plan [LCWIP] is based on corresponding proposals. In Bassetlaw, these routes should include (i) Worksop – Carlton-in-Lindrick – Langold – Blyth – Harworth/Bawtry; (ii) Retford – Sutton-cum-Lound – Ranskill – Harworth/Bawtry; (iii) Retford – Tuxford; and (iv) Worksop – Tuxford. The last can currently be achieved using National Cycle Routes 6 and 647, but these include on-road sections needing diversion and/or improvement. Elements of the above routes might then be delivered as and when opportunities arise and funding becomes available.</p>	<p>New development is only required to provide enhanced or new routes where they are necessary. These are most likely to connect the site to existing routes or to provide routes with a new development. Broader enhancements will likely need to come via external funding. These enhancements are considered aspirational and can be undertaken outside of the Local plan process.</p>
Quired to	Resident	<p>The report on cycling and walking in Retford is excellent, clearly identifying the current problems and the limited opportunities for their absolution. Hopefully the planned cycling and walking route between Tiln Lane and Bolham Lane via a slope west of the Linden Homes development in Tiln Lane will be pursued to completion and that other similar schemes will be implemented as and when possible. In particular the path immediately to the west of the River Idle between Bolham and Morrisons supermarket should be improved.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST56: Transport Infrastructure and Improvement			
REF050	Stone Planning Services	<p>This policy is supported, but we note it is not fully costed and there is no detailed Cost Plan that demonstrates how each element will be funded or the timeframe for delivery. We anticipate that delivery will be dependent on a cocktail of public and private funding, and we conclude there are serious doubts that many of these schemes will be delivered during the Plan Period. The list set out in the policy should be viewed as aspirational. It is noted that delivery on some of the Plan's Site Allocations is heavily dependent on the provision of the respective infrastructure. We consider the Council must also take advantage of its existing infrastructure and support development that can come forward quickly without major front loaded infrastructure investment. As you will be aware our client controls land at the A57/A1 junction. Employment Development can be brought forward here without delay. It is located on a strategically important communication route which will be attractive to inward investment and internal relocation. In our view the Council needs to be clear and confident on delivery of the ST56 Infrastructure and acknowledge that 'oven ready' strategic sites are available and should be supported.</p>	The proposed costs, funding strategy and delivery is included within the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan which has been updated to reflect the latest evidence.
REF052	NCC – Planning Policy Team	<p><u>Strategic Highways</u></p> <p>Paragraph 11.1.6- The County Council will require planning applications to be supported by a Travel Plan, Transport Statement or Transport Assessment dependent on the scale and kind of development. This may not be necessary for the smaller sites <50 dwellings.</p> <p>In most cases the County Council will require highway infrastructure to be secured by planning condition unless the infrastructure appears on the CIL Regulation 123 list.</p> <p><u>Transport and Travel</u></p> <p>The policy lists three areas for delivery: new highways schemes and improvements; bus corridors and improvements to reduce congestion and new routes and improvements to encourage walking and cycling and to reduce congestion. Transport and Travel Services note the identified bus corridors for improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • new east-west distributor road at HS1: Peaks Hill Farm; • new Ordsall South neighbourhood (east and west); • A new bus interchange at Bassetlaw Garden Village; • re-aligned B6420 Mansfield Road to service Bassetlaw Garden Village; and <p>View our privacy notice at www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/privacy</p> <p>Nottinghamshire County Council, County Hall, West Bridgford, Nottingham NG2 7QP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A57 and into EM01: Apleyhead Junction to service the new employment area <p>National Bus Strategy - In spring 2021 the government published the National Bus Strategy - https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/bus-back-better. This includes an expectation that in cities and other congested places, there will be significantly more ambitious bus priority schemes, making services faster, more reliable, more attractive to passengers and cheaper to run. Local Transport Authorities will be expected to implement ambitious bus priority schemes and draw up</p>	The need for Travel Plans, Transport Assessments etc... has been referenced within the Transport related Policies and the site specific policies where appropriate. The National Bus Strategy has been referenced within the supporting text to relevant policies.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST56: Transport Infrastructure and Improvement			
