

Bassetlaw District Council

Sustainability Appraisal Report for the Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version Second Addendum May 2022 - Appendices

Final report

Prepared by LUC

May 2022



Bassetlaw District Council

Sustainability Appraisal of the Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version Second Addendum May 2022 Appendices

Version	Status	Prepared	Checked	Approved	Date
1.	Draft SA Appendices for the Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version Second Addendum May 2022	S. Smith	K. Nicholls	K. Nicholls	22.04.22
2.	Final Draft SA Appendices for the Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version Second Addendum May 2022	S. Smith	K. Nicholls	K. Nicholls	25.04.22
3.	Final SA Appendices for the Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version Second Addendum May 2022	S. Smith	K. Nicholls	K. Nicholls	06.05.22

Bristol
Edinburgh
Glasgow
London
Manchester

landuse.co.uk

Land Use Consultants Ltd
Registered in England
Registered number 2549296
Registered office:
250 Waterloo Road
London SE1 8RD

100% recycled paper

Landscape Design
Strategic Planning & Assessment
Development Planning
Urban Design & Masterplanning
Environmental Impact Assessment
Landscape Planning & Assessment
Landscape Management
Ecology
Historic Environment
GIS & Visualisation



Contents

Appendix 1	1	Appendix 8	567
Consultation Comments	1	Council's justification for selecting sites to take forward for allocation and discounting alternatives	567
Appendix 2	35	Appendix 9	623
Review of Plans, Policies and Programmes	35	Council's Justification for Selecting Garden Settlement Options in Part 1	623
Appendix 3	110	Appendix 10	625
Baseline Information	110	Council's Justification for selecting policies in light of reasonable alternatives	625
Introduction	111		
Bassetlaw District: An Overview	111		
Biodiversity, Green and Blue Infrastructure	115		
Population and Community	122		
Health and Wellbeing	128		
Transport and Accessibility	131		
Land Use, Geology and Soil	134		
Water	137		
Air Quality	143		
Climate Change	144		
Material Assets	147		
Cultural Heritage	149		
Landscape	153		
Key Sustainability Issues	157		
Appendix 4	159		
SA Matrices for Policy Options (January 2019)	159		
Appendix 5	296		
Significance Criteria Applied in the SA of Options and Policies and Appraisal Criteria Applied in the SA of Site Options	296		
Appendix 6	314		
SA Matrices for Site Options Considered to date	314		
Residential Sites	315		
Employment Sites	462		
New Settlement Sites	520		
Gypsy and Traveller Sites	539		
Appendix 7	546		
SA Matrices for Strategic Site Options from the Part 1 Bassetlaw Local Plan (January 2019)	546		

Appendix 1

Consultation Comments

Table A1.1 Consultation Comments received in relation to the SA Scoping Report (March 2016)

Note that this table was originally presented in the Interim SA Report (October 2016) and the actions set out in the final column were taken in that report

Consultee	Consultation question	Consultee response summary	Response/action
Historic England	1 (Plans and Programmes)	Confirms that the review of plans and programmes includes those identified in guidance on SEA/SA produced by Historic England.	Comment noted.
	1 (Plans and Programmes and Baseline)	Welcomes cultural heritage and landscape being identified as specific and separate SA topics/objectives.	Comment noted.
	1 (Baseline)	Welcomes the baseline section on cultural heritage and states that this sets out the current historic environment situation within Bassetlaw in an appropriate way.	Comment noted.
	2 (Key Sustainability Issues)	Notes that the wording for non-designated heritage assets would not address the requirements of para.139 of the NPPF which refers to non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest that are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments. In addition, NPPF requires the need to avoid harm to the significance of all heritage assets as well as their settings (taking a balanced judgement into account). Recommends that the second and third key issues be revised with the following, or a similar alternatives: The need to avoid harm to the significance of heritage assets and their settings; The need to recognise the value of non-designated heritage assets and protect these where possible, taking into account the requirements of NPPF para.139.	Agreed. The key sustainability issues listed in Section 3.12 and Table 3.15 have been amended to read: The need to avoid harm to the significance of heritage assets and their settings; The need to recognise the value of non-designated heritage assets and protect these where possible, taking into account the requirements of the NPPF.
	1 (Baseline)	States that the Landscape section is helpful, and the historic environment references to large estate parklands and mining heritage, amongst others, are welcomed.	Comment noted.
	3 (SA Framework)	Requests that the guide questions (fourth and fifth bullets) under SA Objective 13 (Cultural Heritage) are amended to include reference to setting.	Agreed. The guide questions under SA Objective 13 have been amended to read: Will it protect or enhance the significance of designated heritage assets and their settings? Will it protect or enhance the significance of non-designated heritage assets and their settings?
	3 (SA Framework)	Welcomes the guide questions for SA Objective 14 (Landscape and Townscape).	Comment noted.

Consultee	Consultation question	Consultee response summary	Response/action
	3 (Methodology)	Welcomes the proposed matrix approaches for the Vision and Objectives, and Spatial Strategies. Suggests that in respect of the matrix outcomes for the SA Objectives and Local Plan Vision/Objectives, if any 'uncertain' elements appear in the final SA for Objective 13 Cultural Heritage this will be an indication that further historic impact assessment work is likely to be required.	Comment noted.
	3 (Site Appraisal Criteria)	With regard to the site appraisal criteria, states that the matrix assessment approach and associated thresholds and related scores are considered to be suitable to consider the historic environment at this higher level. However, Historic England is concerned that the criteria is at odds with the listed thresholds since the criteria refers to designated heritage assets only whereas the thresholds include reference to designated and non-designated heritage assets, and their settings. Recommends that the appraisal criteria be revised to read as follows: 'Effects on heritage assets and their settings (based on information provided by developers and professional judgement).'	Agreed. The criteria has been revised to reflect this response.
	3 (Site Appraisal Criteria)	Suggests the inclusion of a footnote under Table 4.7 to define what 'professional judgement' would entail e.g. would it include checking against Historic Environment Records and Heritage at Risk information?	Agreed. A footnote has been included to define what is meant by professional judgement.
	3 (Site Appraisal Criteria)	Considers that the criteria, thresholds and scores for SA Objective 14 (Landscape and Townscape) would provide for consideration of historic landscape elements and are welcomed as part of the matrix for land allocations.	Comment noted.
	3 (Methodology)	Regarding strategic sites, states that the final SA commentary should be clear that mitigation measures do not include compensatory measures since the historic environment is a finite resource. In addition, any uncertainties highlighted in respect of the historic environment are likely to indicate that further impact assessment work will be required.	Comment noted.
	3 (Methodology)	Welcomes the proposed approach to the appraisal of cumulative effects. Highlights that it is probable that the historic environment, via SA Objective 13, will have synergistic effects with the following, amongst others: Potential/existing green infrastructure e.g. open space associated with Scheduled Monuments, e.g. multi user ways along canals, e.g. historic public rights of way, through SA Objective 1: Biodiversity; Open space and green infrastructure coinciding with the historic environment, e.g. canals and Scheduled Monuments, and access to places can enhance understanding and appreciation of an area helping to reinforce a sense of place and ownership of that place through SA Objective 5: Health and Well Being; and,	Comment noted. Where synergises between effects across SA objectives are identified, these will be noted in the appraisal.

Consultee	Consultation question	Consultee response summary	Response/action
		Urban design, public realm and historic landscape characterisation through SA Objective 14: Landscape and Townscape.	
	3 (Definitions of Significance)	With regard to SA Objective 13: Cultural Heritage 'negative' and 'significantly negative' illustrative guidance text, recommends that 'deterioration of' be replaced with 'deterioration of and/or harm to' to reflect the NPPF required approach for assessment of impact on the historic environment. The Guide Questions are welcomed, and some could be developed into SA/LP benchmarks for monitoring.	Agreed. The Definitions of Significance have been amended to reflect this response.
	3 (Definitions of Significance)	Welcomes the guide questions for SA Objective 14: Landscape and Townscape.	
Natural England	1 (Plans and Programmes)	Considers that the range of references set out in Appendix B: Review of Plans and Programmes is comprehensive.	Comment noted.
	1 (Baseline)	Considers that the baseline information recognises the quality and variety of natural assets present in the District and is pleased that all those internationally designated sites located outside of the District but which have the potential to be indirectly affected by the Plan have been identified. Also welcomes inclusion of the list of SSSIs located within the District along with details of their current condition and information relating to LWSs.	Comment noted.
	1 (Baseline)	Is pleased that the Scoping Report acknowledges the presence of significant populations of breeding nightjar and woodlark in the Sherwood Forest area which could be classified as Special Protection Area (SPA) in the future. Natural England encourages the authority to take a risk-based approach and undertake a robust assessment of all policies and potential sites in order to minimise impacts on these Annex 1 species and meet the requirements of duties under regulation 9A of the Habitats Regulations, which requires LPAs to apply all reasonable endeavours to avoid the deterioration of wild bird habitat when exercising their statutory functions. This approach is in accordance with Natural England's Advice Note.	Comment noted. A Habitats Regulations Assessment screening exercise is to be undertaken by the Council.
	2 (Key Sustainability Issues)	Is pleased that the Scoping Report encourages an approach that seeks to deliver green infrastructure enhancement. Highlights that investment in green infrastructure can help to drive economic growth and regeneration and improve public health, wellbeing and quality of life. It can also support biodiversity and the functioning of natural systems such as rivers and flood plains and help reduce the negative impacts of climate change. Considers that the following issues are relevant: Protect and increase populations of protected and priority species. Improve the connectivity of green space.	Agreed. The following key sustainability issues have been listed in Section 3.3 and Table 3.15: The need to protect and increase populations of protected and priority species. The need to improve the connectivity of green space.
	2 (Key Sustainability Issues)	States that access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities. Planning policies	Agreed. The following key sustainability issue has been listed in Section 3.5 and Table 3.15:

Consultee	Consultation question	Consultee response summary	Response/action
		<p>should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision.</p> <p>Considers that the following key sustainability issue is relevant:</p> <p>Improve access to green space.</p>	The need to improve access to green space.
	2 (Key Sustainability Issues)	States that local authorities should protect and enhance the Public Rights of Way (PRoW) network to deliver objectives relating to health and wellbeing, and to allow access to nature and the countryside. The provision and promotion of these routes provides opportunities to deliver modal shift and reduce air pollution as well as economic objectives relating to tourism. Non-motorised routes may also make an important contribution to the GI network.	<p>Agreed. The following key sustainability issue has been listed in Section 3.6 and Table 3.15:</p> <p>The need to protect and enhance the Public Rights of Way network.</p>
	2 (Key Sustainability Issues)	Is pleased that the Scoping Report recognises that development (soil sealing) has an irreversible adverse (cumulative) impact on the finite national and local stock of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land. Avoiding loss of BMV land is the priority as mitigation is rarely possible. Retaining BMV land enhances future options for sustainable food production and helps secure other important ecosystem services.	Comment noted.
	2 (Key Sustainability Issues)	<p>States that protection of water resources and water quality is critical to maintaining the District's natural environment and the ecosystem services it provides. Highlights that Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), which deal with surface water, are designed to mimic natural drainage as closely as possible. They provide an example of green infrastructure and an illustration of opportunities to achieve multiple benefits from the management of land. Well-designed systems can increase habitats for biodiversity and provide additional green space for communities to enjoy, as well as increasing the resilience of built areas to a changing environment.</p> <p>Considers that the following is a key sustainability issue:</p> <p>Enhance the water environment and encourage natural systems.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The key sustainability issues listed in Section 3.8 of the Scoping Report include "The need to protect and enhance the quality of the District's water sources." This is considered to adequately capture enhancement of the water environment.</p> <p>The following additional issue has been included:</p> <p>The need to encourage the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems.</p>
	1 (Baseline)	<p>Is pleased that reference has been made to the National Character Areas (NCAs). Highlights that the new NCA profiles provide an integrated, locally specific evidence base that can be used for making decisions about the natural environment. The NCAs highlight the significant opportunities in each area and therefore provide a useful planning tool that can help guide the design of projects so that they are appropriate to the locality and deliver the maximum benefits for the natural environment. The relevant NCA Profiles can be accessed at:</p> <p>https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-character-area-profiles-data-for-local-decision-making/national-character-area-profiles#ncas-in-east-midlands</p>	Comment noted.

Consultee	Consultation question	Consultee response summary	Response/action
	3 (SA Framework)	Welcomes the SA objectives, in particular 1, 5,6,7,8,10,11,13 and 14 which relate to Natural England's statutory interests.	Comment noted.
	3 (Methodology)	Supports the proposed appraisal methodology.	Comment noted.
	3 (Site Appraisal Criteria)	States that consideration should be given to the direct and indirect effects of development on statutory designated sites and highlights that Natural England's Impact Risk Zones may be useful in helping to identify where development is likely to impact on a statutory designated sites (i.e. SAC, SPA, Ramsar, SSSI).	Comment noted. The potential to utilise Impact Risk Zones will be explored further by the Council at the site appraisal stage.
	3 (Site Appraisal Criteria)	States that impacts on the highways network should include Rights of Way	Agreed. The site appraisal criteria has been revised to include reference to impacts on Public Rights of Way.
	3 (Site Appraisal Criteria)	With regard to land use, geology and soils, states that agricultural land classified as 'best and most versatile' (BMV) includes Grades 1, 2 and 3a land in the Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) system.	Comment noted. However, as stated in the footnote beneath Table 4.7, ALC mapping does not distinguish between sub-grades 3a and 3b. In consequence, sites that comprise Grade 3 land will be assessed as having a negative/uncertain effect on SA Objective 7, unless site specific information is made available to the Council that confirms the agricultural land quality of the site. No change.
Environment Agency	1 (Plans and Programmes)	Highlights that the Environment Agency's 'Water Stress Areas - Final Classifications' (WSA) is an existing source of evidence that could support tighter water efficiency standards than those set of within the Building Regulations. Recommends further discussion between the Council and water company to establish whether there is a need for tighter water efficiency for new development. Requests that the WSA is included in the review of plans and programmes.	Agreed. The WSA has been included in the review of plans and programmes. Reference has also been made to the WSA in the baseline (Section 3.8). Also maintain dialogue with the EA throughout preparation of the plan.
	1 (Plans and Programmes and Baseline)	Welcomes inclusion of the Water Framework Directive (WFD) and the Humber River Basin Management Plan (RBMP) in the review of plans and programmes but notes that the second RBMP has been recently published.	Comment noted. The review of plans and programmes and the baseline analysis (Section 3.8) have been revised to include

Consultee	Consultation question	Consultee response summary	Response/action
			reference to the 2015 Humber RBMP.
	2 (Plans and Programmes and Baseline)	Requests that the 'River Idle Sub Catchment Management Plan' is included in the review of plans and programmes and baseline (including evolution of the baseline without the Local Plan). Requests that reference is made in the baseline to the Trent Rivers Trust.	Agreed. The River Idle Sub Catchment Management Plan has been included in the review of plans and programmes and referred to in the baseline analysis (Section 3.8). Reference has been made to the Trent Rivers Trust in Section 3.8.
	1 (Plans and Programmes)	With regard to flood risk and surface water, requests that the following additional plans and programmes are included: Isle of Axholme Flood Risk Management Strategy The Humber Flood Risk Management Plan	Agreed. The Flood Risk Management Strategy and Flood Risk Management Plan have been included in the review of plans and programmes.
	General	Highlights that the Environment Agency has produced updated flood mapping for surface water and guidance on how climate change could affect flood risk to new development.	Comment noted. The Council will take into account the updated flood mapping and guidance in the preparation of its Local Plan evidence base including Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.
	1 (Plans and Programmes) and 3 (Site Appraisal Criteria)	Notes that the Scoping Report has not considered surface water as a source of flooding and advises that plans for the sustainable management of surface water should be worked up with the LLFA, Council drainage team and the relevant IDBs. Requests that the 'Implications for the SA Framework' as set out in Table 2.2 should be amended (under 'Water') to read: "The SA Framework should include specific objectives relating to the protection and enhancement of water quality and quantity, 'avoidance of flood risk' and minimising 'surface water run-off'.	Agreed. Table 2.2 has been amended as per this response. Additionally, surface water flooding has been included as a specific site appraisal criteria under SA Objective 9.
	2 (Key Sustainability Issues)	Welcomes the summary of the key sustainability issues identified within Table 3.15.	Comment noted.
	2 (Key Sustainability Issues)	Requests that the heading 'Biodiversity' is amended to read 'Biodiversity, Green and Blue Infrastructure' and that the key sustainability issues are amended to read: The need to maintain, restore, protect, expand and create the District's priority habitats The need to prevent the spread of invasive species	Agreed. Table 3.15 has been amended as per the response.

Consultee	Consultation question	Consultee response summary	Response/action
		<p>The need to adapt ecological communities to climate change</p> <p>The need to safeguard and enhance the existing blue/green infrastructure assets/networks</p> <p>The need to prevent harm to geological conservation interests</p>	
	2 (Key Sustainability Issues)	<p>Under 'Water' the following additional key sustainability issues are requested:</p> <p>The need to include the use of SUDs.</p> <p>The need to manage surface water to greenfield run off rates.</p>	<p>Agreed. The following additional key sustainability issues have been identified in Section 3.8 and Table 3.15:</p> <p>The need to encourage the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems.</p> <p>The need to manage surface water to greenfield run off rates.</p>
	General	<p>Advises that the 'Vision' for the Local Plan should be clear and specific in setting out preferences that identify a need for flood risk avoidance/mitigation, protect, conserve and enhance biodiversity (including blue/green infrastructure) and promotes water quality improvement and safeguarding across the District.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Draft vision to incorporate appropriate wording.</p>
	3 (SA Framework)	<p>Welcomes in particular the range of environmental issues identified in the SA Framework and supports the development of the objectives, in particular SA objectives 1, 7, 8, 9 & 11.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
	3 (SA Framework)	<p>Requests that the heading 'Biodiversity' is amended to read 'Biodiversity, Green and Blue Infrastructure' and that all references to green infrastructure within the guide questions should be amended to read 'blue and green' infrastructure.</p>	<p>Agreed. References to green infrastructure throughout the report have been amended to include blue infrastructure.</p>
	3 (SA Framework)	<p>Requests the following additional guide questions under 'Biodiversity' (SA Objective 1):</p> <p>Will it offer protection to existing corridors and opportunities to create and enhance/connect habitats to offer a wider network?</p> <p>Does it consider effects on WFD, prevents deterioration and offers enhancement?</p> <p>Does it consider local BAP requirements and UK protected species?</p>	<p>Comment noted. The following additional guide questions have been included in the SA Framework:</p> <p>Will it consider local BAP requirements and UK protected species?</p> <p>Will it offer protection to existing corridors and opportunities to create and enhance/connect habitats to offer a wider network?</p> <p>A specific guide question relating to the WFD is included under SA Objective 8 (Water) and in consequence, an additional guide</p>

Consultee	Consultation question	Consultee response summary	Response/action
			question on the WFD is not considered necessary.
	3 (SA Framework)	Requests that the guide question under flood risk (SA Objective 9) be amended to read: 'Will it 'avoid' or 'reduce' the risk of flooding to existing and new developments/infrastructure?'	Agreed. The guide question has been amended to read: 'Will it help to avoid or reduce the risk of flooding to existing and new developments/infrastructure?'
	3 (SA Framework)	Requests that the guide question under SA Objective 11 (Climate Change) be amended to read 'Will it promote sustainable design 'and layout' that minimises greenhouse and is adaptable to the effects of climate change?'	Agreed. The guide question has been amended to read: 'Will it promote sustainable design and layout that is energy efficient, minimises greenhouse emissions and is adaptable to the effects of climate change?'
Nottinghamshire County Council	1 (Plans and Programmes and Baseline) and 3 (Site Appraisal Criteria)	<p>Welcomes the comprehensive discussion of mineral resources within the Scoping Report, including in SA Objective 12: Resource Use and Waste. Also welcomes the inclusion of Mineral Safeguarding Areas as a site appraisal criteria for SA Objective 12 (Table 4.7). However, attention is drawn to the following:</p> <p>There is no reference to the adopted or emerging Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan within Table 2.1 Plans and Programmes Reviewed for the SA of the Local Plan.</p> <p>The thresholds within Table 4.7 refer to 'proposed area for future mineral working'. Safeguarding areas do not indicate future working, just the presence of mineral that should be protected from inappropriate non-mineral development. This table could be amended to better reflect this.</p> <p>Depending on the scale of the proposed development, the presence of the mineral, indicated by the Safeguarding Area, has the potential to benefit the non-minerals development through prior extraction. This is particularly the case if prior extraction is considered early within the development process. The SA could have a role in identifying this potential and this could be better reflected in the Scoping Report.</p> <p>The Constraints Mapping set out in Appendix C does not include the Mineral Safeguarding Areas. For the SA to be completed effectively, the County Council believes the Safeguarding Areas should be included in the maps in Appendix C.</p> <p>On a factual note, in paragraph 3.11.5 there is reference to the joint preparation of the LAA with Nottingham City Council. This paragraph could also be read in a way that suggests the Minerals Local Plan is being prepared jointly with Nottingham City Council. The LAA is being prepared jointly, but the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan only covers Nottinghamshire and excludes the City.</p>	<p>Agreed. Reference to the Minerals Local Plan has been included in the review of plans and programmes.</p> <p>The site appraisal criteria contained in Table 4.7 has been revised to reflect this response.</p> <p>Minerals Safeguarding Areas have been added to the settlement constraints mapping.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.11.5 has been revised to avoid confusion.</p>

Consultee	Consultation question	Consultee response summary	Response/action
	1 (Plans and Programmes) and 3 (SA Framework)	<p>Welcomes the comprehensive discussion of waste management within the Scoping Report, including SA Objective 8: Water and SA Objective 12: Resource Use and Waste. However, the following comments are made:</p> <p>There is no reference to the adopted or emerging Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Waste Local Plan within Table 2.1 Plans and Programmes Reviewed for the SA of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Recommends the inclusion an additional appraisal criteria for SA Objective 12 in terms of whether the proposed development will compromise the ongoing operation of an existing waste management facility.</p> <p>Requests the inclusion of existing waste management sites within the constraints mapping.</p>	<p>Agreed. Reference to the Waste Local Plan has been included in the review of plans and programmes.</p> <p>The following additional guide question has been included in the SA Framework under SA Objective 12:</p> <p>Will it compromise the ongoing operation of existing waste management facilities?</p> <p>Existing waste management facilities have been added to the settlement constraints mapping.</p>
	General	Recommends that the District-wide transport study is updated in support of the Local Plan.	An updated transport study will be commissioned in the next stage of plan preparation, following consultation
	1 (Baseline)	<p>Notes that the list of transport schemes at paragraph 3.6.10 should be revised by any subsequent transport study update. Highlights that a number of the named schemes (at least 5) are either under construction, in formal programmes or are expected to be completed by the time the Local Plan is formally adopted.</p> <p>Also notes that the A57/A60/B6024/St Anne's Drive junction improvement scheme is currently under construction and is due to be open to traffic in October 2016.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The list/status of schemes at paragraph 3.6.10 will be updated as the Local Plan and SA thereof progress.</p> <p>Reference to the A57/A60/B6024/St Anne's Drive junction improvement scheme has been amended to state that it is due to open in October 2016.</p>
	1 (Plans and Programmes)	Highlights that the text under the review of the Local Transport Plan is incorrect.	Comment noted. This is an editing error and has been addressed.
	1 (Baseline)	States that at paragraph 3.13.14, the first sentence should read "Bassetlaw's Draft Landscape Character Assessment conserve, reinforce, restore or create landscape features and components" and that the last sentence should read "Only a small number of landscape Policy Zones require landscape creation".	Agreed. The text at paragraph 3.13.14 has been amended to reflect this response.

Consultee	Consultation question	Consultee response summary	Response/action
	2 (Key Sustainability Issues)	Under landscape, states that the following additional issue should be identified: “The need to protect the character of rural areas and ensure that appropriate development takes place in the right place”.	Agreed. The following additional key sustainability issue has been identified in Section 3.13 and Table 3.15: The need to protect the character of rural areas.
	3 (SA Framework)	States that SA Objective 14 (Landscape and Townscape) should include a guide question similar to “Will special landscape features be conserved and reinforced?”	Agreed. The following additional guide question has been included in the SA Framework under SA Objective 14: Will it conserve and reinforce special landscape features?
	3 (SA Framework)	The consultee has submitted a Rapid Health Impact Assessment of the SA Framework. The Assessment concludes that “It is positive that health and wellbeing is a topic for consideration in the sustainability appraisal and with a few minor amendments the framework will consider in a consistent, systematic and objective way any potential positive and negative impacts of the emerging Local Plan on health and wellbeing. It will enable opportunities for maximising potential health gains and minimising harm addressing inequalities taking account the wider determinants of health.” The recommendations arising from the Assessment are as follows:	Comment noted.
		The framework does not specifically mention the provision of housing to meet the need of older or disabled people and so could be strengthened to include this. Affordable housing should also be healthy housing, so new housing developments should meet standards required to maintain warm and healthy housing. The framework could be strengthened to include this. Choice of any additional sites for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation should take account of the need for access to healthcare, especially primary care (GP) services. The Council may find the Research & Evaluation Framework for Ageing Cities and Measuring the Age-Friendliness of Cities useful to contribute to the development of the plan.	Comment noted. The following additional guide question has been included under SA Objective 2 (Housing): Will it deliver housing to meet the needs of the elderly and those with special needs? With regard to housing design, it is considered that this is already captured under the following guide question “Will it help to ensure the provision of good quality, well

Consultee	Consultation question	Consultee response summary	Response/action
			<p>designed homes?" No further amendments are therefore proposed.</p> <p>It should be noted that, in identifying sites for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation, the Council in developing the Local Plan and the SA will consider accessibility to key services and facilities.</p>
		The framework could be more explicit in respect of promoting development that will reduce energy requirements and living costs and ensure that homes are warm and dry in winter and cool in summer.	<p>Agreed. The guide question under SA Objective 11 has been amended to read:</p> <p>'Will it promote sustainable design and layout that is energy efficient, minimises greenhouse emissions and is adaptable to the effects of climate change?'</p>
		The framework could be strengthened by including social care related infrastructure as well as health care.	<p>Agreed. The guide question under SA Objective 5 (Health and Wellbeing) has been amended to read:</p> <p>Will it improve access to health and social care facilities and services?</p>
		The Council may wish to work in conjunction with CCG/Public Health colleagues to undertake modelling work to assess population growth assessment and healthcare service impact to inform the emerging Local Plan.	Comment noted. Discussions to be held with relevant parties in preparation of the Infrastructure Study and Delivery Plan.
		The framework could be strengthened by considering shared community use and co-location of services. The Council may wish to contact CCG colleagues who commission primary, community and secondary health care services to ascertain what needs there will be for shared community use and co-location of services for the development of the emerging Local Plan.	Agreed. Opportunities will be explored in future discussions relating to infrastructure delivery. The following additional guide question has been included under SA Objective 4 (Regeneration and Social Inclusion):

Consultee	Consultation question	Consultee response summary	Response/action
			<p>Will it help to promote shared community use and the co-location of services and facilities?</p>
		<p>The framework could be more explicit in considering links between open and natural spaces and areas of residence, employment and commerce.</p>	<p>Comment noted. As the SA Framework comprises objectives and/or guide questions relating to open space, housing and employment there is not considered to be a need for further guide questions in this instance. However, the linkages between open space provision, housing and economic development will be considered through the appraisal.</p> <p>No change.</p>
		<p>The framework could be more explicit about play areas for children and young people including provision for those that are disabled.</p>	<p>Agreed. The following additional guide question has been included under SA Objective 5 (Health and Wellbeing):</p> <p>Will it maintain and improve access to children's play areas?</p> <p>In addition, the guide question 'Will it maintain and improve access to green infrastructure, open space, leisure and recreational facilities' has been amended to read:</p> <p>Will it maintain and improve access to green infrastructure, open space, leisure and recreational facilities for all?</p>

Consultee	Consultation question	Consultee response summary	Response/action
		The framework could be strengthened to include noise, vibration and odours.	<p>Agreed. The following additional guide question has been included under SA Objective 5 (Health and Wellbeing):</p> <p>Will it minimise noise levels associated with new development and avoid locating sensitive development in areas affected by noise?</p> <p>In addition, the guide questions under SA Objective 10 (Air Quality) have been amended to refer to odour, as follows:</p> <p>Will it avoid locating development in areas of existing poor air quality/odour?</p> <p>Will it minimise emissions to air including odour from new development?</p>
		The framework could be strengthened to include noise pollution.	<p>Agreed. The following additional guide question has been included under SA Objective 5 (Health and Wellbeing):</p> <p>Will it minimise noise levels associated with new development and avoid locating sensitive development in areas affected by noise?</p>
		The framework could be strengthened by being more explicit about traffic management and calming measures to reduce and minimise road injuries.	Agreed. The following additional guide question has been included under SA Objective 6 (Transport):

Consultee	Consultation question	Consultee response summary	Response/action
			Will it help deliver traffic management and calming measures to reduce road injuries?
		The framework could be strengthened to ensure that the Plan promotes accessible buildings and places to enable access to people with mobility problems or a disability.	Agreed. The guide question under SA Objective 5 (Health and Wellbeing) has been amended as follows: Will it support those with disabilities and promote accessible buildings and public spaces?
		<p>The framework should include access to healthy food which considers the development of hot food takeaways (A5). The Council may wish to also consider planning approaches in relation to hot food takeaways:</p> <p>Concentration and clustering/vitality and viability – limiting the number of A5 units next to one another; ensuring the number does not exceed a defined percentage of units or floor space in a primary shopping area/frontage; permission is granted where it will not result in overconcentration to the detriment of the retail function and restrictions where granting would prejudice the vitality and, or viability of a retail area. From a health perspective this will reduce unhealthy options and poor nutritional choice available.</p> <p>Hours of operation –planning conditions restrict the opening hours of the premises depending upon location and proximity to residential properties. This will also address crime and anti-social behaviour</p> <p>Healthy eating options – encouraging the provision of healthy food options and improve the nutritional value of the menu (promoting sign up to the Nottinghamshire Healthy Options Takeaway scheme)</p> <p>The document Tipping the Scales published in January 2016 may be useful.</p>	Comment noted. It is considered that reference to hot food takeaway within the SA Framework is too specific and detailed. Health and wellbeing is a key consideration in the SA process (SA Objective 5). The aspiration to promote healthy lifestyles and support the wellbeing of residents underpins many of the key objectives in the emerging plan.
Barton Willmore (on behalf of R.E. Howard and Sons)	General	Is generally supportive of the Scoping Report and considers that it identifies the key issues that will need to be addressed through the SA.	Comment noted.
	1 (Plans and Programmes)	<p>With regard to Table 2.2, states that care should be taken in weighting the policy areas identified for the purposes of the SA.</p> <p>Considers that, individually, each of topic area under ‘population and community’ could justifiably be considered of equal importance as the other topic areas identified within the report and states</p>	Comment noted. The topics listed in Table 2.2 are used to present contextual and baseline information in the Scoping Report and reflect, and expand upon, the topics

Consultee	Consultation question	Consultee response summary	Response/action
		<p>that care should be given to ensuring that those individual topic areas are given sufficient weight in determining the sustainability credentials of the plan.</p> <p>Considers that the economic wellbeing of the District should be defined as a separate topic area all-together. Is concerned that there is potential for the relative importance of supporting suitable growth of the District's economy to be overlooked in the SA of the Plan without that change.</p>	<p>identified in Annex I of the SEA Directive.</p> <p>It is important to note that the primary purpose of the SA is to identify the likely significant effects of the emerging Local Plan. In this regard, the SA Framework includes a range of objectives (with several concerning population and community) and does not place any weightings on individual objectives.</p> <p>For the reasons set out above, it is not considered necessary to identify the economy as a standalone topic. In any case, the SA Framework includes a specific objective relating to the economy (SA Objective 3) and which will help to ensure that due consideration is given to the economic effects of Plan policies and proposals in the SA.</p> <p>No change.</p>
	3 (SA Framework)	Is supportive of the proposed SA Framework.	Comment noted.
	3 (SA Framework)	With regard to SA Objective 2 (Housing), states that in addition to asking whether the housing requirement will meet objectively assessed housing needs, it should be specifically considered whether the housing requirement will help the Council achieve its economic, regeneration and social inclusion aims for the Plan.	<p>Comment noted. It is not considered necessary to include further guide questions relating to the economy, regeneration and social inclusion since these aspects are already addressed under SA objectives 3 and 4 and against which housing growth options will be considered.</p> <p>No change.</p>
	3 (SA Framework)	States that the guide questions do not seek to deliver growth in the economy (albeit the LEP strategy is to deliver large scale growth) and that this should be explicit within the guide questions.	Comment noted. It is felt that SA Objective 3 (Economy and Skills) itself and the range of associated

Consultee	Consultation question	Consultee response summary	Response/action
		Also considers that the need to attract inward investment to deliver a step change to the economy is worthy of highlighting as a separate guide question.	<p>guide questions concern economic growth and inward investment – for example:</p> <p>Will it provide a supply of flexible, good quality employment land to meet the needs of the District's existing businesses and attract inward investment?</p> <p>Will it help to diversify the local economy and support the delivery of the District's Regeneration and Growth Strategy, Nottinghamshire Growth Plan, Sheffield City Region and the D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership Strategic Economic Plan?</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, the following additional guide question has been included under SA Objective 3 (Economy and Skills):</p> <p>Will it deliver local economic growth?</p>
	3 (SA Framework)	Requests that SA Objective 4 (Regeneration and Social Inclusion) expressly seeks to overcome and regenerate areas which have been affected specifically by the decline of the coal industry and the closure of collieries.	<p>Agreed. The guide question under SA Objective 4 (Regeneration and Social Inclusion) has been amended to read:</p> <p>Will it contribute to regeneration initiatives including in those areas which have been affected by the decline of the coal industry and the closure of collieries?</p>
	3 (Methodology)	Agrees that the SA should assess land allocations, including strategic and smaller scale allocations as part of the plan process. With due regard to development needs of the District and the aspirational objectives of the Council and the LEP's to deliver a step change in the District's economic standing, considers that the identification of strategic allocations and their assessment as part of the Local Plan and SA process should be undertaken as early as possible.	Comment noted.

Consultee	Consultation question	Consultee response summary	Response/action
	3 (Site Appraisal Criteria)	Is generally supportive of the structure and content of the proposed site appraisal criteria although considers that in some cases the criteria have been overly simplified and will potentially misrepresent the potential sustainability of a site.	<p>Comment noted. The proposed approach to the appraisal of sites is considered to be broadly appropriate.</p> <p>No change.</p>
	3 (Site Appraisal Criteria)	With regard to the site appraisal criteria under SA Objective 3 (Economy and Skills), considers that there are many different factors which apply to the sustainability impact of an employment allocation and its ability to deliver high quality local employment opportunities. Proposes that one of the assessment criteria should be the proximity to / accessibility of the site to a recognised labour market which is considered to be more fundamental to those employment opportunities being realised by local people than the proximity of the employment sites to other sites.	<p>Comment noted. The Council agrees that there are a wide range of factors that may determine the impact of employment development on the local economy. However, within the context of the SA, it is not possible to undertake a detailed economic impact assessment of each site and in consequence, the area of employment land to be provided is considered to be an appropriate and proportionate measure that enables all sites to be treated equally and consistently.</p> <p>The Council also agrees that accessibility to a local labour market is an important consideration in assessing employment sites. In this regard, the site appraisal criteria already includes criteria relating to accessibility. In consequence, no additional criteria is considered to be necessary.</p> <p>With regard to the inclusion of the criteria 'Proximity to key employment sites', this is primarily related to housing development – i.e. it concerns the extent to which a proposed housing site is accessible to existing employment opportunities.</p> <p>No change.</p>

Consultee	Consultation question	Consultee response summary	Response/action
		With regard to SA Objective 4 (Regeneration and Social Inclusion), considers that, whilst the proximity of sites (employment or housing) to a local service centre is an important consideration, additional consideration should be given to the impact of locating new development near to recognised areas of deprivation and those in need of regeneration.	Agreed. Additional site appraisal criteria has been included to refer to proximity to LSOAs which rank within the top 20% most deprived areas nationally.
	3 (Definitions of Significance)	Supports the definitions of significance contained in Appendix D to the Scoping Report.	Comment noted.
Planning and Design Group (on behalf of Welbeck Estates Company Limited)	3 (SA Framework)	Agrees with the range and focus of the guide questions under SA Objective 1 (Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure) and in particular questions 5 and 9.	Comment noted.
	3 (SA Framework)	Considers that the Scoping Report fails to build in the need to assess existing green infrastructure for genuine biodiversity or geotechnical value. States that consideration should be given to ensuring that existing sites of green space, which are of low biodiversity or geodiversity value or interest, are not protected purely on the basis it may conserve biodiversity or geodiversity and that sites have to be assessed on their merits; a District wide approach that categorises certain green spaces in the current way needs to be more responsive to this.	Comment noted. The relative importance of the green infrastructure is reflected in various designations and recreational/amenity use, which is then captured within the SA Framework. When considering individual site proposals, contextual consideration will be given to the relative value of the green space, where up to date information is available.
	3 (SA Framework)	Supports SA Objectives 2, 3 and 4 as Bassetlaw District suffers from an existing shortfall in housing numbers.	Comment noted.
	General	States that housing need continues to exceed housing supply within the District and that to maximise the likelihood that housing supply will meet these increasing needs, it is important that all reasonable opportunities for housing growth are explored. Highlights that this will require a review of options available at/around the village as well as larger settlements. States that growth also needs to be supported by opportunities for new jobs and improved education and training. Considers that settlements such as Nether Langwith / Whaley Thorns have a good range of key facilities that would merit a 'service centre' location or equivalent within the District and that there would be a reasonable policy jurisdiction to focus some additional growth in these settlements and reduce the pressure upon an alternative approach that relies too heavily on the main urban areas. Also states that such settlements have the capacity to physically accommodate housing growth within or adjoining the current settlement boundaries without adverse impacts on the settlement form or function and that new housing can serve to underpin retention of these existing services and facilities. Whilst the Council's aspirations to balance housing growth with employment opportunity are noted, states that an artificial capping of housing numbers at relatively modest levels in these settlements could undermine securing such benefits.	Comment noted.