REF059	Environment Agency	<p>ambitious Bus Service Improvement Plans (BSIPs). Statutory traffic management guidance will be updated to make promoting bus reliability an integral part of highway authorities' Network Management Duty.</p> <p>The aspirations of the National Bus Strategy including BSIPs and Enhanced Partnership Schemes, should be reflected in the public transport measures set out in the new Local Plan to support future growth. This includes the introduction of Demand Responsive Transport, with a government funded pilot scheme in rural Bassetlaw due to commence in 2022.</p>	
REF062	National Trust	<p>Whilst we're really pleased to see "blue-green Infrastructure" referenced (ST6 – Point 6), after this first reference the text appears to go back to just "green infrastructure". We recommend that you amend the following references to highlight the importance of blue-green infrastructure;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy ST56. A. 3. C) – "...and along green infrastructure corridors...." <p>National Trust has significant concerns about the scope and scale of proposed transport upgrades along the A57 corridor. These have potential not only for significant disruption associated with road works in the medium-long term, but also a major change in the character of the surrounding area as a result of the cumulative impact of major development, transport upgrades, traffic increases, congestion and pollution. The surrounding area includes sensitive landscapes and ecology forming part of Sherwood Forest and the setting of Clumber Park Grade I Registered Historic Park and Gardens. The Sustainability Appraisal note acknowledges that 'further development of the highway network could be seen as encouraging and facilitating ongoing car use with the associated emissions', but states that 'the level of housing and employment development proposed through the Local Plan will inevitably require some improvements to the highway network in order to avoid congestion which would have adverse impacts in terms of creating and exacerbating pockets of poor air quality'. We urge the Council to consider whether the level of housing and employment growth proposed by the plan – which is not currently justified by identified need in the Local Plan evidence base – represents an unsustainable level of development. The Sustainability Appraisal goes on to state that 'the infrastructure improvements identified in the policy could also have negative effects on SA objectives 1: biodiversity and 13: cultural heritage'. The impacts on Clumber Park Site of Special Scientific Interest, Sherwood Forest ppSPA and the setting of Clumber Park are not yet fully understood and robust modelling of traffic increases including associated emissions is required.</p> <p>Furthermore, it should be noted that an area of land to the south of the A57 corridor, close to the A1 junction, is owned by the National Trust. The land is 'inalienable'. Once the Trust has declared a piece of land inalienable, we cannot sell, give away or mortgage that land. Nor can the land be compulsorily acquired from the Trust against our will without a special procedure involving both Houses of Parliament. The National Trust would therefore welcome early consultation on any development or infrastructure proposals that have potential to impact on National Trust inalienable land.</p>	<p>This has been included within the updated Local Plan.</p> <p>Any significant road improvements to the A57 will need to be carefully planned. Due to the potential for the current capacity of the A57 around Worksop to become constrained, it is important to consider options on how to provide improvements in the most suitable way.</p> <p>The proposed Local Plan growth only forms a small part of increased traffic along this road. The majority of traffic is regional that travels between the A1 and the M1. The road has a large proportion of freight using it which can slow the flow of traffic and lead to congestion.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the Highways Authority and adjacent landowners on future proposals for the A57.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST56: Transport Infrastructure and Improvement			
REF071	Rotherham MB Council	The Council previously commented on this proposal and welcomes policy ST56 which sets out proposed transport improvements which will be important to improve the sustainability of this site given its remote location. Safe connectivity between this site and the proposed strategic employment land at Apleyhead junction will also be important for encouraging sustainable transport patterns, for biodiversity and to provide a good standard of living for future residents. Policy ST56 sets out that a new bus interchange and further collaboration with bus operators is planned to ensure quality service for Bassetlaw Garden Village. If the proposed new railway station and/or good bus services are not in place during initial occupation of dwellings, there is a risk that unsustainable travel patterns will be established by new residents before these amenities can be provided.	The Council will continue to work with its partners on delivering sustainable transport options for the Bassetlaw Garden Village and other allocations. The new railway station will be delivered through external funding with only small contributions from the first phase of the development. The rail station will have a broader benefit and is not only required to support the development of the Garden Village. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that the delivery of this transport infrastructure will need to be phased over the longer term.