Consultee	Consultation question	Consultee response summary	Response/action
		<p>Considers that within other settlements such as Cuckney there is the potential to deliver a sustainable balance of small scale residential development commensurate with the current form and scale of the village, to assist with the District's overall housing delivery and effective re-use of brownfield sites.</p> <p>In order to sustain a sustainable growth of employment, states that it is crucial that growth is supported within smaller settlements which can support such businesses and more rural economies. Highlights that Welbeck Colliery borders Meden Vale and that housing growth there would support the expansion of the Colliery and also underpin retention of existing services and facilities.</p>	
	3 (SA Framework)	<p>Supports SA Objective 7 (Land Use, Geology and Soils) and states that sites such as the former NCC Depot Site, Cuckney and Langwith Mill, Langwith should play a role in meeting the housing need of the District.</p> <p>Highlights that the use of greenfield land will be required to meet all of the Local Plan objectives.</p>	Comment noted.
	3 (SA Framework)	<p>Supports SA Objective 13 (Cultural Heritage).</p> <p>Whilst supporting the re-use of historic buildings which hold important historic and architectural interest, considers that such re-development must not be rendered unfeasible and unviable due to overly onerous policy and planning obligations. Highlights that often the restoration and preservation of historic buildings require significant investment and that in order to safeguard their future, the Council must recognise a balance has to be struck. Considers that a mechanism to enable such redevelopments could be through the delivery of sympathetically designed new build development either on site or as an offsite provision.</p>	Comment noted.
	3 (SA Framework)	<p>Suggests that the wording of SA Objective 15 (Landscape and Townscape) is amended to replace 'conserve' with 'respect'.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The use of the term</p> <p>'conserve' in the wording of SA Objective 15 reflects the wording of the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance. It is also consistent with the wording of other objectives contained in the SA Framework.</p> <p>No change.</p>
	3 (Site Appraisal Criteria)	<p>With regard to SA Objective 2 (Housing), considers that a more flexible approach should be taken, with the threshold for number of dwellings reduced. States that two smaller sites of 50+ dwellings may be more suitable than a single larger site. Larger sites may also be more difficult to deliver.</p>	<p>Comment noted. It is considered that a threshold of 100 dwellings represents a significant quantum of housing when considered against the objectively assessed housing need identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2013)</p>

Consultee	Consultation question	Consultee response summary	Response/action
			of between 435-500 dwellings per annum (over the period 2010 to 2031). The range of objectives that comprise the SA Framework are intended to help identify those sites that are, in terms of sustainability, more suitable. In this context, the quantum of housing delivery is only one consideration when appraising a site. Further, the SA is not the sole decision making tool and a wider range of issues such as viability will be considered by the Council when determining those sites to be allocated in the Local Plan No change.
	3 (Site Appraisal Criteria)	With regard to SA Objective 3 (Economy and Skills), suggests that the threshold for significant effects is reduced to help secure more local employment opportunities that reduce the need to travel and support the vitality and viability of existing settlements.	Comment noted. It is considered that a threshold of 1ha of employment land is significant when considered against past delivery rates. The range of objectives that comprise the SA Framework are intended to help identify those sites that are, in terms of sustainability, more suitable. In this context, the quantum of employment land to be delivered is only one consideration when appraising a site. No change.
	3 (Site Appraisal Criteria)	With regard to SA Objective 5 (Health and Wellbeing), suggests that access to GP surgeries and access to open space should not be afforded the same weight with greater weight afforded to open space.	Disagree. It is considered that both GP surgeries and open space play an important role in supporting the health and wellbeing of residents. No change.
Architectural Technologist Ltd	1 (Baseline)	Considers that in terms of the baseline analysis, particularly for housing, there appears to be reliance upon Bassetlaw's Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD and the plans at Appendix C appear to follow that guidance. States that the Council cannot show a 5 year housing supply and, as such, policies that have an impact on housing numbers should not be relied upon either in dealing with planning applications or producing new policy documents. Considers that the plans included at Appendix C of the Scoping Report all have development	Comment noted. The purpose of the review of plans and programmes and analysis of baseline information contained in the Scoping Report is to inform the development of the SA Framework.

Consultee	Consultation question	Consultee response summary	Response/action
		<p>boundaries which are a limiting and restrictive tool. Highlights that paragraph 49 of the NPPF is clear on this issue and a recent court of appeal ruling (Richborough Estates site, Willaston, Cheshire) clearly confirms that restrictive policies cannot be relied upon including greenbelt and open countryside policies. The understanding is that if the Council has a 5 year housing supply then it can have confidence in suggesting development boundaries and areas to be left undeveloped. If it has not got a 5 year housing supply then it needs to start from square one rather than reliance upon documents etc that are clearly incorrect and out of date.</p>	<p>The Scoping Report is not a policy document. Instead, it sets out the approach to the SA of the emerging Local Plan. In this context, reference to extant Development Plan policy within the Scoping Report does not imply that this policy will be 'carried forward' into the Local Plan which will be prepared in accordance with the NPPF and subject to examination in public prior to its adoption.</p> <p>No change.</p>
		<p>Questions why the Scoping Report does not contain suggestions as to how the Council proposes to reverse the year on year under supply of housing. Highlights that there is a cumulative undersupply of 600 dwellings and that 2015 figures still showed completions less than the previous year. States that there has to be a fundamental change in the way the Council approach planning for homes.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Scoping Report is not a policy document. Instead it sets out the approach to the SA of the emerging Local Plan. In this context, the Council's policy approach to housing will be set out in the emerging Local Plan, informed by evidence include a Strategic Housing Market Assessment.</p>

Table A1.2 Consultation comments received in relation to the Interim SA Report (October 2016)

Note that this table was originally presented in the SA Report for the Part 1 Draft Bassetlaw Plan (January 2019) and the actions set out in the final column were taken in that report.

Consultee	Consultee response summary	Response/action
Environment Agency	No comments relating to the SA Report.	N/A
Natural England	Natural England expects sufficient evidence to be provided, through the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and the Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA), to justify the site selection process and to ensure sites of least environmental value are selected, e.g. land allocations should avoid designated sites and landscapes.	An outline of how reasonable alternatives were identified is given in Chapter 2 of the SA Report and the reason for selecting or rejecting site options is presented in Appendix 8 . Note that whilst the SA is a factor in the Council's decision-making, it is not the only basis for decision-making.
	The Local Plan should be underpinned by up to date environmental evidence, this should include an assessment of existing and potential components of ecological networks working with Local Nature Partnerships, as recommended by paragraph 165 of the NPPF to inform the Sustainability Appraisal...	The baseline data informing the SA has been reviewed and updated as appropriate. The updated information is presented in Appendix 3 . The note outlining proposed revisions to the SA methodology (subject to consultation with Natural England in July 2018) set out how the ecological network will be considered in the SA. Worcestershire Local Nature Partnership will have the opportunity to comment on this and future SA reports.
	[in relation to air pollution] The environmental assessment of the plan (SA and HRA) should also consider any detrimental impacts on the natural environment, and suggest appropriate avoidance or mitigation measures where applicable.	In line with the SEA Regulations the SA will assess any likely significant environmental effects of the plan on the natural environment, including with regards to air pollution, which is assessed via SA objective 10. The SA also includes information on potential avoidance or mitigation measures as part of the full assessment appendices presented in Chapter 5 and Appendix 6 .
	Natural England advises that one of the main issues which should be considered in the plan and the SA/HRA are proposals which are likely to generate additional nitrogen emissions as a result of increased traffic generation, which can be damaging to the natural environment. The effects on local roads in the vicinity of any proposed development on nearby designated nature conservation sites (including increased traffic, construction of new roads, and upgrading of existing roads), and the impacts on vulnerable sites from air quality effects on the wider road network in the area (a greater distance away from the development) can be assessed using traffic projections and the 200m distance criterion	Air pollution is assessed via SA objective 10 and transport is assessed via SA objective 6. Both of these include consideration of all transport emissions. It is beyond the scope of the SA to consider air pollution impacts in detail for each site, but risk of increased air pollution and proximity to designated biodiversity sites has been considered for each site option. The likely effects of air pollution on

Consultee	Consultee response summary	Response/action
	followed by local Air Quality modelling where required. We consider that the designated sites at risk from <i>local impacts</i> are those within 200m of a road with increased traffic ³ , which feature habitats that are vulnerable to nitrogen deposition/acidification. APIS provides a searchable database and information on pollutants and their impacts on habitats and species.	internationally designated sites has been assessed through the HRA process, which has informed the SA.
	<p>Tranquillity</p> <p>The Local Plan should identify relevant areas of tranquillity and provide appropriate policy protection to such areas as identified in paragraph 123 of the NPPF. Tranquillity is an important landscape attribute in certain areas e.g. within National Parks/AONBs, particularly where this is identified as a special quality. The CPRE have mapped areas of tranquillity which are available here and are a helpful source of evidence for the Local Plan and SEA/SA.</p>	We anticipate that tranquillity will be taken into account in the ongoing work being undertaken by Bassetlaw District Council to inform the SA. A sub-question has been added to SA Objective 14: landscape to refer to tranquillity. The SA will consider the effects of the plan on tranquillity, where appropriate.
Historic England	No comments relating to the SA Report.	N/A

Table A1.3 Consultation comments received in relation to the SA Methodology Consultation (July 2018)

Note that this table was originally presented in the SA Report for the Part 1 Draft Bassetlaw Plan (January 2019).

Consultee	Comment	Action
Natural England	<p>Thank you for your email of 24th July and accompanying documents concerning the revised methodology for the Sustainability Appraisal of Bassetlaw Local Plan.</p> <p>We have reviewed the consultation note on the proposed revisions to the methodology and can confirm that we have no comments.</p>	Noted, no action required.
Historic England	<p>Historic England notes that the 'Cultural Heritage' and 'Landscape and Townscape' site appraisal criteria in Table 4 have yet to be confirmed and we would be happy to assist the Council with work on these, and in relation to strategic sites, in due course if you consider that to be a useful way forward. The HE advice note (HEAN 8) on SEA/SA's may also be of interest to you: https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/sustainability-appraisal-and-strategic-environmental-assessment-advice-note-8/</p> <p>I can advise that there are no concerns with regard to the other proposed revisions to the methodology.</p>	Noted, no action required. Advice will be sought from Historic England when the site appraisal criteria for cultural heritage and landscape and townscape are worked up at a later stage in the SA process.
Environment Agency	<i>No comments received.</i>	N/A

Table A1.4 Consultation comments received in relation to the SA of the Part 1 Draft Bassetlaw Plan (January 2019)

Note that this table was originally presented in the SA Report for the Draft Local Plan (January 2020) and the actions set out in the final column were taken in that report.

Consultee	Consultee comment (summarised where appropriate)	LUC response
<p>Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd</p>	<p>It is necessary for the SA to appraise reasonable alternatives for the Local Plan to properly understand the implications of the Council’s proposed housing requirement. Do not consider that such an assessment has been adequately undertaken. Paragraph 4.41 of the SA notes that it has taken into account the SMOAN [Standard Methodology OAN], updated ONS household projections and an updated evidence base, including a draft EDNA.</p> <p>Para 4.42 of the SA notes the revised set of four housing target options has been appraised. Note that the Interim SA report comments how the options would contribute to HMA-wide OAN and city region employment ambitions. Para 4.42 stresses that these have not been considered because it was considered that up to date figures for wider needs were not available at the time of assessment and the Council no longer considers the Sheffield City Region Strategic Economic Plan figure (636 dpa) to be a reasonable alternative, based on the updated evidence available. This is an inadequate assessment of alternative options - It is vital for the SA to consider the sustainability implications for the delivery of an ambition [sic] Local Plan, including a scenario where the employment land it has permitted comes forward (with the housing growth to support it) and at least consider a level of growth that supports the City Region for which it forms part of the LEP. It is not clear why an increased figure of 636dpa has no longer been considered as a reasonable alternative. The assessment provides an oversimplified and misleading representation of the development options available. The benefits of the options in terms of their housing contribution have been capped once they have exceeded the minimum expectation of the SMOAN. This is not an acceptable assessment of sustainability where planning guidance notes that sustainability of the plan can be enhanced through the provision of additional supply of housing; the Council has sought to boost the supply of housing above the minimum requirements of the SMOAN to increase the sustainability of the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Note that the reasonable alternatives assessed were identified by the Council.</p> <p>The SA has assessed a scenario to support the proposed levels of economic growth, as this is the purpose of Option 4 assessed.</p> <p>The Council no longer considers the 636dpa figure to be a reasonable alternative, as it is significantly higher than the standard methodology and there is no evidence to support such a high housing target.</p> <p>In terms of 'capping' the benefits of options in terms of their housing, the SA simply identifies whether effects are positive or negative, minor or significant. It is a strategic assessment and does not consider a sliding scale of significance. It is considered that all options would be likely to have a significant positive effect on housing provision in the district.</p>
<p>Persimmon Homes & Charles Church</p>	<p>The SA sets out the methodology looking at the likely social, environmental and economic effects of proposed Local Plan policies and proposals to maximise sustainable development. The assessment suggests that significant growth in rural settlements and a lower growth for Worksop and Retford will reduce large scale development on Greenfield sites. The reality is rural settlement growth is as likely to use Greenfield land as urban extensions. An important question is whether the sustainable outcome from adopting a differentiated rural growth pattern is greater than pursuing large scale urban extensions. Don't consider the SA provides sufficient evidence to suggest why a higher apportionment of rural development is sustainable. Bassetlaw is served by three towns; the Largest Worksop (41,000</p>	<p>Greater growth in rural settlements is considered less likely to result in large scale growth on greenfield sites as growth will be more dispersed (i.e. a larger number of smaller sites).</p> <p>The SA highlights the pros and cons of the different spatial strategies and does not identify any as being more sustainable than the others. Table 4.2 of the main body of the SA Report and</p>

Consultee	Consultee comment (summarised where appropriate)	LUC response
	<p>population); Retford (22,000 population) and Harworth (7800 population). The remainder of the District is served by circa 40 or so rural villages & hamlets. The draft Local Plan apportionments: Worksop (24%) 1600 homes; Retford (13%) 853 homes; Harworth (21%) 1400 homes; New villages (15%) 1000 homes; Rural settlements (27%) 1777 homes. The rationale in the SA behind the spatial distribution of housing numbers is questionable. Table 4.2 scores the 5 available spatial approaches against 14 sustainable objectives and provides a brief overview stating whether an approach is considered to provide a positive or negative impact. Unfortunately the level of detail provided to justify positive or negative outcomes lacks the necessary detail to allow a full appreciation of the Council's rationale. Without this detail unable to determine whether the scoring in Table 4.2 is accurate, by extension whether a hybrid or parallel strategy is justified.</p>	<p>accompanying text provides an overview of the assessment. More detailed assessments of each option are presented in Appendix 4 of the SA Report. The Council's reasons for selecting the proposed approach are detailed in Appendix 9 of the SA Report.</p>
Natural England	<p>Note the Sustainability Appraisal follows an appropriate methodology. Note the significant positive effects on biodiversity from strategic objectives 5 to 10.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
Gladman Developments	<p>Should ensure that the results of the SA process conducted through the review clearly justify any policy choices that are ultimately made, including the proposed site allocations (or any decision not to allocate sites) when considered against 'all reasonable alternatives'. In meeting the development needs of the area, it should be clear from the results of the assessment why some policy options have been progressed and others have been rejected. Undertaking a comparative and equal assessment of each reasonable alternative, the Council's decision making, and scoring should be robust, justified and transparent.</p>	<p>Noted. Note that the SA is one of a number of factors considered by the Council in decision-making. The Council's reasons for selecting the proposed approach are detailed in Appendix 9 of the SA Report.</p>
Stone Planning Services on behalf of the Charterpoint Group	<p>Paragraph 4.5 is very much focussed on planned growth commensurate to settlement size with a growth cap of 20%. References are made to 'new homes' with no reference to employment.</p>	<p>This paragraph is explaining Option 7 as it was detailed to LUC by the Council. It was assumed that employment growth would come forward proportionately to housing growth.</p>

Table A1.5 Consultation Comments received in relation to the SA Report for the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan (January 2020)

Note that this table was originally presented in the SA Report for the Draft Local Plan (November 2020) and the actions set out in the final column were taken in that report. References in the final column to chapter numbers etc. relate to the November 2020 version of the SA Report.

Consultee	Consultee response summary	Response/action
Cllr John Shephard Chair of BDC Overview and Scrutiny Committee	Disagrees with the statement in the SA Appendices (page 145) that “cycling provision in the District is around Worksop and Retford. The town centres and their environs have fairly comprehensive networks of dedicated cycling infrastructure, pedestrianised streets and quiet roads suitable for cycling.”	Noted. This statement in the baseline information (Appendix 3) about existing cycling infrastructure has been reviewed and updated with supplementary information from the Council.
Jordan Clark Barton Willmore representing Howard Retford Ltd	<p>Considers that the assessment of alternative options for the Local Plan is inadequate. Consultee states that it is vital for the SA to consider the sustainability implications for the delivery of an ambitious Local Plan, including a scenario where the employment land it has permitted comes forward (with the housing growth to support it) and at least consider a level of growth that supports the City Region for which it forms part of the LEP. Argues that the reasons provided in the SA do not make it clear why an increased figure of 636dpa has no longer been considered as a reasonable alternative.</p> <p>States that the assessment of the development options undertaken provides an oversimplified and misleading representation of the development options available. It is argued that the benefits of the various options in terms of their housing contribution have been capped once they have exceeded the minimum expectation of the standard methodology. Consultee states that this is not an acceptable assessment of sustainability where planning guidance notes that sustainability of the plan can be enhanced through the provision of additional supply of housing.</p>	<p>Noted. The background to the options for the quantum of housing and employment development to be delivered is explained in Chapter 4 of this SA Report. Additional wording has been added to more clearly explain why the 636dpa housing option is not considered by the Council to be a reasonable option.</p> <p>Noted. The appraisal of high level options for the Local Plan is inevitably itself a high level assessment, and in relation to options for the quantum of development, the likely effects cannot be assessed in great detail as it is not known exactly where the development would take place under each option. The appraisal seeks to identify the key differences in sustainability terms between the likely effects of the options. Positive effects are shown as minor or significant – as described in Chapter 2, the threshold for identifying significant effects is largely a matter of professional judgement. Once a significant effect has been identified for an option with higher housing growth against a certain SA objective, increasing the quantum of development above that level will still result in a significant effect (as there is no higher level of significance). In addition, while positive effects on some objectives may be significant where housing numbers are increased, there may be more negative effects (some of which may be significant) on other SA objectives, particularly the environmental objectives. Therefore, the overall sustainability of the Local Plan is not necessarily enhanced by increasing the housing number as far as possible.</p>
NHS Bassetlaw Clinical	Welcomes the recognition within the SA that there is a need to safeguard existing health care facilities and services and ensure the timely delivery of new facilities and services to meet needs arising from new development. It is important to note again that increasing/improving access to	Noted. Access to services via different modes of transport is addressed in the SA by appraising site and policy options against SA objective 6: Transport

Consultee	Consultee response summary	Response/action
Commissioning Group	existing service via appropriate transport is also important to ensuring access to health services and contribution to promoting healthy lifestyles/reducing health inequalities.	
Josh Plant Gladmans	States that the Council should ensure that the results of the SA process clearly justifies any policy choices that are ultimately made, including the proposed site allocations (or any decision not to allocate sites) when considered against 'all reasonable alternatives'. In meeting the development needs of the area, it should be clear from the results of the assessment why some policy options have been progressed and others have been rejected.	Noted. As explained in the SA Report, the SA findings are one of a number of factors that are considered by the Council when deciding which policy and site options to take forward in the Local Plan. Other factors such as the deliverability and accessibility of development site options, for example, will be taken into account, and it is not necessarily the case that the options with the highest number of positive effects and the least negative effects will be, or should be, taken forward in the Local Plan. Appendices 8, 9 and 10 in this SA Report explain the Council's reasons for taking forward certain options and rejecting others.
	Consultee states that Bevercotes Colliery has been subject to SA and agrees with the potential positive sustainability effects identified in relation to Housing, Economy, Regeneration, Health and Wellbeing, Transport and Land Use. Disagrees with the SA effects relating to Biodiversity and Geodiversity, Water, Flood Risk, Cultural Heritage and Landscape and Townscape, which are all scored negative.	Noted. The site options, including the Bevercotes Colliery, have been appraised in line with the assumptions set out in Appendix 5 of this SA Report in order to ensure consistency between all site options appraised.
Roslyn Deeming Natural England	States that the SA follows accepted methodology and guidance. However, also states that in terms of the Bassetlaw Garden Village site at Apleyhead Junction (Upper Morton site) the impact on the Clumber Park SSSI has not been fully considered.	Noted. A potential significant negative effect on biodiversity has been identified in the SA in relation to this allocation at the options stage (see matrix in Appendix 6 and summary in Chapter 5 in the SA Report) and a potential significant negative effect has again been identified in the SA once the provisions of the site allocation policy are taken into account (see Chapter 6). The appraisal has now been updated to refer to the impact on the Clumber Park SSSI as part of the justification for the negative effect identified.
Ian Armstrong	Disagrees with the summary of SA Scores for the Sandhills site. States that the value of open space is undervalued. In particular that the assessment of constructing 75 houses across a significant area of the site will have neither a positive or negative impact on biodiversity.	Noted. The appraisal is consistent with the assumptions set out in Appendix 5 of this SA report.
Nether Langwith	Disagrees with the classification of Nether Langwith as a Small Rural Settlement within Policy ST1 given its contextual relationship with both Langwith and Whaley Thorns and the western part of the settlement of Nether Langwith. Queries whether this spatial relationship and level of amenities afforded to these settlements, within walking distance of the part of Nether Langwith located in Bassetlaw, has been appropriately considered in the settlement hierarchy and SA. The response highlights a number of existing amenities in the settlement to highlight this point.	Noted. The classification of the settlements has been determined by Bassetlaw District Council and the Council has taken into consideration access to facilities within the identification of small rural settlements. No changes are considered necessary to the status of Nether Langwith.
Robert Martin	Consultee comment relates to Site EM007 (address by Policy ST34). It is stated that there could be adverse effects relating to the Local Wildlife site included in the area. The comment refers to paragraphs 6.265 and 6.267 and point 6.272 of the SA, stating that at the minimum the area of the designated Local Wildlife Site should be extended from its current width and length to a minimum width of 100m / 330 ft and a length that includes the entire length of the proposed High	Noted. This comment relates to how the site in question should be developed, making reference to the SA for context, rather than relating to the content of the SA or the appraisal findings for this site.

Consultee	Consultee response summary	Response/action
	Marnham Energy Hub situated alongside the Fledborough to Harby disused Railway line. Also making reference to the findings of the SA (paragraphs 6.289 and 6.294) in relation to policy ST41 and ST42, it is stated that an area could be developed for use by Scout, Cub and Brownie packs operating out of Normanton on Trent and other Bassetlaw villages close to the Hub.	
Historic England	States that the SA refers to heritage assets but it is not clear how impact on the historic environment has been undertaken in respect of the proposed site allocations. On this basis it seems that the Plan puts forward a number of sites which, if developed, have the potential to affect the significance of one or more designated heritage assets in their vicinity. Recommends that further assessment work is undertaken and included in the supporting text of the SA, or within a separate Heritage Topic Paper as part of the evidence base for the Plan to ensure the Plan meets the requirements of the NPPF	Noted. As explained in this SA report, the appraisal of site options in relation to SA objective 13: heritage has now been reviewed and updated to take into account assessment work undertaken by Bassetlaw District Council's heritage officer.

Table A1.6 Consultation Comments received in relation to the SA Report for the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan (November 2020)

Note that any references in the final column to chapter numbers etc. relate to the current version of the SA Report.

Consultee	Consultee response summary	Response/action
Natural England	Natural England acknowledges that the Sustainability Appraisal has now been updated to refer specifically to the potential impacts on Clumber Park SSSI, as we advised in our previous response.	Noted, no action required.
Historic England	<p>In our earlier consultation responses we indicated it was not clear how the historic environment had been considered in respect of the Plan process. We note that additional work has been undertaken but this concern has not been fully addressed.</p> <p>There are some disconnects within the SA itself, for example some sites are identified as having a negative or significant negative effect on heritage or archaeology but this is not addressed in the summary. The disconnects continue into the Historic Environment Site Assessment (November 2020) where in a number of cases the impact sets out the SA position only with no further analysis or consideration of whether a site would be developable in the manner anticipated to achieve the expected housing delivery.</p> <p>Of particular concern is the Historic Environment Site Assessment (November 2020) comment relating to Upper Morton Garden Village where it states that the 'County Council's HER should be consulted'. We would expect that to be undertaken for all potential development allocation sites as part of the Plan process and would welcome clarification as to whether that has been undertaken or not. If not it is of great concern that that some sites which are indicated in the SA as having potential for a negative, or significant negative, effect on archaeology are being taken forward as proposed development sites since it is not clear whether the sites would be developable or deliverable in respect of the historic environment.</p> <p>The considerations are not helped through the separation of archaeology from heritage since archaeology is heritage. This stems from Objective 10 of the Draft Plan which is considered below.</p> <p>There are also inconsistencies in the SA with regard to the site assessments which would need addressing ahead of the next round of consultation. For example, NP18 Land south of Gilbert Avenue, Tuxford is shown as an allocation in the SA text, which also sets out it is not being taken forward.</p> <p>We recommend that further work is undertaken on the SA and the Historic Environment Site Assessment (November 2020) document in relation to the proposed allocation sites and the historic environment ahead of the next round of consultation. In addition, the HER would need to form part of the evidence base of the Plan.</p>	Following receipt of this comment, a meeting was held in February 2021 between Bassetlaw District Council, LUC and Historic England to discuss the issues raised. Following this meeting, LUC reviewed the SA work carried out for site options in relation to the historic environment to ensure that the findings are consistent with the Historic Environment Site Assessment.
Stone Planning Services Limited on behalf of Charterpoint (NG22) Limited	As you will be aware our client has an interest in land East of Markham Moor. Consequently, our comments are confined to the assessment of this site. Land East of Markham Moor (LAA263) is considered on page 78 of the Sustainability Appraisal.	The consultee refers to the SA findings for LAA263 (East of Markham Moor) but it is understood that they are in fact promoting a different site: LAA368 (South of Markham Moor). There appears to have been some confusion between the two options.

Consultee	Consultee response summary	Response/action
	<p>The comments below were made at the previous consultation stage which were submitted to the Council but disappointingly we note that the SA remains unaltered.</p> <p>We would be grateful if the Council would reconsider the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>SA1 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity</u> <p>The SA notes, “Cliff Gate Grassland LWS is within the site and Beacon Hill Grassland is adjacent the site”.</p> <p>The Quants Ecology report commissioned by our client and submitted to the Council in 2019 indicates the former is 0.35km to the north and the latter 0.39km to the west. The Plan is submitted as Plan 1 and is clear that development of the site will not impact on the two LWS’s. No LWSs lie within or adjacent site LAA263.</p> <p>We consider that the assessment is an error which should be corrected. It skews the overall site assessment We conclude that there will be no negative effect on SA Objective 1 and consider there will be no negative impact on Biodiversity and Geodiversity.</p> 2. <u>SA3 – Economy and Skills</u> <p>The Council will be aware that our client has submitted three separate SHLEAAs with regard to site LAA263 - Land east of Markham Moor, Nottinghamshire. The 3 SHELAAAs related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site A - 15.76ha • Site B - 13.61ha • Site C - 6.64ha <p>The commentary refers to an 8.5ha site which doesn’t appear to correlate with any of the 3 SHELAA submission sites. We would be grateful if this could be clarified as the potential economic and skills benefits have been underscored in the assessment. The Site Plans for each are attached to this response.</p> 3. <u>SA8 – Water</u> <p>It is acknowledged that much of the site lies within a Special Protection Zone (SPZ); some of the allocated sites also fall within an SPZ. This is not uncommon in the District. We agree with the potential mitigation measures which could be incorporated in a development. The majority are standard requirements and any additional measures will be undertaken by the developer.</p> 4. <u>SA13 - Cultural Heritage</u> 	<p>The SA findings as quoted, e.g. in relation to the proximity of the site to the LWSs, are correct for LAA263 which is the parcel of land to the east of Markham Moor. This is the 8.5ha site.</p> <p>The 15.76ha site promoted by the consultee has been appraised in the SA as LAA368.</p> <p>In any case, both site options have been appraised in line with the assumptions set out in Appendix 5 of this SA Report in order to ensure consistency between all site options appraised. Only the red line boundary of each site is considered in this initial options appraisal, excluding any potential mitigation measures that may be implemented as a result of allocation.</p> <p>The SA findings are not the only factor which has influenced the selection and rejection of site options by the Council. Appendix 8 sets out the Council’s reasons for selecting or rejecting each site option.</p>

Consultee	Consultee response summary	Response/action
	<p>The site's relationship with heritage assets is recognised. The 2019 SHELAA's considered this and the potential mitigation in detail. We refer the Council to that submission.</p> <p>We note that Paragraph 5.120 states the following site options are identified as having largely negative effects with regards to a higher number of the SA objectives and therefore, if allocated, suitable avoidance and mitigation measures would need to be required within the accompanying site allocation policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • East of Markham Moor (LAA263). • South of Markham Moor (LAA368) • High Marnham Power Station (LAA369). • Carlton Forest (LAA468). <p>The High Marsham Power Station site is being pursued as an allocation and we see no reason why LAA263 should not. Adaptation and mitigation can be undertaken at LAA263 as it can at LAA369. We would be grateful if the Council would further review its Sustainability Appraisal with regard to Site LAA263 - Land east of Markham Moor. It is our firm belief that the site is highly sustainable when assessed against the SA objectives. Furthermore, its location is also commercially attractive to investors such that it is deliverable. Mitigation of any negative impacts set out in the SA can be dealt with and adaptation considered.</p>	
<p>Gladman Developments Ltd promoting former Bevercotes Colliery Site</p>	<p>The response includes an overview of relevant policies and procedures in Local Plan production.</p> <p>With regards to the SA process, the Bassetlaw District Council should ensure that the results of the SA process clearly justify its policy choices. In meeting the development needs of the area, it should be clear from the results of the assessment why some policy options have been progressed, and others have been rejected. Undertaking a comparative and equal assessment of each reasonable alternative, the Bassetlaw Local Plan's decision-making and scoring should be robust, justified and transparent.</p> <p>Gladman encourage Bassetlaw to fully consider the merits of planning for a housing figure beyond the minimum requirement of 288 dwellings per annum. For instance, an increased housing figure would enable Bassetlaw to capture a larger proportion of the £7 billion yearly housebuilder contributions. With 218,000 homes predicted not to be built due to COVID-19 from now to 2024/25, it is also imperative that Bassetlaw Local Plan identifies sufficient land to support the delivery of homes.</p> <p>In order for the housing needs for the whole plan period to be met, it will also be essential to provide sufficient headroom within the housing supply. In this regard, Gladman supports the Home Builders Federation's recommendation that local plan should seek to identify sufficient deliverable sites to provide a 20% buffer between the housing requirement and supply.</p>	<p>Comments are noted. Reasonable alternative options for the overall quantum of development have been considered and the SA findings are set out in Chapter 4 of the SA Report.</p>

Consultee	Consultee response summary	Response/action
	The latest correspondence from Government regarding the revisions to the Standard Method for calculating local housing need will not affect the minimum local housing need which Bassetlaw should Plan for. Nonetheless, it is vital that the Council keeps in touch with the implementation of changes deriving from the White Paper consultation to determine any potential implications for the Local Plan.	

Table A1.7 Consultation Comments received in relation to the SA document that accompanied the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan Focussed Consultation (June 2021)

Note that references in the final column to chapter numbers etc. relate to the current version of the SA Report.

Consultee	Consultee response summary	Response/action
The Coal Authority	<p>Comments that there are some coal mining legacy features, at surface and shallow depth, within the Bassetlaw area which may pose a potential risk to surface stability and public safety. These include mine entries, reported hazards, mine gas sites and fissures. The potential risks posed by these features should be considered when development proposals and site allocations are proposed in areas where they are recorded as being present.</p> <p>Notes that this consultation relates to revisions to the Sustainability Appraisal with regard to a number of policies in the Draft Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>Confirms that the Planning Team at the Coal Authority has no specific comments to make on the revisions proposed to the Sustainability Appraisal.</p>	Noted, no action required.

Appendix 2

Review of Plans, Policies and Programmes

Table A2.1 Review of Plans, Policies and Programmes

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
International Plans and Programmes		
The Cancun Agreement- UNFCCC (2011)		
Shared vision to keep global temperature rise to below two degrees Celsius, with objectives to be reviewed as to whether it needs to be strengthened in future on the basis of the best scientific knowledge available.	No targets or indicators.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Local Plan should aim to reduce emissions. The SA assessment framework should include greenhouse gas emissions.
The Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe (Granada Convention 1985)		
The main purpose of the convention is to reinforce and promote policies for the conservation and enhancement of Europe's heritage and to foster closer European co-operation in defense of heritage. Recognition that conservation of heritage is a cultural purpose and integrated conservation of heritage is an important factor in the improvement of quality of life.	No measurable targets or indicators.	The SA Framework should include an objective on the conservation and enhancement of heritage and decision making criteria on architectural heritage.
The European Convention on the Protection of Archaeological Heritage (Valetta Convention 1992)		
Agreement that the conservation and enhancement of an archaeological heritage is one of the goals of urban and regional planning policy. It is concerned in particular with the need for co-operation between archaeologists and planners to ensure optimum conservation of archaeological heritage.	No measurable targets or indicators.	The SA Framework should include an objective on the conservation and enhancement of heritage and decision making criteria on archaeological heritage.
European Landscape Convention 2000 (became binding March 2007)		
Convention outlined the need to recognise landscape in law, to develop landscape policies dedicated to the protection, management and creation of landscapes, and to establish procedures for the participation of the general public and other	Specific measures include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> raising awareness of the value of landscapes among all sectors of society, and of society's role in shaping them; 	SA objectives must consider the outcomes of the convention should feed into the Local Plan and associated documents.

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
<p>stakeholders in the creation and implementation of landscape policies. It also encourages the integration of landscape into all relevant areas of policy, including cultural, economic and social policies.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • promoting landscape training and education among landscape specialists, other related professions, and in school and university courses; • the identification and assessment of landscapes, and analysis of landscape change, with the active participation of stakeholders; • setting objectives for landscape quality, with the involvement of the public; and • the implementation of landscape policies, through the establishment of plans and practical programmes. 	
United Nations (2015) United Nations Climate Change Conference (COP 21) Paris Agreement		
<p>The agreement's main aim is to keep a global temperature rise this century well below 2 degrees Celsius and to drive efforts to limit the temperature increase even further to 1.5 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels.</p> <p>The 1.5 degree Celsius limit is a significantly safer defense line against the worst impacts of a changing climate.</p> <p>Additionally, the agreement aims to strengthen the ability to deal with the impacts of climate change.</p>	<p>Each Member State to ensure temperature rise this century is below 2 degrees Celsius.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local plan should positively contribute to a low carbon economy. • The SA Framework should include an objective on climatic factors.
UNESCO World Heritage Convention (1972)		
<p>Countries are required to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that measures are taken for the protection, conservation and presentation of cultural and natural heritage • Adopt a general policy that gives cultural and natural heritage a function in the life of the community 	<p>Designation of UNESCO World Heritage Sites.</p>	<p>The SA Framework should include an objective on heritage and archaeological issues.</p>

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
Integrate the protection of heritage into comprehensive planning programmes.		
UNFCCC (1997) The Kyoto Protocol to the UNFCCC		
The Kyoto Protocol to the UNFCCC established the first policy that actively aims to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by industrialised countries.	Construction is a significant source of greenhouse gas emissions due to the consumption of materials and use of energy. The Kyoto Protocol aims to reduce greenhouse gas emissions of the UK by 12.5%, compared to 1990 levels, by 2008 – 2012.	The Kyoto Protocol is influential to achieving sustainable development as it encourages transition to a low carbon economy. Therefore it is an integral factor in planning documents.
World Commission on Environment and Development (1987) Our Common Future (The Brundtland Report)		
<p>The Brundtland Report is concerned with the world's economy and its environment. The objective is to provide an expanding and sustainable economy while protecting a sustainable environment. The Report was a call by the United Nations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to propose long-term environmental strategies for achieving sustainable development by the year 2000 and beyond; • to recommend ways concern for the environment may be translated into greater co-operation among countries of the global South and between countries at different stages of economic and social development and lead to the achievement of common and mutually supportive objectives that take account of the interrelationships between people, resources, environment, and development; • to consider ways and means by which the international community can deal more effectively with environment concerns; and • to help define shared perceptions of long-term environmental issues and the appropriate efforts needed to deal successfully with the problems of protecting and 	The report issued a multitude of recommendations with the aim of attaining sustainable development and addressing the problems posed by a global economy that is intertwined with the environment.	The Brundtland Report provided the original definition of sustainable development. The accumulated effects of the SA objectives seek to achieve sustainable development.

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
<p>enhancing the environment, a long term agenda for action during the coming decades, and aspirational goals for the world community.</p>		
<p>The World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD), Johannesburg, September 2002</p>		
<p>Commitments arising from Johannesburg Summit:</p> <p>Sustainable consumption and production patterns.</p> <p>Accelerate the shift towards sustainable consumption and production - 10-year framework of programmes of action; Reverse trend in loss of natural resources.</p> <p>Renewable Energy and Energy efficiency.</p> <p>Urgently and substantially increase [global] share of renewable energy.</p> <p>Significantly reduce rate of biodiversity loss by 2010.</p>	<p>No targets or indicators, however actions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater resource efficiency; • Support business innovation and take-up of best practice in technology and management; • Waste reduction and producer responsibility; and • Sustainable consumer consumption and procurement. <p>Create a level playing field for renewable energy and energy efficiency.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New technology development • Push on energy efficiency • Low-carbon programmes • Reduced impacts on biodiversity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Plan can encourage greater efficiency of resources. Ensure policies cover the action areas. • The Local Plan can encourage renewable energy. Ensure policies cover the action areas. • The Local Plan can protect and enhance biodiversity. Ensure policies cover the action areas.
<p>National Plans and Programmes</p>		
<p>Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) (2001) The Historic Environment: A Force for our Future</p>		
<p>Report sets the following objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • public interest in the historic environment is matched by firm leadership, effective partnerships, and the development of a sound knowledge base from which to develop policies; • the full potential of the historic environment as a learning resource is realised; 	<p>No key targets.</p>	<p>Local Plan policies should ensure the historic environment is utilised as both a learning resource and an economic asset, whilst ensuring it is sustained for future generations.</p>

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the historic environment is accessible to everybody and is seen as something with which the whole of society can identify and engage; the historic environment is protected and sustained for the benefit of our own and future generations; and the historic environment's importance as an economic asset is skilfully harnessed. 		
DCMS (2008) Heritage Protection for the 21st Century: White Paper		
<p>The Consultation Paper has three core principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developing a unified approach to the historic environment; Maximising opportunities for inclusion and involvement; and Supporting sustainable communities by putting the historic environment at the heart of an effective planning system. 	No formal targets, but a number of measures/recommendations.	The SA Framework should include objectives which take into account the White Paper's principles.
DCMS (2008) Play Strategy for England		
<p>Strategy aims that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In every residential area there are a variety of supervised and unsupervised places for play, free of charge; Local neighbourhoods are, and feel like, safe, interesting places to play; Routes to children's play space are safe and accessible for all children and young people; Parks and open spaces are attractive and welcoming to children and young people, and are well maintained and well used; 	Every local authority will receive at least £1 million in funding, to be targeted on the children most in need of improved play opportunities.	SA Objectives should seek to promote sport and physical activity and promote healthy lifestyles.

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children and young people have a clear stake in public space and their play is accepted by their neighbours; • Children and young people play in a way that respects other people and property; • Children and young people and their families take an active role in the development of local play spaces; and • Play spaces are attractive, welcoming, engaging and accessible for all local children and young people, including disabled children, and children from minority groups in the community. 		
DCLG (2011) Planning for Schools Development		
<p>The Government is firmly committed to ensuring there is sufficient provision to meet growing demand for state-funded school places, increasing choice and opportunity in state-funded education and raising educational standards.</p> <p>It is the Government's view that the creation and development of state-funded schools is strongly in the national interest and that planning decision-makers can and should support that objective, in a manner consistent with their statutory obligations.</p>	There are no specific targets or indicators of relevance.	SA Framework should include a guide question relating to schools.
MHCLG (2021) National Planning Policy Framework		
MHCLG (2021) National Planning Policy Framework.	The general thrust of the NPPF is aimed at contributing towards sustainable development through the planning system. There is a presumption in favour of sustainable development "which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking." There are three dimensions as to how the government aims to achieve sustainable development which gives rise to the need for the planning system to perform	The SA Framework should include objectives covering aspects of sustainable development.