1859314	Resident	We can not currently maintain our current roads and transport infrastructure. It is an interesting concept to discover how the cost of this development and improvement, as well as existing repair will be funded. I am particularly interested to hear how the creation of green infrastructure, open spaces etc is going to be managed in relation to tackling the issues of illegal encampment.	Improvements to the roads and transport infrastructure will be delivered in two ways. The first is through Government or County Council investment and the second is through developer enhancements and contributions. Developments are only required to mitigate against the impact of that development, so in some cases, it doesn't mean providing a new road or fully improvement another. The developer of a scheme is required to undertake a transport assessment and travel plan to detail about what impacts that development will create and how that development will then mitigate those impacts.
1858983	Resident	11.1.1 Improving connectivity and the transport network is a key principle which will support the growth of the District. By facilitating the movement of people between their home, work, There is and will be need to get better bus services Worksop/Retford to all the employment hubs currently there is little to no buses from Retford to worksop so Retford people can access the worksop job market, I know lots of people who just cannot get to jobs in Worksop because of lack of public transport	Thank you for your comments.
1858552	BDC Councillor	Page 25- I broadly welcome the Council's ambition in improving the road network. I particularly note the suggested improvements J,K,L,M,N,O as my constituents do raise these as issues on a regular basis. I would urge that if possible any development in road infrastructure take into account the needs of cyclists. Due to the topography of the District and the projected increase in battery supported bicycles I believe we do have an opportunity to take some cars off the road. I know many people would prefer to cycle but do to the speed limit and disrepair on the roads they lack the confidence to do so. Finally I strongly support the new station at the Green Village. This must be pushed for at the highest levels. This will allow this community to access well paid jobs across the District and also Sheffield/Lincoln. Please ensure that if the Village does go ahead this work is prioritised.	New cycle provision will form part of some highway improvements such as those in Ordsall, the Garden Village and Peaks Hill Farm. Additional enhancements to existing may also form part of contributions from development where appropriate or where opportunities exist.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST58: Safeguarded Land			
REF004	Canal & River Trust	<p>Having reviewed the areas subject to the Focused Consultation, the Trust wish to provide the following comments with regards to the proposed River Ryton Flood Management Impact Zone, which includes proposals for water storage. This is referred to in section 10 (e.g. 10.3.13) and within revised Policy ST58: Safeguarded Land.</p> <p>Policy ST58 has been amended to include the following safeguarded site:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">6. Land between Shireoaks and Worksop to accommodate water storage as part of a wider Worksop Flood Management Scheme.</p> <p>The land set aside extends close to the Chesterfield Canal. Flood storage areas have the potential to result in erosion or the saturation of soils which could impact any existing canal supporting structures. In addition, existing sluices from the Canal are present in this location to accommodate water management upon the waterway. If these sluices are underwater, then there is a risk that Flood Risks from the canal itself could increase. Careful design management is required to ensure that the Flood Storage area proposed does not adversely impact the canal. This would include the need for sections to show the changes in flood water levels in relation to any supporting structures and detailed plans to confirm how any existing sluices will be affected. We anticipate that these matters would be explored further during the development of any future Flood Management Scheme, and are therefore comfortable that the principle of the safeguarded land shown. It may be best practice, however, if these matters are made clear to future designers and decision makers, to ensure that any final flood storage area design takes these matters into account. We therefore advise that the Local Planning Authority ensure that suitable mechanisms are in place, either through text in any ancillary documents or masterplans associated with the Flood Storage area or additional ancillary wording in the Local Plan, to ensure that impacts on the Canal are fully assessed.</p>	<p>The detail of a flood management scheme within this area will be subject to consultation with relevant landowners and stakeholders at that time. The Council recognise the need to reduce the impacts from a scheme to nearby property, land and infrastructure.</p>