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
	<p>in a number of roles. These roles are based around economic, environmental and social objectives.</p> <p>The NPPF is supported by National Planning Practice Guidance which expands upon and provides additional guidance in respect of national planning policy.</p>	
NPPF – Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Soil	<p>The NPPF sets out core planning principles for plan and decision making, including: 'Conserving and enhancing the natural environment'. The planning system should contribute and enhance the natural and local environment by;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils; • Recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland; • Maintaining the character of the undeveloped coast, while improving public access to it where appropriate; • Minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures; • Preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality, taking into account relevant information such as river basin management plans; and 	SA Framework should include objectives which seek to protect geological sites and improve biodiversity.

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate. <p>Plans and decisions should: distinguish between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites; allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework; take a strategic approach to maintaining and enhancing networks of habitats and green infrastructure; and plan for the enhancement of natural capital at a catchment or landscape scale across local authority boundaries.</p> <p>Local planning authorities should apply the following principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused; • development on land within or outside a SSSI, and which is likely to have an adverse effect on it, should not normally be permitted; • development resulting in the loss of deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists; and • .development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported; while opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity or enhance public access to nature where this is appropriate. 	
NPPF – Landscape	The NPPF sets out core planning principles for plan and decision making, including: 'Conserving and enhancing the	SA Framework should include objectives which seek to protect and improve landscapes

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
	<p>natural environment'. The planning system should contribute and enhance the natural and local environment by;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils ; • Recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services-- including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland; • Maintaining the character of the undeveloped coast, while improving public access to it where appropriate; • Minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures; • Preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality, taking into account relevant information such as river basin management plans; and • Remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate. <p>Plans and decisions should: distinguish between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites; allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework; take a strategic approach to maintaining and enhancing networks of habitats and green infrastructure; and plan for the enhancement of</p>	<p>for both people and wildlife and to protect and maintain vulnerable assets.</p>

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
	<p>natural capital at a catchment or landscape scale across local authority boundaries.</p> <p>Local planning authorities should apply the following principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused; • development on land within or outside a SSSI, and which is likely to have an adverse effect on it, should not normally be permitted; • development resulting in the loss of deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists; and • development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported; while opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity or enhance public access to nature where this is appropriate. 	
NPPF – Cultural Environment	<p>One of the NPPF's core planning principles for plan and decision making is the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment. Local planning authorities are required to set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. The strategy should take into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets, and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation; 	SA Framework should include objectives which seek to maintain vulnerable assets including built and historic.

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The wider, social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring; • The desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness; and • Opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of the place. <p>In determining applications, local authorities should take account of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation; • the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and • the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. 	
NPPF – Water	<p>Among the NPPF's core principles are 'conserving and enhancing the natural environment' and 'meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change'.</p> <p>In fulfilling these objectives, the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • preventing new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. <p>In preparing plans to meet development needs, the aim should be to minimise pollution and other adverse effects on the local and natural environment.</p> <p>Local planning authorities should adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change, taking full account the</p>	SA Framework should include objectives which aim to maintain quality of water and reduce the risk of flooding.

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
	<p>long-term implications for flood risk, coastal change and water supply and demand considerations.</p> <p>Inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future), but where development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Strategic policies should be informed by a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and manage flood risk from all sources. They should consider cumulative impacts in, or affecting, local areas susceptible to flooding, and take account of advice from the Environment Agency and other relevant flood risk management authorities, such as lead local flood authorities and internal drainage boards. Local Plans should apply a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development – taking into account the current and future impacts of climate change-- to avoid where possible flood risk to people and property and manage any residual risk, by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • applying the Sequential Test and then if necessary, the Exception Test; • safeguarding land from development that is required, or likely to be required, for current and future flood management; • using opportunities provided by new development and improvements in green and other infrastructure to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding (making as much as possible of natural flood management techniques as part of an integrated approach to flood risk management); and • where climate change is expected to increase flood risk so that some existing development may not be sustainable in the long-term, seeking opportunities to facilitate the 	

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
	relocation of development, including housing, to more sustainable locations.	
NPPF – Climate Change	<p>One of the core principles of the NPPF is meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change and encourages the adoption of proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change, taking into account the long-term implications for flood risk, coastal change, water supply, biodiversity and landscapes, and the risk of overheating from rising temperatures. The NPPF also supports the transition to a low carbon future by helping to increase the use of renewable and low carbon energy sources.</p> <p>Plans should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide a positive strategy for energy from these sources, that maximises the potential for suitable development, while ensuring that adverse impacts are addressed satisfactorily; consider identifying suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy sources, and supporting infrastructure, where this would help secure their development; and • identify opportunities for development to draw its energy supply from decentralised, renewable or low carbon energy supply systems and for co-locating potential heat customers and suppliers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SA Framework should include objectives which seek to reduce the causes and impacts of climate change. • SA Framework should include objectives which seek to ensure the prudent use of natural resources and the sustainable management of existing resources.
NPPF – Air Quality	Sets out that planning policies should sustain and contribute towards compliance with relevant limit values or national objectives for pollutants, taking into account the presence of Air Quality Management Areas and Clean Air Zones, and the cumulative impacts on air quality from individual sites in local areas. Planning decisions should ensure that any new development in Air Quality Management Areas and Clean Air Zones is consistent with the local air quality action plan.	SA Framework should include objectives which seek to improve air quality.

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
NPPF – Minerals and Waste	<p>One of the core principles of the NPPF is facilitating the sustainable use of minerals. Planning policies should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide for the extraction of mineral resources of local and national importance, but not identify new sites or extensions to existing sites for peat extraction; • So far as practicable, take account of the contribution that substitute or secondary and recycled materials and minerals waste would make to the supply of materials, before considering extraction of primary materials, whilst aiming to source minerals supplies indigenously; • Safeguard mineral resources by defining Mineral Safeguarding Areas and Mineral consultation Areas; and adopt appropriate policies so that known locations of specific minerals resources of local and national importance are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this should be avoided: • Set out policies to encourage the prior extraction of minerals, where practical and environmentally feasible, if it is necessary for non-mineral development to take place; • Safeguard existing, planned and potential sites for: the bulk transport, handling and processing of minerals; the manufacture of concrete and concrete products; and the handling, processing and distribution of substitute, recycled and secondary aggregate material; • Set out criteria or requirements to ensure that permitted and proposed operations do not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment or human health, taking into account the cumulative effects of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or a number of sites in a locality; • When developing noise limits, recognise that some noisy short-term activities, which may otherwise be 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SA Framework should include objectives which seek to reduce the quantity of minerals extracted and imported. • SA Framework should include objectives which seek to reduce the generation and disposal of waste and for its sustainable management.

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
	<p>regarded as unacceptable, are unavoidable to facilitate minerals extraction; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that worked land is reclaimed at the earliest opportunity, taking account of aviation safety, and that high quality restoration and aftercare of mineral sites takes place. 	
NPPF - Economy	<p>One of the NPPF's core planning principles for plan and decision making is building a strong competitive economy. The NPPF highlights the Government's commitment to securing economic growth to create jobs and prosperity, ensuring the planning system does everything it can to support sustainable economic growth.</p> <p>Economic growth in rural areas should be supported to create sustainable growth, including expansion of all types of businesses, diversification of agriculture, supporting sustainable rural tourism and retention of local services, community facilities and character.</p> <p>In drawing up local plans, local authorities should;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set out a clear economic vision and strategy which positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth, having regard to Local Industrial Strategies and other local policies for economic development and regeneration; • Set criteria, or identify strategic sites, for local and inward investment to match the strategy and to meet anticipated needs over the plan period; • Seek to address potential barriers to investment, such as inadequate infrastructure, services or housing, or a poor environment; and <p>Be flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the plan, allow for new and flexible working practices (such</p>	SA Framework should include objectives which seek for the District to achieve a strong and stable economy which offers rewarding and well located employment opportunities to everyone.

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
	<p>as live-work accommodation), and to enable a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances.</p>	
<p>NPPF – Housing</p>	<p>One of the NPPF's core principles is the delivery of a sufficient supply of homes. It is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay.</p> <p>Provision of affordable housing should not be sought for residential developments that are not major developments, other than in designated rural areas (where policies may set out a lower threshold of 5 units or fewer). To support the re-use of brownfield land, where vacant buildings are being reused or redeveloped, any affordable housing contribution due should be reduced by a proportionate amount.</p> <p>Where major development involving the provision of housing is proposed, planning policies and decisions should expect at least 10% of the total number of homes be available for affordable home ownership. Unless this would exceed the level of affordable housing required in the area, or significantly prejudice the ability to meet the identified affordable housing needs of specific groups. Exemptions to this 10% requirement should also be made where the site or proposed development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provides solely for Build to Rent homes; • provides specialist accommodation for a group of people with specific needs (such as purpose-built accommodation for the elderly or students); • is proposed to be developed by people who wish to build or commission their own homes; or • is exclusively for affordable housing, an entry-level exception site or a rural exception site. 	<p>SA Framework should include objectives which encourage the, availability and affordability of housing to everyone.</p>

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
	<p>Strategic policy-making authorities should establish a housing requirement figure for their whole area, which shows the extent to which their identified housing need can be met over the plan period. Within this overall requirement, strategic policies should also set out a housing requirement for designated neighbourhood areas which reflects the overall strategy for the pattern and scale of development and any relevant allocations³⁰. Once the strategic policies have been adopted, these figures should not need retesting at the neighbourhood plan examination, unless there has been a significant change in circumstances that affects the requirement.</p> <p>Planning policies should identify a supply of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • specific, deliverable sites for years one to five of the plan period, and • specific, developable sites or broad location for growth, for years 6-10 and where possible, for years 11-15 of the plan. <p>To promote the development of a good mix of sites local planning authorities should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identify, through the development plan and brownfield registers, land to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare; unless it can be shown, through the preparation of relevant plan policies, that there are strong reasons why this 10% target cannot be achieved; • use tools such as area-wide design assessments and Local Development Orders to help bring small and medium sized sites forward; • support the development of windfall sites through their policies and decisions - giving great weight to the benefits of using suitable sites within existing settlements for homes; and 	

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> work with developers to encourage the sub-division of large sites where this could help to speed up the delivery of homes. <p>To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.</p>	
NPPF – Health	<p>Amongst the planning principles of the NPPF is the promotion of healthy and safe communities.</p> <p>Planning policies and decision should aim to achieve health, inclusive and sage places which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote social interaction, including opportunities for meetings between people who might not otherwise come into contact with each other; Are safe and accessible, so that crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion; and Enable and support healthy lifestyles, especially where this would address identified local health and well-being needs. <p>To provide the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning policies and decisions should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan positively for the provision and use of shared spaces, community facilities, and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments; Take into account and support the delivery of local strategies to improve health, social and cultural well-being for all sections of the community; Guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community's ability to meet its day-to-day needs; 	SA Framework should include objectives which promote healthy communities and healthy living.

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that established shops, facilities and services are able to develop and modernise and are retained for the benefit of the community; and • Ensure an integrated approach to considering the location of housing, economic uses and community facilities and services. <p>Access to a network of high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and physical activity is important for the health and well-being of communities.</p> <p>Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users.</p> <p>Local and neighbourhood plans should identify community green spaces of particular importance (including recreational and tranquillity) to them, ensuring any development of these areas is ruled out in a majority of circumstances.</p>	
NPPF – Transport and Accessibility	<p>Amongst the planning principles of the NPPF is promoting sustainable transport.</p> <p>Transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making, so that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The potential impacts of development on transport networks can be addressed; • Opportunities from existing or proposed transport infrastructure, and changing transport technology and usage, are realised; • Opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified and pursued; • The environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure can be identified assessed and taken into account– including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains; and 	SA Framework should include objectives which seek to reduce road traffic and its impacts and promote sustainable modes of transport.

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patterns of movement, streets, parking and other transport considerations are integral to the design of schemes, and contribute to making high quality places. <p>Planning policies should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support an appropriate mix of uses across an area, and within larger scale sites, to minimise the number and length of journeys needed for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities; • Be prepared with the active involvement of local highways authorities, other transport infrastructure providers and operators and neighbouring Councils, so that strategies and investments for supporting sustainable transport and development patterns are aligned; • identify and protect, where there is robust evidence, sites and routes which could be critical in developing infrastructure to widen transport choice and realise opportunities for large scale development; • Provide for attractive and well-designed walking and cycling networks with supporting facilities such as secure cycle parking; • Provide for any large scale transport facilities that need to be located in the area, and the infrastructure and wider development required to support their operation, expansion and contribution to the wider economy. In doing so they should take into account whether such development is likely to be a nationally significant infrastructure project and any relevant national policy statements; and • Recognise the importance of maintaining a national network of general aviation airfield, and their need to adapt and change over time. 	

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
	All developments that will generate significant amounts of movement should be required to provide a travel plan.	
NPPF – Quality of Life	<p>Two of the core planning principles of the NPPF are: 'Promoting healthy and safe communities', and 'Supporting high quality communications'. The NPPF argues that the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. Local planning authorities should create a shared vision with communities of the residential environment and facilities they wish to see.</p> <p>Local policies and decisions should therefore promote:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safe and accessible environments and developments; • Opportunities for members of the community to mix and meet; • Plan for development and use of high quality shared public space; • Guard against loss of facilities; • Ensure established shops can develop in a sustainable way; and • Ensure integrated approach to housing and community facilities and services. <p>The framework sets out open space, sport and recreation considerations for neighbourhood planning bodies. These include an assessment of needs and opportunities; setting local standards; maintaining an adequate supply of open space and sports and recreational facilities; planning for new open space and sports and recreational facilities; and planning obligations.</p> <p>Advanced, high quality and reliable communications infrastructure is essential for economic growth and social well-</p>	SA Framework should include objectives which seek to improve the quality of life for those living and working within the District.

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
	being. Planning policies should support the expansion of electronic communications networks.	
MHCLG (2021) Planning Practice Guidance		
Planning Practice Guidance is designed to support the NPPF. It reflects the objectives of the NPPF which are not repeated here.	No formal targets identified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Plan should reflect the Planning Practice Guidance. • The SA Framework should reflect the principles of the NPPF and the Planning Practice Guidance.
HM Government (2003) The Urban Waste Water Treatment Regulations		
The Regulations protect the environment from the adverse effects of urban waste water discharges and certain industrial sectors, notably domestic and industrial waste water. The regulations require the collection of waste water and specifies how different types of waste water should be treated, disposed and reused.	<p>The Regulations require specific:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collection and treatment of waste water standards for relevant population thresholds • Secondary treatment standards • A requirement for pre-authorisation of all discharges of urban wastewater <p>Monitoring of the performance of treatment plants and receiving waters and Controls of sewage sludge disposal and re-use, and treated waste water re-use.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SA Objectives should include priorities to minimise adverse effects on ground and/or surface water.
HM Government (2017) The Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) Regulations		
The Regulations protect inland surface waters, transitional waters, coastal waters and groundwater, and outlines the associated river basin management process.	<p>All surface water bodies should achieve good ecological status and good chemical status by December 2021.</p> <p>Production of River Basin Management Plans.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Plan policies should consider how the water environment can be protected and enhanced. This will come about through reducing pollution and abstraction.

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SA Framework should consider effects upon water quality and resource. Protection and enhancement of water courses can be can also come about through physical modification. Spatial planning will need to consider whether watercourse enhancement can be achieved through working with developers.
HM Government (2016) The Water Supply (Water Quality) Regulations		
<p>The Regulations focus on the quality of water for drinking, washing, cooking and food preparation, and for food production. Their purpose is to protect human health from the adverse effects of any contamination of water intended for human consumption by ensuring it is wholesome and clean.</p>	<p>Sets levels of certain characteristics, elements and substances that are allowed in drinking water to protect public health, and how much of each substance should be in the water supply.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local Plan should recognise that development can impact upon water quality and include policies to protect the resources. SA Framework should consider objectives relating to water quality
HM Government (2016) The Nitrate Pollution Prevention Regulations		
<p>The Regulations provide for the designation of land as nitrate vulnerable zones and imposes annual limits on the amount of nitrogen from organic manure that may be applied or spread in a holding in a nitrate vulnerable zone. The Regulations also specify the amount of nitrogen to be spread on a crop and how, where and when to spread nitrogen fertiliser, and how it should be stored. It also establishes closed periods during which the spreading of nitrogen fertiliser is prohibited.</p>	<p>Provides for the identification of vulnerable areas.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local Plan should consider impacts of development upon any identified nitrate sensitive areas where such development fails to be considered within its scope. Policies should consider objective to promote environmentally sensitive agricultural practices.
HM Government (2010) The Air Quality Standards Regulations (as amended)		
<p>The Regulations set out limits on concentrations of outdoor air pollutants that impact public health, most notably particulate</p>	<p>Sets limits on concentrations of:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local Plan policies should consider the maintenance of good air quality and the

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
<p>matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) and nitrogen dioxide (NO₂). It also sets out the procedure and requirements for the designation of Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs).</p>	<p>PM₁₀ PM_{2.5} Nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) Oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) Sulphur dioxide (SO₂) Lead Benzene Carbon Monoxide (CO)</p>	<p>measures that can be taken to improve it through, for example, an encouragement to reduce vehicle movements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SA Framework should include objectives relating to air quality.
<p>HM Government (2006) The Environmental Noise Regulations (as amended)</p>		
<p>The Regulations apply to environmental noise, mainly from transport. The regulations require regular noise mapping and action planning for road, rail and aviation noise and noise in large urban areas. They also require Noise Action Plans based on the maps for road and rail noise and noise in large urban areas. The Action Plans identify Important Areas (areas exposed to the highest levels of noise) and suggest ways the relevant authorities can reduce these. Major airports and those which affect large urban areas are also required to produce and publish their own Noise Action Plans separately. The Regulations do not apply to noise from domestic activities such as noise created by neighbours; at work places; inside means of transport; or military activities in military areas.</p>	<p>No formal targets identified.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Local Plan will need to have regard to the requirements of the Environmental Noise Directive. The SA framework should include the protection against excessive noise.
<p>HM Government (2020) The Waste (Circular Economy) (Amendment) Regulations</p>		
<p>The Regulations amend a range of legislation to prevent waste generation and to monitor and assess the implementation of measures included in waste prevention programmes. They set out requirements to justify not separating waste streams close</p>	<p>No formal targets identified.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Local Plan should promote the circular economy.

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
<p>to source for re-use, recycling or other recovery operations, prohibit incineration and landfilling of waste unless such treatment process represent the best environmental outcome in accordance with the waste hierarchy. The Regulations set out when waste management plans and in waste prevention programmes are required. The Regulations focus on the circular economy as a means for businesses to maximise the value of waste and waste treatment.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SA framework should include an objective to minimise waste and promote sustainable waste management.
HM Government (2021) The Energy Performance of Buildings Regulations		
<p>The Regulations seek to improve the energy efficiency of buildings, reducing their carbon emissions and lessening the impact of climate change. The Regulations require the adoption of a standard methodology for calculating energy performance and minimum requirements for energy performance, reported through Energy Performance Certificates and Display Energy Certificates.</p>	<p>Requires energy performance certification.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Directive will help manage energy demand and thus reduce consumption. As a result it should help reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and ensure future energy security.
HM Government (2013) The Bathing Water Regulations		
<p>Seeks to protect and enhance the quality of bathing waters and enable the public to be informed about bathing water quality.</p>	<p>Sets standards for the quality of bathing waters in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the physical, chemical and microbiological parameters; the mandatory limit values and indicative values for such parameters; and the minimum sampling frequency and method of analysis or inspection of such water. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local Plan should recognise that development can impact upon water quality and include policies to protect the resources. SA Framework should consider objectives relating to water quality.
MHCLG (2020) White Paper: Planning for the future		
<p>Proposes reforms of the planning system to streamline and modernise the planning process, bring a new focus to design and sustainability, improve the system of developer</p>	<p>The White Paper sets out five core proposals to reform the planning system:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SA Framework should include objectives which seek to improve the quality of design.

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
<p>contributions to infrastructure, and ensure more land is available for development where it is needed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Streamlining the planning process with more democracy taking place more effectively at the plan-making stage and replacing the entire corpus of plan-making law in England. A digital-first approach to modernise the planning process. A focus on design and sustainability. Improving infrastructure delivery in all parts of the country and ensuring developers play their part Ensuring more land is available for the homes and development people and communities need, and to support renewal of our town and city centres. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SA Framework should include objectives which seek to secure the provision of appropriate levels of infrastructure to support development. The SA Framework should include objectives which seek to ensure the appropriate level of new homes are provided and town centres are protected and enhanced.
<p>DCLG (2014) National Planning Policy for Waste</p>		
<p>Sets out detailed waste planning policies for local authorities. States that planning authorities need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use a proportionate evidence base in preparing Local Plans Identify sufficient opportunities to meet the needs of their area for the management of waste streams Identifying suitable sites and areas. 	<p>The overall objective of the policy is to deliver sustainable development by protecting the environment and human health by producing less waste and by using it as a resource wherever possible.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local Plan should consider opportunities to reduce waste and encourage recycling and composting e.g. integration of recycling and composting facilities into new development and use of recycled materials in new buildings. SA Framework should consider objectives which relate to re-use, recycle and reduce.
<p>DCLG (2014) House of Commons: Witten Statement on Sustainable Drainage Systems</p>		
<p>Under these arrangements, in considering planning applications, local planning authorities should consult the relevant lead local flood authority on the management of surface water; satisfy themselves that the proposed minimum standards of operation are appropriate and ensure through the use of planning conditions or planning obligations that there are clear arrangements in place for ongoing maintenance over the</p>	<p>There are no specific targets or indicators of relevance.</p>	<p>SA Framework should include a guide question relating to Sustainable Drainage Systems.</p>

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
lifetime of the development. The sustainable drainage system should be designed to ensure that the maintenance and operation requirements are economically proportionate.		
DCLG (2015) Planning Policy for Traveller Sites		
<p>This document sets out the Government's planning policy for traveller sites. It identifies the following aims:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that local planning authorities should make their own assessment of need for the purposes of planning • to ensure that local planning authorities, working collaboratively, develop fair and effective strategies to meet need through the identification of land for sites • to encourage local planning authorities to plan for sites over a reasonable timescale • that plan-making and decision-taking should protect Green Belt from inappropriate development • to promote more private traveller site provision while recognising that there will always be those travellers who cannot provide their own sites • that plan-making and decision-taking should aim to reduce the number of unauthorised developments and encampments and make enforcement more effective • for local planning authorities to ensure that their Local Plan includes fair, realistic and inclusive policies • to increase the number of traveller sites in appropriate locations with planning permission, to address under provision and maintain an appropriate level of supply • to reduce tensions between settled and traveller communities in plan making and planning decisions 	No formal targets are identified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Plan will need to make appropriate provision for traveller sites, in accordance with national planning policy. • SA Framework should include a specific guide question relating to provision for travellers.

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to enable provision of suitable accommodation from which travellers can access education, health, welfare and employment infrastructure, and for local planning authorities to have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. 		
Department for Education (2014) Home to School Travel and Transport Guidance		
<p>There are five main elements to the duty which local authorities must undertake:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> an assessment of the travel and transport needs of children, and young people within the authority's area; an audit of the sustainable travel and transport infrastructure within the authority's area that may be used when travelling to and from, or between schools/institutions; a strategy to develop the sustainable travel and transport infrastructure within the authority so that the travel and transport needs of children and young people are best catered for; the promotion of sustainable travel and transport modes on the journey to, from, and between schools and other institutions; and the publication of Sustainable Modes of Travel Strategy. 	<p>There are no specific targets or indicators of relevance.</p>	<p>SA Framework should include a guide question relating to accessibility to Schools and Transport.</p>
Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC) (2009) The UK Low Carbon Transition Plan: National Strategy for Climate and Energy		
<p>This Paper plots out how the UK will meet the cut in emissions set out in the budget of 34% on 1990 levels by 2020. The Plan includes:</p>	<p>Sets out a vision that by 2020:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More than 1.2 million people will be in green jobs; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategy covers a number of SA objectives including climate change, energy and air quality; landscape; geology and biodiversity; and waste.

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New money for a 'smart grid', and to help regions and local authorities prepare for and speed up planning decisions on renewable and low carbon energy whilst protecting legitimate environmental and local concerns; • Funding to significantly advance the offshore wind industry in the UK; • Funding to cement the UK's position as a global leader in wave and tidal energy; • Funding to explore areas of potential "hot rocks" to be used for geothermal energy; • Challenging 15 villages, towns or cities to be testbeds for piloting future green initiatives; • Support for anaerobic digestion; • Encouraging private funding for woodland creation; and • Reducing the amount of waste sent to landfill, and better capture of landfill emissions etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 million homes will have benefited from whole house makeovers, and more than 1.5 million households will be supported to produce their own clean energy; • Around 40 percent of electricity will be from low-carbon sources, from renewables, nuclear and clean coal; • We will be importing half the amount of gas that we otherwise would; and • The average new car will emit 40% less carbon than now. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Plan & associated documents must recognise the importance to cut emissions in line with national targets.
Department for Transport (2018) The Road to Zero		
<p>Outlines how the government will support the transition to zero emission road transport and reduce emissions from conventional vehicles during the transition up to 2050 and beyond.</p>	<p>The long-term ambition of the document is to put the UK at the forefront of the design and manufacturing of zero emission vehicles, and for all new cars and vans to be effectively zero emission by 2040. At least 50%, and as many as 70%, of new car sales and up to 40% of new van sales are expected to be ultra low emission by 2030. As part of this approach the document sets out a number of related overarching objectives including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Driving uptake of the cleanest new vehicles; • Reduce emissions from heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) and road freight; and 	<p>SA Framework should include an objective which seeks to support the uptake of electric vehicles.</p>

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supporting the development of one of the best electric vehicle infrastructure networks in the world. 	
Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy (2017) Clean Growth Strategy		
<p>Seeks to set out the path for growing the national income while cutting greenhouse gas emissions.</p>	<p>The strategy contains a number of proposals to help drive emissions down throughout the next decade:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop world leading Green Finance capabilities Improve Business and Industry Efficiency Improve Our Homes Accelerating the Shift to Low Carbon Transport Delivering Clean, Smart, Flexible Power Enhancing the Benefits and Value of Our Natural Resources Leading in the Public Sector Government Leadership in Driving Clean Growth 	<p>SA Framework should include an objective which seeks to promote economic growth as well as limiting carbon emissions.</p>
Department for Transport (2020) Decarbonising Transport: Setting the Challenge		
<p>Seeks to provide the first step to deliver the emissions reduction needed from transport.</p>	<p>Includes six strategic priorities for the Transport Decarbonisation Plan, to deliver a vision of a net zero transport system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accelerating modal shift to public and active transport; Decarbonising road vehicles; Decarbonising how we get our goods; Place-based solutions (i.e. considering where, how and why emissions occur in specific locations); Promoting UK as a hub for green transport technology and innovation; and Reducing carbon in the global economy (including recognising the international nature of aviation and maritime). 	<p>SA Framework should include an objective which seeks to promote sustainable modes of transport.</p>
Department for Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) (2019) Clean Air Strategy		

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
The strategy sets out plans for dealing with all sources of air pollution, to make our air healthier to breathe, protect nature and boost the economy.	Proposes new goals to cut public exposure to particulate matter pollution, as recommended by the World Health Organization.	SA Framework should include an objective which seeks to reduce air pollution in the plan area.
Department for Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) (2018) A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment		
Sets out goals for improving the environment within the next 25 years. It details how the Government will work with communities and businesses to leave the environment in a better state than it is presently.	To develop policies that encourages the protection and enhancement of the natural environment.	Include sustainability objective / appraisal question that relates to the protection and enhancement of the natural environment.
Defra (2007) The Air Quality Strategy for England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland		
This document provides an overview and outline of the UK Government and devolved administrations' ambient (outdoor) air quality policy. It sets out a way forward for work and planning on air quality issues, details objectives to be achieved, and proposes measures to be considered further to help reach them.	Strategy details various targets and limits relating emissions from a variety of sources.	The Local Plan should look to positively enhance the air quality of the District.
Defra (2007) Strategy for England's Trees, Woods and Forests		
<p>Key aims for government intervention in trees, woods and forests are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to secure trees and woodlands for future generations; • to ensure resilience to climate change; • to protect and enhance natural resources; • to increase the contribution that trees, woods and forests make to our quality of life; and • to improve the competitiveness of woodland businesses and products. 	Strategy aims to create 2,200 hectares of wet woodland in England by 2010.	Plan policies to protect and enhance trees, woods and forests. In turn ensuring resilience to climate change.

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
<p>These aims will form the basis on which the Delivery plan will be developed by Natural England and the Forestry Commission England (FCE). The strategy provides a national policy direction, which can be incorporated alongside regional priorities within regional forestry frameworks.</p>		
<p>Defra (2009) Safeguarding Our Soils: A Strategy for England</p>		
<p>The strategy is underpinned by the following vision:</p> <p>By 2030, all England's soils will be managed sustainably and degradation threats tackled successfully. This will improve the quality of England's soils and safeguard their ability to provide essential services for future generations.</p> <p>Achieving this vision will mean that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • agricultural soils will be better managed and threats to them will be addressed; • soils will play a greater role in the fight against climate change and in helping us to manage its impacts; • soils in urban areas will be valued during development, and construction practices will ensure vital soil functions can be maintained; and • pollution of our soils is prevented, and our historic legacy of contaminated land is being dealt with. 	<p>No further targets identified.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Plan should seek to protect soil quality where appropriate. • The SA Framework should include an objective/guide question relating to the effects of policies/proposals on soils.
<p>Defra (2011) Biodiversity 2020: A Strategy for England's Wildlife and Ecosystem Services</p>		
<p>The Strategy is designed to help to deliver the objectives set out in the Natural Environment White Paper.</p>	<p>The strategy includes the following priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creating 200,000 hectares of new wildlife habitats by 2020; 	<p>Develop policies that support the vision emphasising biodiversity.</p>

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Securing 50% of SSSIs in favourable condition, while maintaining at least 95% in favourable or recovering condition; • Encouraging more people to get involved in conservation by supporting wildlife gardening and outdoor learning programmes; and • Introducing a new designation for local green spaces to enable communities to protect places that are important to them. 	
Defra (2011) Natural Environment White Paper: The Natural Choice: Securing the Value of Nature		
<p>The Natural Environment White paper sets out the Government's plans to ensure the natural environment is protected and fully integrated into society and economic growth.</p>	<p>The White Paper sets out four key aims:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • protecting and improving our natural environment; • growing a green economy; • reconnecting people and nature; and • international and EU leadership, specifically to achieve environmentally and socially sustainable economic growth, together with food, water, climate and energy security and to put the EU on a path towards environmentally sustainable, low-carbon and resource-efficient growth, which is resilient to climate change, provides jobs and supports the wellbeing of citizens. 	<p>Develop policies that support the vision emphasising biodiversity.</p>
Defra (2012) UK post 2010 Biodiversity Framework		
<p>The Framework is to set a broad enabling structure for action across the UK between now and 2020:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To set out a shared vision and priorities for UK- scale activities, in a framework jointly owned by the four countries, and to which their own strategies will contribute; 	<p>The Framework sets out 20 new global 'Aichi targets' under 5 strategic goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address the underlying causes of biodiversity loss by mainstreaming biodiversity across government and society; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Plan policies should seek to protect biodiversity. • The SA framework should ensure that the objectives of biodiversity are taken into consideration.

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To identify priority work at a UK level which will be needed to help deliver the Aichi targets and the EU Biodiversity Strategy; To facilitate the aggregation and collation of information on activity and outcomes across all countries of the UK, where the four countries agree this will bring benefits compared to individual country work; and To streamline governance arrangements for UK- scale activity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce the direct pressures on biodiversity and promote sustainable use; To improve the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems species and genetic diversity; Enhance the benefits to all from biodiversity and ecosystem services; and Enhance implementation through participatory planning, knowledge management and capacity building. 	
Defra (2018) The National Adaptation Programme and the Third Strategy for Climate Adaptation Reporting– Making the Country Resilient to a Changing Climate		
<p>This Programme contains a mix of policies and actions to help adapt successfully to future weather conditions, by dealing with the risks and making the most of the opportunities.</p> <p>It sets out six priority areas of climate change risks for the UK:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flooding and coastal change risks to communities, businesses and infrastructure; Risks to health, well-being and productivity from high temperatures; Risks of shortages in the public water supply for agriculture, energy generation and industry; Risks to natural capital including terrestrial, coastal, marine and freshwater ecosystems, soil and biodiversity; Risks to domestic and international food production and trade; and New and emerging pests and diseases and invasive non-native species affecting people, plants and animals. 	<p>Local Planning Authorities are required under the Planning Act 2008 to adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change. The Programme identifies a number of actions although no formal targets are identified.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local Plan proposals should seek to mitigate and adapt to the effect of climate change. The SA Framework should include and objective/guide question relating to climate change adaptation.
Defra (2013) Waste Management Plan for England		

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
<p>Sets out the Government's ambition to work towards a more sustainable and efficient approach to resource use and management.</p> <p>The document includes measures to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage reduction and management of packaging waste; • Promote high quality recycling; • Encourage separate collection of bio-waste; and • Promote the re-use of products and preparing for re-use activities. 	<p>The Plan seeks to ensure that by 2020 at least 50% of weight waste from households is prepared for re-use or recycled and at least 70% by weight of construction and demolition waste is subject to material recovery.</p>	<p>The Local Plan should consider opportunities to reduce waste and encourage recycling and composting.</p>
<p>Environment Agency (2016) Managing Water Abstraction</p>		
<p>Managing Water Abstraction (2016) sets out how the Environment Agency will manage water resources in England and Wales. It is the overarching document that links together its abstraction licensing strategies. The availability of water resources for abstraction is assessed through the Catchment Abstraction Management Strategy (CAMS) approach.</p>	<p>No targets identified.</p>	<p>The Local Plan should consider the objectives relating to water abstraction.</p>
<p>Environment Agency (2013) Water Stress Areas - Final Classifications</p>		
<p>This report sets out the revised methodology developed by the Environment Agency and Natural Resources Wales for the classification of areas of water stress in England and Wales. The Anglian Water area is designated as being in 'serious water stress.'</p>	<p>No targets identified.</p>	<p>The Local Plan and SA should consider the impacts of proposals on water resources.</p>
<p>Forestry Commission (2005) Trees and Woodlands Nature's Health Service</p>		
<p>An advisory document which provides detailed examples of how the Woodland Sector (trees, woodlands and green spaces) can significantly contribute to people's health, well-being (physical,</p>	<p>No targets identified.</p>	<p>The SA Framework should include objectives which relate to providing more equal access to</p>

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
psychological and social) and quality of life. Increasing levels of physical activity is a particular priority.		opportunities, services and facilities for recreation.
Historic England (2015) Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 1		
The purpose of this Historic England Good Practice Advice note is to provide information on good practice to assist local authorities, planning and other consultants, owners, applicants and other interested parties in implementing historic environment policy in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the related guidance given in the National Planning Practice Guide (PPG).	There are no specific targets or indicators of relevance.	SA Framework should include an objective relating to the historic environment.
HM Government (1979) Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act		
This is the main legislation concerning archaeology in the UK. This Act, building on legislation dating back to 1882, provides for nationally important archaeological sites to be statutorily protected as Scheduled Ancient Monuments. Section 61(12) defines sites that warrant protection due to their being of national importance as 'ancient monuments'. These can be either Scheduled Ancient Monuments or "any other monument which in the opinion of the Secretary of State is of public interest by reason of the historic, architectural, traditional, artistic or archaeological interest attaching to it".	There are no specific targets or indicators of relevance.	<p>The SA framework should aim to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include objectives relating to the protection of the historic environment. • Assess how the NPS should seek to avoid adverse impacts on Ancient Monuments and Areas of Archaeological Importance.
The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (JNCC, 1981)		
The main UK legislation relating to the protection of named animal and plant species includes legislation relating to the UK network of nationally protected wildlife areas: Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs). Various amendments have occurred since the original enactment.	Under this Act, Natural England has responsibility for identifying and protecting SSSIs in England.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop policies that identify and continue the protection of SSSIs within the District. • Consider targets that require 95% of SSSI's within region to be of a favourable condition.

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
HM Government (1990) Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended)		
<p>This Act was passed to better regulate the way in which large and small scale developments were approved by local authorities in England and Wales. It provides local planning authorities the power to take steps requiring land to be cleaned up when conditions adversely affect the amenity of an area.</p>	<p>There are no specific targets or indicators of relevance.</p>	<p>The SA should aim to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider the impacts of network improvements on towns/cities where relevant
HM Government (2000) Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000		
<p>This Act:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> gives people greater freedom to explore open country on foot; creates a duty for Highway Authorities and National Park Authorities to establish Local Access Forums; provides a cut-off date of 1 January 2026 for the recording of certain rights of way on definitive maps and the extinguishment of those not so recorded by that date; offers greater protection to wildlife and natural features, better protection for Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and more effective enforcement of wildlife legislation; and protects Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty with legislation similar to that for National Parks. 	<p>Act seeks to protect sites of landscape and wildlife importance.</p>	<p>SA objectives should seek to protect areas of landscape and wildlife importance.</p>
HM Government (2005) Securing the future - delivering UK sustainable development strategy		
<p>The Strategy has 5 guiding principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Living within environmental limits Ensuring a strong, healthy and just society 	<p>The Strategy contains a new set of indicators to monitor progress towards sustainable development in the UK. Those most relevant at the District level include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greenhouse gas emissions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider how the Local Plan can contribute to Sustainable Development Strategy Objectives. Consider using some of the indicators to monitor the effects of

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Achieving a sustainable economy Promoting good governance Using sound science responsibly <p>and 4 strategic priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> sustainable consumption and production natural resource protection and environmental enhancement building sustainable communities climate change and energy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Road freight (CO₂ emissions and tonne km, tonnes and GDP) Household waste (a) arisings (b) recycled or composted Local environmental quality 	<p>the Local Plan and as basis for collecting information for the baseline review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SA Framework should reflect the guiding principles of the Strategy.
HM Government (2006) The Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 (as amended)		
<p>The Act:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> makes provision about bodies concerned with the natural environment and rural communities; makes provision in connection with wildlife, sites of special scientific interest, National Parks and the Broads; amends the law relating to rights of way; makes provision as to the Inland Waterways Amenity Advisory Council; and provides for flexible administrative arrangements in connection with functions relating to the environment and rural affairs and certain other functions; and for connected purposes. 	<p>Act contains no formal targets.</p>	<p>SA objectives must consider the importance of conserving biodiversity and landscape features as set out in the Act.</p>
HM Government (2008) The Climate Change Act 2008 (as amended)		
<p>This Act aims:</p>	<p>The Act sets legally binding targets - Greenhouse gas emission reductions through action in the UK and abroad of at net zero by</p>	<p>Act sets out a clear precedent for the UK to lead in responding to the threats climate</p>