REF016	Barton Willmore on behalf of Howard Retford Ltd	<p>Our client has reviewed the June 2021 focussed Consultation document subject to this consultation. The following comments are provided:</p> <p>At 7.14.14, we refer to our comments above in relation to the policies maps. The location of the school and health hub needs to be further discussed with the County Council. Whilst we agree that it needs to have the very best connectivity, this might be restricted by inclusion of the 'safeguarded land' part of the Council's strategy. We believe that a criteria-based Policy in HS13 would be better.</p> <p>For the reason cited above, we do not see the need for part A, 7 of Policy ST58 and consider that the Council's aspirations would be better served by including appropriate wording into Policy 29 and HS13 site specific requirements. (See Policy 29 for other comments)</p>	<p>The identified land for the safeguarding of school facilities and buildings has now been removed from the policy and policies map and the policy now refers to the amount of land needed to provide the school so this provides more flexibility on where it is located on site.</p>
REF052	NCC – Planning Policy Team	<u>Education</u> <p>Policy ST58 states that land is safeguarded "to accommodate a new Primary School and associated infrastructure at Peaks Hill Farm through Policy ST17". Although current pupil projections (based on existing school capacity) would appear to support the requirement for a primary school at Peaks Hill, it is considered that with the additional capacity that a new school at Gateford North would provide, there would not be a requirement for a second primary school at Peaks Hill. NCC has secured land and funding through s106 to deliver a 315-place school at Gateford North and, assuming this project can proceed, there is expected to be sufficient capacity within the Worksop Planning Area to accommodate the remaining permitted development at Gateford, in addition to that proposed across Worksop in the draft Local Plan. However, NCC requests that the land safeguarded at Peaks Hill is retained for</p>	<p>The identified land for the safeguarding of school facilities and buildings has now been removed from the policy and policies map and the policy now refers to the amount of land needed to provide the school so this provides more flexibility on where it is located on site.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST58: Safeguarded Land		<p>secondary school use. It is not expected that the existing secondary school estate will be able to expand beyond the level which is already planned to be delivered through existing CIL funds.</p> <p>In order to accommodate the demand on secondary school places arising from Peaks Hill and other proposed Worksop development, it is envisaged that satellite secondary school provision could be provided on the Peaks Hill site and funded through the contributions collected during the Local Plan period. The level of additional capacity necessary to accommodate the 2000 dwellings proposed for Worksop would be two forms of entry (i.e. 300 places). Further investigative work is required to establish an approximate land size for delivering satellite secondary provision of this scale. As this provision would be intended to mitigate the cumulative impact of Worksop developments, it is acknowledged that the financial contribution towards build costs required for the Peaks Hill site may need to be adjusted to reflect the school land value, so that the land requirement does not impose an additional obligation on the developer. However, please note that the delivery of any satellite provision is subject to discussion with the relevant Academy Trust at the appropriate time. Policy ST58 states that land is safeguarded "to accommodate a 2-form entry primary school and health hub, and associated infrastructure at HS13: Ordsall South through Policy 29". An allocation of 1250 dwellings on this site, as referred to under Policy 29 Site HS13, would generate sufficient primary pupil demand to sustain at least a one form entry (210 place) primary school, based on pupil yield formula. A new primary school of this size should be accompanied by a 26-place nursery and should have core space and service to allow for later expansion to a one and a half form entry (315 place) school. The land size required for a 1.0-1.5FE primary school is approx. 1.5ha. Please note the delivery of a school on this site would be subject to the relevant DfE approval process at the appropriate time. Where land is to be provided by a developer to enable the delivery of school infrastructure, the County Council will require fully serviced land, remediated to a residential standard with a topography appropriate for the building of a school and associated playing fields. Further details on the Council's serviced site requirements are set out at para 3.17 of its Planning Obligation Strategy.</p>	
REF059	Environment Agency	<p>We are pleased to see the safeguarding of land under policy ST58 for use in a future flood risk management scheme and we are highly supportive of this in principle. However, we'd like to take this opportunity to highlight that whilst we have undertaken preliminary testing of flood water storage in this location, which does show a positive impact on flood risk downstream, this testing was purely hypothetical and was not supported by appropriate engineering assessments. Whilst we'll continue to work towards the development of a flood risk management scheme for Worksop, at this present time we do not hold appropriate evidence to categorically demonstrate the requirement for, or the scope or scale of, a flood risk management scheme in this location. We understand that your Authority are comfortable with proceeding with the safeguarding of land on this basis and we're keen to support you with this where our role and remit allows.</p>	<p>The Council will continue to work with the Environment Agency on a proposed Flood Management Scheme for Worksop. Due to some uncertainty related to future results of river modelling, the area of safeguarded land will remain on the Policies Maps.</p>
REF074	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	<p>Natural Flood Management (NFM) not only reduces flood risk it can also achieve multiple benefits for people and wildlife, helping restore habitats, improve water quality and helping make catchments more resilient to the impacts of climate change. Within the flood storage area near Shireoaks/Rhodesia (Figure 33: Shireoaks flood storage area) there are a number of Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) including Lady Lee Quarry (1/45), Lady Lee Pasture (2/103), Holme Carr Wood (2/120) and Shireoaks Park Water Garden (1/47). We would like LWS to be included on policy maps because they have protection under the NPPF (2021). We note that they are indicated on the policy map for Harworth and Bircotes but not for Worksop.</p> <p>These measures should particularly include a stronger emphasis on carefully targeted floodplain reconnection, as a means to simultaneously deliver sustainable flood storage, Water Framework Directive (WFD) outputs and habitat restoration and re-creation. An objective should be to protect the LWS as they are designated nature conservation sites and bring them into favourable condition, where</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST58: Safeguarded Land		this is possible, through FRM interventions. We strongly advocate Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) habitat creation in low-lying areas. We would hope to see area targets set for BAP habitat creation through FRM with a clear deadline, informed by the Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping (BOM) that has been undertaken in Nottinghamshire. Wherever possible, efforts should be made to reconnect with the floodplain, to use natural river processes to slow the flow and reduce the impacts of flooding. This should be encouraged within local authorities when considering new developments within the floodplain. Every opportunity should be taken where measures are being implemented to ensure that this complies with WFD and that all efforts are made to protect and enhance biodiversity. The benefit of implementing NFM is that the problem of flooding can be dealt with at the source, and wildlife as receptors can benefit from the management. Partnership plays a huge role in NFM. It is pivotal for delivering projects, and it allows for a creative approach. As Catchment Hosts for the Lower Idle, Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust is ideally placed to work with BDC and other partners to deliver such a multifunctional project.	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST60: Provision and Delivery of Infrastructure			
REF059	Environment Agency	<p>Whilst we're really pleased to see "blue-green Infrastructure" referenced (ST6 – Point 6), after this first reference the text appears to go back to just "green infrastructure". We recommend that you amend the following references to highlight the importance of blue-green infrastructure;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12.3 – 12.3.3 – "...green infrastructure: including open spaces..." • Policy ST60 A. – "...social and green infrastructure and where appropriate..." 	Thank you for your comments. We will incorporate these into the revised policy.