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to improve carbon management and help the transition towards a low carbon economy in the UK; and to demonstrate strong UK leadership internationally, signalling that the UK is committed to taking its share of responsibility for reducing global emissions in the context of developing negotiations on a post-2012 global agreement at Copenhagen next year. 	<p>2050, and reductions in CO₂ emissions of at least 26% by 2020, against a 1990 baseline.</p> <p>Further the Act provides for a carbon budgeting system which caps emissions over five year periods, with three budgets set at a time, to set out our trajectory to 2050. The first three carbon budgets will run from 2008-12, 2013-17 and 2018-22, and must be set by 1 June 2009.</p>	<p>change provides. The Local Plan and associated documents must ensure that greenhouse gases are reduced or minimised and that energy use comes increasingly from renewable sources.</p>
HM Government (2009) The UK Renewable Energy Strategy		
<p>Strategy sets out to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Put in place the mechanisms to provide financial support for renewable electricity and heat worth around £30 billion between now and 2020; Drive delivery and clear away barriers; Increase investment in emerging technologies and pursue new sources of supply; and Create new opportunities for individuals, communities and business to harness renewable energy. 	<p>A vision is set out in the document whereby by 2020:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More than 30% of our electricity generated from renewables; 12% of our heat generated from renewables; and 10% of transport energy from renewables. 	<p>The SA Framework should include objectives which seek to provide support for renewable energy.</p>
HM Government (2017) The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended)		
<p>This is the UK transposition of EC Directive 92/43/EC on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora. It was amended by the EU Exit version of the Regulations to account for the UK leaving the EU.</p>	<p>The Regulations provide for the designation and protection of 'European sites' and the national site network, the protection of 'European protected species', and the adaptation of planning and other controls for the protection of European Sites.</p>	<p>The SA Framework should include objectives which seek to conserve the natural environment.</p>
HM Government (2010) Flood and Water Management Act 2010 (as amended)		
<p>The Flood and Water Management Act 2010 makes provisions about water, including provision about the management of risks in connection with flooding and coastal erosion.</p>	<p>Those related to water resources, include:</p>	<p>The SA Framework should include an objective and/or guide questions relating to flood risk.</p>

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To widen the list of uses of water that water companies can control during periods of water shortage, and enable Government to add to and remove uses from the list. • To encourage the uptake of sustainable drainage systems by removing the automatic right to connect to sewers and providing for unitary and county Councils to adopt SUDS for new developments and redevelopments. • To reduce 'bad debt' in the water industry by amending the Water Industry Act 1991 to provide a named customer and clarify who is responsible for paying the water bill. • To make it easier for water and sewerage companies to develop and implement social tariffs where companies consider there is a good cause to do so, and in light of guidance that will be issued by the Secretary of State following a full public consultation. 	
HM Government (2011) Carbon Plan: Delivering our Low Carbon Future		
<p>This sets out how the UK will achieve decarbonisation within the framework of energy policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To make the transition to a low carbon economy while maintaining energy security, and minimising costs to consumers, particularly those in poorer households. 	No key targets.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Plan should consider policies in term of access by low-carbon means and also the capacity for sites to use low carbon sources of energy. • The SA needs to ensure that the plan is embracing the low carbon agenda and appropriate sustainability objectives are utilised to assess the plan's credentials in terms of a low carbon future and the impact it could have on climate change.
HM Government (2011) UK Marine Policy Statement		
This document provides the framework for marine planning and taking decisions affecting the UK marine area. It outlines the UK	No specific indicators or targets.	The SA should aim to:

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
<p>Administrations' vision for the UK marine area, general principles for decision making and the high level approach to marine planning that will contribute to delivering this vision and so achievement of sustainable development. It sets out the environmental, social and economic considerations that need to be taken into account.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include objectives for the protection of water resources; • Include objectives relating to access to employment and regeneration areas and access to services.
<p>HM Government (2011) Water for Life, White Paper</p>		
<p>Water for Life describes a vision for future water management in which the water sector is resilient, in which water companies are more efficient and customer focused and in which water is valued as the precious and finite resource it is.</p>	<p>There are no formal targets or indicators.</p>	<p>Local Plan should take into account the vision of this document as a means of protecting existing water resources.</p>
<p>HM Government (2013) The Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) Regulations 2013</p>		
<p>The Community Infrastructure Level (CIL) is a charge which may be applied to new developments by local authorities. The money can be used to support development by funding infrastructure that the Council, local community and neighbourhoods want.</p>	<p>No key targets.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Plan should make some reference to the possibility of a Charging Schedule, as per the regulations. • The SA should make some reference to how proposed development will improve the social, economic and environmental issues that exist in areas that will accommodate housing.
<p>NHS England (2014) Five Year Forward View</p>		
<p>The NHS Five Year Forward View was published on 23 October 2014 and sets out a new shared vision for the future of the NHS based around the new models of care. It has been developed by the partner organisations that deliver and oversee health and care services including Care Quality Commission, Public Health</p>	<p>No specific indicators or targets.</p>	<p>SA Framework should include a question relating to health.</p>

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
<p>England and NHS Improvement (previously Monitor and National Trust Development Authority).</p> <p>Patient groups, clinicians and independent experts have also provided their advice to create a collective view of how the health service needs to change over the next five years if it is to close the widening gaps in the health of the population, quality of care and the funding of services.</p>		
<p>Regional Plans and Programmes</p>		
<p>Anglian Water (2015) Water Resources Management Plan</p>		
<p>The 2015 Water Resource Management Plan (WRMP) describes how Anglian Water will manage the balance between supply and demand over the 25 year period from 2015 to 2040. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Using cost-effective demand management, transfer, trading and resource development schemes to meet growth in demand from new development and to restore abstraction to sustainable levels ('sustainability reductions'), and In the medium to long term, ensuring that sufficient water continues to be available for growth and that our supply systems are flexible enough to adapt to climate change. 	<p>Government policy for the water sector is described in the water white paper "Water for Life". This paper makes clear that the goal of the water industry is to deliver a reliable, affordable and sustainable system of supply, which is resilient to the possible future effects of climate change and population growth. The outcomes that are desired include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> High quality drinking water; Secure supplies to households and business; Effective removal of wastewater; and A flourishing water environment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Local Plan should consider opportunities to reduce water use and increase water efficiency and take account of infrastructure requirements arising from new development. SA Framework should consider objectives which seek to minimise the use of water and ensure the delivery of appropriate infrastructure to accommodate new development.
<p>Defra and the Environment Agency (2015) Water for Life and Livelihoods: Humber River Basin District River Basin Management Plan</p>		
<p>The Plan focuses on the protection, improvement and sustainable use of the water environment.</p> <p>The overall objective is to ensure sufficient water supplies for future generations especially in the face of climate change, housing growth and an increase in individual water use.</p>	<p>The plan sets out actions to improve the water environment by 2021.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Local Plan should seek to reduce water use and maintain/improve water quality. The SA Framework should include objectives/guide questions which seek to

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
		minimise the use of water and conserve and improve water quality.
East Midlands Airport (2015) Sustainable Development Plan		
Sets out four detailed plans relating to Land Use, Community, Environment and Economy and Surface Access.	Identify the land, uses and facilities required to support the operation capable of handling annually 10 million passengers and 1.2 million tonnes of cargo.	The Local Plan should not compromise the safe operation of the Airport.
Environment Agency (2016) Humber River Basin District Flood Risk Management Plan 2015 – 2021		
<p>Flood risk management plans (FRMPs) set out how organisations, stakeholders and communities will work together to manage flood risk. The Humber FRMP identifies a total of 396 measures to address flood risk and 280 measures to prepare for flood risk.</p> <p>The FRMP contains the following objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SOC 1: Understanding Flood Risk and Working in Partnership • SOC 2: Community Preparedness and Resilience • SOC 3: Reduce Community Disruption • SOC 4: Flood Risk and Development • SOC 5: Reduce risk to people • ECON 1: Reduce economic damage • ECON 2: Maintenance of main river and existing assets • ECON 3: Transport Services • ECON 4: Flood risk to agricultural land • ECON 5: Tourism 	The FRMP summarises the WFD outcomes expected to be delivered through flood risk management by 2021.	The SA Framework should include an objective and/or guide questions relating to flood risk.

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ENVI1: Water Framework Directive • ENVI 2: Designated Nature Conservation Sites • ENVI 3: Designated Heritage sites • RES 1: Reservoir flood risk 		
Natural England (2009) East Midlands Landscape Character Assessment		
<p>The Landscape Character Assessment presents a comprehensive analysis of the character of the East Midlands landscape and draws together information about the natural, historic and built environment to facilitate the protection, management and planning of the East Midlands Region.</p>	<p>No formal targets identified.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Plan should promote the conservation and enhancement of landscape character and respond to aims identified in the Landscape Character Assessment. • The SA Framework should include a specific objective relating to landscape.
Network Rail (2010) East Midlands Route Utilisation Strategy		
<p>The strategy seeks to address the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • network capacity and railway service performance • train and station capacity including crowding issues • the trade-offs between different uses of the network • rolling stock issues • how maintenance and renewals work can be carried out while minimizing disruption to the network • opportunities from using new technology • opportunities to improve safety 	<p>The plan sets out actions to cope with the implications and levels of growth over 30 years.</p>	<p>The Local Plan should consider the objectives set out in the Route Utilisation Strategy.</p>
Severn Trent Water (2019) Water Resources Management Plan		

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
<p>Water companies in England and Wales are required to produce a Water Resources Management Plan that sets out how they aim to maintain water supplies over a 25-year period. The current Water Resources Management Plan was published in 2019. The plan recognises the major future challenges associated with expected deficit between water demand and supply. One key difference from their previous plans is the need to prevent the risk of future environmental deterioration.</p> <p>The Severn Trent WRMP demonstrates how they plan to use a two-fold long-term strategy to respond to these challenges, through the use of demand management measures and making the best use of sustainable sources of supply..</p>	<p>The overall objective is to ensure sufficient water supplies for future generations especially in the face of climate change, housing growth and an increase in individual water use.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Plan should consider opportunities to reduce water use and increase water efficiency and take account of infrastructure requirements arising from new development. • SA Framework should consider objectives which seek to minimise the use of water and ensure the delivery of appropriate infrastructure to accommodate new development.
<p>Sub-Regional Plans and Programmes</p>		
<p>D2N2 (Derby, Derbyshire, Nottingham, Nottinghamshire) Local Enterprise Partnership (2013) Vision 2030: Strategic Economic Plan</p>		
<p>Sets targets for growth over the next decade and outlines some ambitious targets: up to £9 billion in added value in the D2N2 economy, getting us into the top 25% in Europe for productivity, raising earnings, narrowing inequality, and sharing prosperity across all parts of our two cities and two counties.</p>	<p>The vision is that, by 2030, D2N2 will have a transformed high-value economy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be in the top quarter of productive local economies in Europe; • Increase the value of our economy to £70billion, with £9bn added by the actions of this Plan; • Enjoy prosperity levels in the top quarter of all LEP areas; • Raise real wages and narrow inequality by a rise in median weekly earnings of at least 40% and narrow wage disparities within D2N2; • Maintain a high and stable employment rate with a workforce of some one million people; 	<p>The SA Framework should include specific objectives relating to economic growth.</p>

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce the gap in economic activity levels between places in the D2N2 area; and • Eliminate the gap in workforce qualifications between the UK and D2N2. 	
Environment Agency (2010) River Trent Catchment Flood Management Plan		
<p>This Catchment Flood Management Plan (CFMP) identifies flood risk management policies to assist all key decision makers in the catchment. It is only the first step towards an integrated approach to Flood Risk Management. The Plan divides the River Trent catchment into ten distinct sub areas which have similar physical characteristics, sources of flooding and levels of risk. The Plan identifies the most appropriate approach to managing flood risk for each of the sub areas and allocated on of six generic flood risk management policies.</p>	<p>No formal targets identified but the objective of the CFMP is to reduce the scale and extent of flooding both now and in the future.</p>	<p>The Local Plan should consider the policies set out in the Plan.</p>
Environment Agency (2011) Isle of Axholme Flood Risk Management Strategy		
<p>This Strategy sets out how flood risk is to be managed from the Rivers Torne and Idle for the next 100 years.</p>	<p>No formal targets identified.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Plan should seek to support and complement the Flood Risk Management Strategy. • The SA Framework should include an objective and/or guide questions relating to flood risk.
Environment Agency (2013) Lower Trent and Erewash Abstraction Licensing Strategy		
<p>This licensing strategy sets out how we will manage water resources in the Lower Trent & Erewash catchment, provides information on how existing abstraction is regulated and if water is available for further abstraction.</p>	<p>Sets the requirement for a licence if more than 20m³ /day (4400 gallons of water).</p>	<p>The Local Plan should consider the policies set out in the Strategy.</p>

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
Environment Agency (2013) The Idle and Torne Abstraction Licensing Strategy		
Sets out how water resources are managed in the Idle and Torne area and when a licensing strategy is required. It provides information on how existing abstraction are regulated and whether water is available for further abstraction.	Sets the requirement for a licence if more than 20m ³ /day (4400 gallons of water).	The Local Plan should take account of the Idle and Torne Licensing Strategy as water abstraction is a key requirement of many developments.
Nottinghamshire County Council (2005) Minerals Local Plan Adopted December 2005		
<p>The Minerals Local Plan sets out the County Council's approach towards mineral extraction in Nottinghamshire. The Plan has six priorities, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Culture • Regeneration • Environment • Community • Minerals provision • Optimum use of minerals • Minerals sterilisation <p>It should be noted that the adopted Minerals Local Plan is due to be replaced by the emerging new Minerals Local Plan.</p>	No formal targets identified.	The SA Framework should include guide questions relating to minerals use.
Nottinghamshire County Council (2010) Sustainable Community Strategy 2010 – 2020		
<p>The priorities of the strategy were identified from wide-ranging research and consultation. They are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A greener Nottinghamshire • A place where Nottinghamshire's children achieve their full potential • A safer Nottinghamshire 	Whilst targets for 2015 have been identified under each of the priorities, there have been no updated targets.	The Local Plan should consider the priorities set out in the Strategy.

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health and well-being for all • A more prosperous Nottinghamshire • Making Nottinghamshire's communities stronger 		
Nottinghamshire County Council (2011) A Cultural Strategy for Nottinghamshire County Council 2011 – 2021		
<p>The aims of the strategy are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • work throughout Nottinghamshire to promote, deliver and support cultural services that are high quality and accessible to all. • be guided by our communities and visitors to create, nurture and deliver a wide range of inspiring, fun and quality cultural experiences that will excite and engage them. • show pride in Nottinghamshire's rich cultural heritage, and we will be ambitious in our aims to protect, enhance and build on our current service provision for the future. 	No formal targets identified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Plan should promote the aims set out in the Strategy. • The SA Framework should include specific objectives relating to Cultural Heritage.
Nottinghamshire County Council (2011) Local Transport Plan 2011-2026		
<p>The Nottinghamshire Local Transport Plan (LTP3) sets the framework for improvements to the transport infrastructure network in the District and wider County. The LTP sets out three goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide a reliable, resilient transport system which supports a thriving economy and growth whilst encouraging sustainable and healthy travel; • improve access to key services, particularly enabling employment and training opportunities; and • minimise the impacts of transport on people's lives, maximise opportunities to improve the environment and help tackle carbon emissions. <p>A further 12 transport objectives are also identified:</p>	<p>The LTP Implementation Plan (2015/16 to 2017/18) identifies a number of priorities for transport investment in the District including major funding in respect of improvements to A57/A60/B6024/St Anne's, Worksop roundabout and Harworth junction and for a new bus station in Worksop), as well as improvements at key pressure points on the road network around Worksop to accommodate future development.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Plan should promote the objectives and vision set out in the Plan. • The SA Framework should include specific objectives relating to transport.

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tackle congestion and make journey times more reliable. 2. Improve connectivity to inter-urban, regional and international networks, primarily by public transport. 3. Address the transport impacts of planned housing and employment growth. 4. Encourage people to walk, cycle and use public transport through promotion and provision of facilities. 5. Support regeneration. 6. Reduce transport's impact on the environment (air quality, buildings, landscape, noise etc.). 7. Adapt to climate change and the development of a low-carbon transport system. 8. Improve levels of health and activity by encouraging active travel (walking or cycling) instead of short car journeys. 9. Address and improve personal safety (and the perceptions of safety) when walking, cycling or using public transport. 10. Improve access to employment and other key services particularly from rural areas. 11. Provision of an affordable, reliable, and convenient public transport network. 12. Maintain the existing transport infrastructure (roads, footways, public transport services etc.). 		
Nottinghamshire County Council (2011) Mobility Strategy for Nottinghamshire (as amended)		
<p>This Strategy sets out a new framework for transport services for people in mobility need, which will allow residents, whether disabled, frail, elderly, young or rurally isolated people, to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access those services and facilities which they need to, in order to play a full role in the community. • Travel, within reason, when they need to travel. • Access transport services which are reasonably priced. 	No formal targets identified.	The Local Plan should promote the objectives set out in the strategy.

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be provided with appropriate transport services to allow them to access the nearest town / transport hub from which they can travel onwards to their final destination. • Enjoy a range of quality accessible, flexible and efficient transport services. • Use transport services to access employment, education and training opportunities. 		
Nottinghamshire County Council (2013) Economic Development Strategy 2014 – 2018		
<p>This Economic Development Strategy has been written to reflect the ambitions as outlined in the Council's Strategic Plan and also to enable alignment with the key objectives of the D2N2 LEP. The Economic Development Strategy is split into the themes of 'Jobs, Skills and Training'; 'Business Growth'; and 'Infrastructure and Assets'. This strategy outlines the Council's ambitions in each of these themes and the main drivers for action.</p>	No formal targets identified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Plan should consider the ambitions set out in the Strategy. • The SA Framework should include specific objectives relating to Economic Development.
Nottinghamshire County Council (2013) Green Estate Development Strategy and Plan 2013-2023		
<p>The vision of the Green Estate Development Strategy and Plan is "to manage and promote the Green Estate for the benefit of the people of Nottinghamshire, aiming to improve the quality of the environment through sustainable management practices which enhance biodiversity and protect our cultural heritage for future generations."</p>	No formal targets identified.	The Local Plan should consider the vision set out in the Strategy and Plan.
Nottinghamshire County Council and Nottingham City Council (2013) Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Replacement Waste Local Plan – Part 1: Waste Core Strategy		
<p>The strategy sets out their goals for delivering sustainable waste management over the next 20 years, until 2031. It covers nearly all types of waste, apart from radioactive waste, and sets</p>	<p>Seeks to achieve 70% recycling or composting of all waste by 2025.</p> <p>The national targets are:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Plan should support the delivery of the Waste Core Strategy. • The SA Framework should reflect the objectives of the Waste Core Strategy.

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
<p>out their vision for all levels of waste management including prevention, re-use, recycling, recovery and disposal.</p> <p>The Waste Core Strategy sets out the overall planning policy towards existing and future waste management facilities within Nottinghamshire and Nottingham. It contains the following objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SO1 Strengthen our economy • SO2 Care for our environment • SO3 Community well-being • SO4 Energy and climate • SO5 Sustainable transport • SO6 Meet our future needs • SO7 High quality design and operation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to recover 67% of municipal waste by 2015, rising to 75% by 2020. • at least 45% of household waste should be recycled or composted by 2015, rising to 50% by 2020. 	
Nottinghamshire County Council (2018) Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2018 – 2022		
<p>The Strategy has identified four key ambitions for the people of Nottinghamshire:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To give everyone a good start in life • To have healthy and sustainable places • To enable healthier decision making • To work together to improve health and care services <p>All of these ambitions support the overall vision to improve health and wellbeing in Nottinghamshire. At the heart of the strategy for Nottinghamshire is the desire to reduce health inequalities. The strategy aims to identify where there are inequalities across the county and to help address them.</p>	<p>No formal targets identified.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Plan should promote the ambitions set out in the Strategy. • The SA Framework should include specific objectives relating to health.