REF060	NHS Property Services	<p>Policy ST60 of the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan relates to how physical, social and green infrastructure is intended to be provided for and delivered.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework 2021 is clear in Paragraph 20 that 'Strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and quality of development, and make sufficient provision for infrastructure and community facilities (such as health).' Paragraph 34 goes on to state that 'Plans should set out the contributions expected from development.' Alongside this, they should include the levels and type of infrastructure required over the plan period.</p> <p>We therefore support the opportunity for Bassetlaw Council and infrastructure partners to engage in the preparation of spatial strategy for infrastructure as is stipulated in Part A of policy ST60; and would encourage that NHS Commissioners, relevant NHS bodies and health providers are included in such engagement.</p> <p>There is a well-established connection between planning and health; in so far that the planning system has an important role in creating healthy communities. Planning can not only facilitate improvements to health services and infrastructure - thereby enabling the health providers to meet changing healthcare needs; but planning also provide a mechanism to address the wider factors of health.</p> <p>A vital part of this is ensuring the NHS continues to receive a commensurate share of developer contributions to mitigate the healthcare impacts arising from growth and help deliver transformation plans. Though supporting statement 12.3.10 of the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan document makes reference to health facilities, subsequent paragraphs including 12.3.15 and 12.3.16 focus on Affordable</p>	Thank you for your comments. We will continue to work with the NHS through the delivery of the Plan and we will work towards agreeing a Statement of Common Ground with health providers moving forward.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST60: Provision and Delivery of Infrastructure			
		<p>Housing, Highways and Education and give little indication of Bassetlaw Community Infrastructure Levy and developers contributions being considered for Health.</p> <p>Historically the NHS has not had appropriate recognition of its role in supporting the development of new communities. According to the MHCLG Review the value of developer contributions agreed in England during the financial year 2018/19 was £7bn. Health is not provided a separate entry but is grouped under 'other' which received just £187m of non-affordable housing planning obligations in 2018/19– of which the NHS only receives a proportion. Education on the other hand received £439m in 2018/19.</p> <p>Large residential developments often have very significant impacts in terms of the need for additional healthcare provision for future residents, meaning that a planning obligation requiring that the development delivers a new healthcare facility is necessary. As such, the requirement that development plan documents and planning policies recognise the role large sites can play in delivering necessary health facilities is welcomed. We concur with Part B of draft Policy ST60 which seeks to secure developers contribution towards improvements to infrastructure. We also believe that the cumulative impacts of smaller residential developments should also be recognised, and when receiving funds, health facilities should be put on a level footing with education and public transport improvements in order to ensure that healthcare infrastructure and funding requirements arising from planned and unplanned growth across the borough are appropriately represented given its strategic importance.</p> <p>Policy ST60 and the supporting statements would therefore be made more effective and consistent with national policy if it was ensured that Health had access to a more equitable share of developer contributions and recommended criteria for the allocation of health infrastructure monies that come through both S106 and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding routes. This should be at a level to support investment in all forms of healthcare provision to meet the demands of housing growth across Bassetlaw, including primary, secondary, and mental health services.</p> <p>We endorse the continued support for wider public health outcomes, pertaining the aim to better integrate health and social care services including wider community health services and maximise positive contribution to health and wellbeing. We believe that net health gains should be a strategic target for the planning system, and therefore be considered as a requirement in all strategic plans.</p> <p>In order to deliver this, is vital that Bassetlaw Council work with NHS organisations to plan for the healthcare infrastructure required to support the levels of growth anticipated within the Bassetlaw Local Plan. We would encourage the inclusion of health providers being actively involved in the preparation of Local plan as well as planning applications for large residential developments within the Bassetlaw area as these begin to come forward.</p> <p>NHSPS thanks Bassetlaw Council for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Local Plan and hope the comments regarding Policy ST60 are considered constructive and helpful.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST60: Provision and Delivery of Infrastructure			
1855535	Resident	<p>This platform seems to be a way of hobbling public response to your plans. I would need a degree in IT to understand all of this new technology (and you say you don't have enough computer space to provide a pdf printable copy. I don't believe that). You are up to something here. Public gagging! So here are my comments about your plans for my town centre all in one.</p> <p>My town (born and lived here all my life 61 years now) has become a gruesome botch of: Unsuitable pedestrianization which doesn't suit this town - orange block paving and daft lights shining patterns and (only a few) ridiculous market stalls on a hill along Bridge Street (just to cover up all the empty shops I reckon). We once had a lovely market place adjacent to the town hall where it was flat and thriving but you have since turned it into "Adulation Square" again another mismatch of slate and a gruesome "spaceship" cinema and behind that some absolute fenced off derelict land - a great (not) vista for visitors to our town coming down Park Street. Flooding. Your incompetent leader Simon Greaves was told to open the sluice gates in the morning of the flood in Worksop in 2019 but did nothing and has since concocted a story blaming someone else (when he was IN CHARGE . . . err?). The system of sluices and run offs and the library duck pond are the initial problem. Then there is the inadequate width of the Ryton upriver alongside the cricket pitch and the inadequate height of the run-under the shops on Bridge place. So if the water backs up due to sluice gate incompetence, it then double backs up on the shops bridge then overflows. It is simply engineering and sensible reaction to water building up. LET IT GO - DOWNSTREAM. Don't go harping on about letting Shireoaks mop up water - UPSTREAM. Also build a fast reaction plan for sluice gates when ever you see a big storm coming and don't let anyone called Greaves become involved ever again.</p> <p>Our town has no useful purpose now and needs production / manufacturing jobs with a lean towards starting up from the bottom. Boughton Camp in Ollerton is a classic example (go and take a look . . . it isn't pretty but it works and keeps people useful). 100 Wartime Nissen huts give employment to around 500 local people. We need to build national resilience and make our people in out town useful again since we have lost 17,000 production and mining jobs over last 25 years (we need local sustainability) so we must build cheap / subsidized / local workspace quickly on brownfield land.</p> <p>Have you sorted out the 60,000 tonnes of stinking waste plastic abandoned by the botched council / private recycling scheme yet? Its been there now for about 15 years. Shift it and put our 400 Rates free Nissen huts for 2,000 peoples jobs there quickly.</p> <p>Regarding the town's purpose, it used to be called the Gateway to the Dukeries but I reckon Notts were jealous of us and made us take the signs down. We are punching well below our weight now and could beautify the town and begin a big tourism push. We have lots to be proud of that could be enhanced.</p> <p>The Chesterfield Canal (surrounded by clapped out buildings behind the Golden Ball) could be a great asset leading off to Godfreys Pond and the Marina. The proximity to the Dukeries and Sherwood Forest and our other woodlands e.g. Hodsock and Osberton and other tourist attractions such as Creswell Crags and Langold Lake is an asset too and somehow should be made more of.</p> <p>Regarding attracting visitors to the town we need shops that are open and not charity shops nor have tramps sleeping in the doorways and I suggest you adopt free parking to attract people instead of you trying to be revenue based by charging to come for nothing at present.</p> <p>Instead of thinking round in circles and spinning in spirals, try to be more outward looking and inventive.</p> <p>By the way whilst writing, I object to you building an east west "distribution road" popping out at Peaks Hill Farm. This is really a "by-pass" so call it what it is. You have no right to cut down those ancient woodlands which have delighted my eyes all my life and give Worksop a lovely entrance (haha the spellchecker doesn't recognise Worksop . . . technology in your favour ??? American spelling doesn't even recognise recognise or favour . . . Good God!)</p>	<p>The provision of infrastructure delivery will be phased alongside the delivery of development over the Plan period. The Council has developed an Infrastructure delivery Plan and schedule to help structure the need and delivery of infrastructure.</p> <p>This will be updated periodically.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST60: Provision and Delivery of Infrastructure			
		<p>Look after our town Planners! Its simple.</p> <p>1.) Gateway to the Dukeries.</p> <p>2.) Jobs jobs jobs!</p> <p>3.) Open the Sluice gates when it rains.</p> <p>4.) Capitalize on our natural beauty and heritage.</p>	
REF025	Sports England	Should be informed by evidence from a Sport England perspective is the Playing Pitch Strategy and the Emerging Built Sports Facilities Strategy.	Thank you for your comments.

Appendix 2: Representations to Regulation 19 Local Plan

For the submission stage an additional document will be produced which will contain full Representations submitted to the Bassetlaw Local Plan Regulation 19. The Representations will be set out in Local Plan document order (followed by the evidence base) and each Representation will include the verbatim comment (unless such comments will need to be redacted as the Council reserves the right not to publish or take into account any Representations which are openly offensive or defamatory). A Council summary of the comment, followed by a short/initial response from the Council to the Representation will also be provided. Please note, a number of the Representations may be submitted with additional supporting information, such as advocacy documents, site technical surveys and assessment work, masterplans etc. These supporting documents will not be included but it should be noted that all the Representations will be available to view via the Council's website.