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
Nottinghamshire County Council and Nottinghamshire Health and Wellbeing Board (2018) Strategic Plan 2018-2022		
<p>The Strategic Plan sets out what the County Council is planning to achieve, how they will measure their progress and the role they will take to help achieve each outcome. They have proposed four ambitions which will aid in transforming the services they provide. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to give everyone a good start in life • To have healthy and sustainable place =s • To enable healthier decision making • To work together to improve health and care services 	No formal targets identified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Plan should promote the objectives set out in the Strategic Plan. • The SA Framework should include specific objectives relating to the safe and thriving communities, the environment, economic growth and employment, and care and health.
Nottinghamshire County Council (2015) Integrated Passenger Transport Strategy		
<p>The strategic transport goals for the county were developed locally through consultation with the public, County Council elected members, and other stakeholders. The LTP has three main goals which support one another to deliver the required transport improvements in the county:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a reliable, resilient transport system which supports a thriving economy and growth whilst encouraging sustainable and healthy travel; • Improve access to key services, particularly enabling employment and training opportunities; and • Minimise the impacts of transport on people's lives, maximise opportunities to improve the environment and help tackle carbon emissions. 	No formal targets identified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Plan should promote the objectives set out in the strategy. • The SA Framework should include specific objectives relating to transport.
Nottinghamshire County Council (2018) Minerals Local Plan (Draft Plan consultation)		

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
<p>The new Minerals Local Plan will set out the County Council's overall approach to future minerals provision in Nottinghamshire up to 2036 and replace the Minerals Local Plan adopted in 2005.</p> <p>The Submission Draft Local Plan sets out the following objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SO1: Improving the sustainability of minerals development • SO2: Providing an adequate supply of minerals • SO3: Addressing climate change • SO4: Safeguarding of mineral resources • SO5: Minimising impacts on communities • SO6: Protecting and enhancing natural assets • SO7: Protecting and enhancing historic assets • SO8: Protecting agricultural soils 	<p>No formal targets identified yet.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Plan should support the delivery of the objectives set out in the Minerals Local Plan. • The SA Framework should include specific objectives and/or guide questions relating to mineral resources.
Idle Catchment Partnership Action Plan (undated)		
<p>The Action Plan identifies priority areas for improvement to the water environment. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Farming • Nature • Community • Industrial and Urban • Water Management 	<p>The Plan contains a range of actions but no formal targets.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Plan should support the delivery of the Action Plan where appropriate. • The SA Framework should include specific guide questions relating to water quality and resources.
Sheffield City Region Local Enterprise Partnership (2014) Strategic Economic Plan		

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
<p>The Strategic Economic Plan sets out a 10 year plan (2015-2025) for growth in the Sheffield City Region (SCR). It identifies that Bassetlaw has the need and ability to accommodate significant economic growth in key settlements, taking advantage of access to the M1.</p> <p>The Strategy identifies the following objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure SCR businesses have the support they need to realise their full growth potential • Become more outward looking • Provide the conditions that businesses need to prosper and become more resilient 	<p>The Strategy includes a range of actions across the following six key areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ensure new businesses receive the support they need to flourish 2. Facilitate and proactively support growth amongst existing firms 3. Attract investment from other parts of the UK and overseas and improve our brand 4. Increase sales of SCR's goods and services to other parts of the UK and abroad 5. Develop the SCR skills base, labour mobility and education performance 6. Secure investment in infrastructure where it will do most to support growth 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Plan should support the economic growth in the context of the SCR. • The SA Framework should include specific objectives relating to economic growth.
South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan Partnership Sheffield City Region (2017) Sheffield City Region Transport Strategy 2018 – 2040		
<p>The strategy sets out the following goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • support inclusive economic growth • Create healthy streets where people feel safe • Improve the quality of our outdoors • Promote, enable and adopt different technologies 	<p>The plan sets out a number of actions including creating more sustainable and integrated transport links, enhancing air quality and investing in integrated packages of infrastructure to help achieve the policies.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Plan should reflect key actions and targets set out in the Strategy. • The SA Framework should include specific objectives relating to economic growth, social inclusion and health, carbon emissions and transport.
Local Plans and Programmes		
Bassetlaw District Council (2008) Langold Country Park Management Plan for Local Nature Reserve		
<p>The management objectives of the Plan are:</p>	<p>No specific targets or indicators identified.</p>	<p>The Local Plan should be aware of the objectives set out in the management plan.</p>

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Woodland management to reduce gradually the amount of sycamore in order to restore the semi-natural composition of the woodland community and bring Dyscarr Wood SSSI into favourable condition; • Conserve the diversity of habitats on the site, and the wildlife interest of those habitats; • Maintain or increase populations of species which are near the limits of their range, or are at least locally uncommon; • Reduce abuse of the site, whilst encouraging positive use by the public where compatible with the ecological and geological interest; • Encourage public understanding and appreciation of the site; and • Add to the body of information concerning the site. 		
Bassetlaw District Council (2008) Retford Cemetery Management Plan		
<p>The management objectives of the plan are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conserve and enhance the habitats on the site, and the wildlife interest of those habitats; • Maintain or increase populations of species which are near the limits of their range, or are at least locally uncommon; • Provide interpretation for the site; and • Add to the body of ecological information concerning the site, in particular conduct the following surveys. 	No specific targets or indicators identified.	The Local Plan should be aware of the objectives set out in the management plan.
Bassetlaw District Council (2008) Woodsetts Pond Management Plan		
The management objectives of the plan are:	No specific targets or indicators identified.	The Local Plan should be aware of the objectives set out in the management plan.

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conserve the diversity of habitats on the site, and the wildlife interest of those habitats; • Maintain or increase populations of species which are near the limits of their range, or are at least locally uncommon; • Conserve the features of geological interest on the site; • Reduce abuse of the site, whilst encouraging positive use by the public where compatible with the ecological and geological interest; • Encourage public understanding and appreciation of the site; and • Add to the body of information concerning the site. 		
Bassetlaw District Council (2009) Landscape Character Assessment		
<p>The Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment has defined the landscape character of the administrative area of Bassetlaw District Council [BDC] and will form part of the evidence base for the Local Development Framework [LDF]. It will be used by BDC to aid development control decisions on planning applications.</p> <p>The document provides an objective methodology for assessing the varied landscape within Bassetlaw and contains information about the character, condition and sensitivity of the landscape to provide a greater understanding of what makes the landscape within Bassetlaw locally distinctive. The study has recognised this by the identification of Policy Zones across the 5 Landscape Character Types represented in Bassetlaw. Figure 1 shows the Landscape Character Types for the whole county.</p>	No specific targets or indicators identified.	The Local Plan should consider the objectives set out in the assessment as well as including reference to the assessment and its findings.
Bassetlaw District Council (2010) Sustainable Community Strategy 2010 – 2020		

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By 2020 Bassetlaw will have a national reputation as a place to live and work and as a tourist destination. • Our residents will have pride in the District and reach their full potential. • Educational attainment will exceed the national average. • Bassetlaw will have a clear identity with strong sub-regional links to South Yorkshire/North East Derbyshire/North Nottinghamshire. • We will understand the needs of our communities, young and old and shape services to meet these needs. 	<p>The performance of the BLSP is managed by its Board on a quarterly basis. Each of its thematic groups are expected to report on the implementation of projects and progress in meeting targets.</p> <p>Progress reports will also go to Bassetlaw District Council's Cabinet and to partners Boards and Executives.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Plan should support the delivery of the Community Strategy. • The aims of the strategy need to be compatible with the SA objectives.
Bassetlaw District Council (2011) Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document		
<p>This Core Strategy is the key LDF document and provides the overarching framework for all other documents that may be produced. It sets out a vision for change in Bassetlaw to 2028, along with the place-specific policy approaches to be taken in order to achieve this vision. A small number of more detailed development management policies, on key issues that will need to be addressed when delivering new development, are also included. Finally, the document incorporates a Monitoring and Implementation scheme, to enable the Council to assess whether the policies are delivering the vision.</p>	<p>Monitoring is carried out through the Annual Monitoring Report.</p>	<p>The Local Plan under preparation will replace the adopted Plan.</p>
Bassetlaw District Council (2012) Contaminated Land Inspection Strategy		
<p>The quality of our land in Bassetlaw District is important to all of us, in terms of public health, ensuring continuing economic prosperity and enabling residents to enjoy our public spaces safely.</p> <p>One of the Council's overall objectives is to control threats to public health and the environment that could arise from</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To protect human health • To protect controlled waters • To protect designated ecosystems • To prevent damage to specified property uses 	<p>The Local Plan should consider the vision set out in the Contaminated Land Inspection Strategy.</p>

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
contaminated land. This strategy sets out how we aim to achieve that.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To prevent any further land contamination To encourage voluntary remediation To encourage re-use of brownfield sites 	
Bassetlaw District Council (2017) Homelessness Prevention Strategy 2017-2022		
<p>The Bassetlaw Homelessness Strategy aims to review the homelessness situation in Bassetlaw and, support the delivery of a wide variety of homes across all sectors (town & rural areas); work with the private rented sector to improve the quality of homes; use our full range of powers to protect local people and the place they live; and support the health & wellbeing of local people through early intervention and initiatives. The vision for the strategy is:” to offer early help, support and intervention to ensure people in Bassetlaw do not become homeless. We want to eradicate rough sleeping by helping to enable the life-skills needed for individuals to access stable accommodation.”</p> <p>The Council is currently consulting on its draft strategy.</p>	Increase the housing stock of the District and provide for specialist needs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Local Plan should consider the vision set out in the Homelessness Strategy. To provide an adequate supply of land for both market and affordable housing. Ensure housing needs across the District are considered in the SA Framework objectives.
Bassetlaw District Council (2012) Residential Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document		
This Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) forms part of the Bassetlaw Local Development Framework. It has been produced to expand upon Policy DM13: Sustainable Transport in the Core Strategy & Development Management Policies DPD, setting out the approach that the Council expects developers to take when establishing parking requirements for new residential development proposals.	No specific targets or indicators identified.	The Local Plan should consider the objectives set out in the SPD.
Bassetlaw District Council (2012) Sports Development Strategy		
Bassetlaw District Council’s Sports Development Service aims to:	No specific targets or indicators identified.	The Local Plan should consider the vision set out in the Sports Development Strategy.

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
<p>“Deliver an excellent standard of service that will create opportunities through sport and physical activity to improve the health and well-being of all residents in Bassetlaw.”</p>		
<p>Bassetlaw District Council (2020) The Canch Management Plan</p>		
<p>The Management Plan will be used to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess and evaluate the current value of the park as a community facility; Establish opportunities for future improvements to its facilities and features and formulate actions accordingly; and Monitor the management of the park in respect of its on-going maintenance and future development potential. 	<p>No specific targets or indicators identified.</p>	<p>The Local Plan should be aware of the objectives set out in the management plan.</p>
<p>Bassetlaw District Council (2013) Climate Change Strategy 2013</p>		
<p>This strategy highlights the work planned, showing that Bassetlaw is addressing its local and global responsibilities to tackle climate change. The strategy intends to show that climate change is correlated to a number of different issues, transport, waste and energy generation and use are but a few and massive change is needed if Bassetlaw is to reduce its contribution to global climate change.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To increase the % of household waste sent for reuse, recycling and composting. To reduce the % of people receiving income based benefits living in homes with a low energy efficiency rating. To reduce the per capita CO₂ emissions in the local authority area. 	<p>The Local Plan should consider the vision set out in the Climate Change Strategy.</p>
<p>Bassetlaw District Council (2020) Kings Park Management Plan</p>		
<p>This Kings Park Management Plan has been produced by Bassetlaw District Council and was released in 2020. The document is supported by the Friends of Kings Park Sub-Committee and benefits from contributions from local community groups, organisations and park users.</p>	<p>No specific targets or indicators identified.</p>	<p>The Local Plan should be aware of the objectives set out in the management plan.</p>

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
<p>The Management Plan will be used to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess and evaluate the current value of the park as a community facility; Establish opportunities for future improvements to its facilities and features and formulate actions accordingly; and Monitor the management of the park in respect of its on-going maintenance and future development potential. 		
Bassetlaw District Council (2013) Successful Places Supplementary Planning Document		
<p>The purpose of this guide is about creating sustainable places that deliver a good quality of life for the people that will live there and preventing costly poor design. This demands that our neighbourhoods are designed around the linked concepts of good place making and sustainability.</p>	<p>The purpose of this guide is about creating sustainable places that deliver a good quality of life for the people that will live there and preventing costly poor design. This demands that our neighbourhoods are designed around the linked concepts of good place making and sustainability.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Local Plan policies should seek to work in conjunction with the design guidance. The SA framework should include objectives and/or guidance questions relating to high quality design.
Bassetlaw District Council (2013) Sustainability Strategy		
<p>The Bassetlaw District Council Sustainability Strategy provides a framework for good practice that is applicable to every service, and every decision made must consider the sustainability impact, be it carbon emissions, household or trade waste, or the natural environment.</p>	<p>The strategy builds upon the work already identified in the Carbon Management Plan and the Climate Change Strategy and complements and informs other Council strategies.</p> <p>The strategy addresses the need to work with the Councils partners to reduce its impact on the environment and to progress delivery through the Councils partnerships.</p>	<p>The Local Plan should consider the vision set out in the Sustainability Strategy.</p>
Bassetlaw District Council (2014) Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document		
<p>This SPD has been produced to expand upon policy set out in the Core Strategy in relation to affordable housing. In particular this SPD gives guidance on:</p>	<p>No specific targets or indicators identified.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Local Plan should seek to provide policies capable of contributing towards the provision of affordable housing.

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The amount of affordable housing contribution being sought from housing developments; • Affordable Housing Providers; • Occupancy and management arrangement; • Providing affordable housing contributions through on-site or off-site contributions; • Development viability impacts; • Rural exception sites; and • Section 106 agreements for affordable housing provision. <p>This SPD also provides a summary and links to other sources of information that relate to the delivery of affordable housing such as the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SA framework should include a specific objective relating to housing delivery to meet local needs.
Bassetlaw District Council, Council Plan 2017 – 2020		
<p>The Council plan establishes the framework within which the Council operates and establishes goals and priorities for the plan period. The ambitions identified and explained in the plan are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Driving Efficiency & Resilience. • Supporting Business & Growth. • Enhancing Home & Place. 	<p>Priorities over the plan period can be summarised as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Become a self-financing Council, with balanced budgets and new sources of income. • Diver digital service transformation and improve digital connectivity. • Develop new models of service delivery and a flexible and skilled workforce. • Deliver affordable public services. • Support establishment and growth of businesses. • Work with SCR.D2N2 to provide future infrastructure. • Develop and deliver a robust Local Plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Plan should include policies and proposals that help deliver the Corporate Plan. • The Local plan should help deliver the main priorities of the Corporate Plan. • The SA framework should consider the aims of the Corporate Plan.

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximise geographical benefits and transport links across the District. • Develop plans for a resilient visitor economy. • Town centre interventions at Worksop, Retford and Harworth. • Support delivery of a wide variety of homes. • Work with the private rented sector to improve the quality of homes. • Protect the natural and historic environment for future generations. • Use full range of powers to protect local people and the place they live. • Support the health and wellbeing of local people through early interventions. • Direct work with the Hospital Trust, CCG and Public Health to improve local health. 	
Bassetlaw District Council (2014) A Guide to Good Shopfront Design and Signage Supplementary Planning Document		
<p>This supplementary planning document (SPD) is intended to provide guidance to anyone proposing new, repairing or replacing shopfronts. The SPD supports policy DM4 and DM8 of the Bassetlaw Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD.</p>	<p>No specific targets or indicators identified.</p>	<p>The Local Plan should consider the guidance set out in the SPD.</p>
Bassetlaw District Council (2014) Night Time Economy Strategy		
<p>The vision for the Bassetlaw Night Time Economy is to “support a thriving and safe evening and night time economy in our towns”. The Strategy aims to see an increase in the choice and availability of services for visitors and residents alike, create a</p>	<p>No specific targets or indicators identified.</p>	<p>The Local Plan should be aware of the objectives set out in the strategy.</p>

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
feeling of safety within the town centres and encourage greater diversity and vibrancy within them.		
Bassetlaw District Council (2014) Regeneration and Growth Strategy 2014 – 2028		
<p>This strategy sets out realistic ambitions that builds on the Council's past successes in the economic development arena, along with current and emerging strategies. In undertaking this task it is acknowledged that the District is not an isolated economy, and that other economic factors whether sub-national, national and international will impact on the productivity and competitiveness of the District</p> <p>Building a competitive vision for North Nottinghamshire looks to create a sustainable and prosperous future that will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthen the area's economic competitiveness, which will underpin development of sustainable growth; • Develop an appropriately educated and skilled workforce; • Support the innovation of enterprise that will help diversify the business base; and • Recognise the importance of strategic and sustainable areas of economic growth and investment. 	No specific targets or indicators identified.	The Local Plan should support the objectives set out in the regeneration and growth strategy.
Bassetlaw District Council (2017) Housing Strategy 2017-2020		
<p>The objective of this strategy is to set-out how the Council will support the availability of good quality homes which best meet the needs of the current and future residents of Bassetlaw. The priorities set out are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Providing affordable and social rented homes 2. Improve the quality of private rented accommodation 	In accordance with the new Council Plan (2017-2020) the Housing strategy supports the ambition: Enhancing Home and Place. This strategy will be delivered in collaboration with key services across the Council. This holistic approach ensures the skills and experience of services across the Council are coordinated to deliver the key priorities of the housing strategy.	The Local Plan should consider the vision set out in the Housing Strategy.

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
3. independent living for out ageing and vulnerable population		
Blyth Neighbourhood Plan (Made 2021)		
<p>The Plan provides positive planning for development and seeks to improve the lives of residents by ensuring the area grows in a way that is both socially and environmentally sustainable.</p> <p>The Plan sets out a vision for the future of the community and a proposed set of planning policies intended to help in achieving that vision.</p>	No specific targets or indicators identified.	The Local Plan should consider the objectives set out in the neighbourhood plan.
Bolsover District Council Local Plan (2020)		
The plan sets out the spatial strategy for the District. Aims to create a sustainable District. The vision is that by 2033, Bolsover will be a growing District, undergoing an economic and visual transformation. The main objectives are: sustainable growth, climate change, countryside, landscape character and wildlife, historic environment, regeneration, tourism, infrastructure and new facilities, sustainable transport, green spaces and green infrastructure, rural areas, health and wellbeing, economic prosperity, employment opportunities, meeting housing needs, place making and town centres.	Monitoring is carried out through the Authority Monitoring Report.	There is potential for interaction between this Plan and the Bassetlaw Local Plan leading to cumulative effects.
Carlton-in-Lindrick Neighbourhood Plan (Made 2019)		
The Neighbourhood Plan seeks to make Carlton in Lindrick will be a better place to live, with a strong sense of identity and community spirit. It includes three site allocations and development management policies to promote sustainable development.	No specific targets or indicators identified.	The Local Plan should consider the objectives set out in the neighbourhood plan.
Central Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee (Adopted) Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (2017)		

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
<p>The Central Lincolnshire Local Plan contains planning policies and allocations for the growth and regeneration of the area over the next 20 years.</p> <p>To achieve their vision they have set out multiple objectives: housing, employment, local economy, transport and accessibility, health, social equality and community, biodiversity and green infrastructure, landscape and townscape, built and historic environment, natural resources- water, pollution, natural resources- land use and soils, waste, climate change effects and energy, and climate change adaptation and flood risk.</p> <p>The consultation on the new Draft Central Lincolnshire Local Plan has now commenced. When adopted, this will replace the current Local Plan.</p>	<p>No specific targets or indicators identified.</p>	<p>The Local Plan should consider the objectives set out in the local plan.</p>
Chesterfield Borough Local Plan (2018-2035)		
<p>The Chesterfield Borough Local Plan covers the period to 2035, provides the overall spatial strategy for the Local Development Framework. It provides the basic principles and policies that will steer development and the use of land within the District. It establishes the overall general scale and location of development, and the approach to the key issues facing the Borough.</p>	<p>Monitoring is carried out through the Authority Monitoring Report.</p>	<p>The Local Plan should consider the objectives set out in the neighbouring local plan.</p>
Clarlborough & Welham Neighbourhood Plan (Made 2017)		
<p>The Parish Council believes that interaction with their Plan will give residents of the villages a greater influence and involvement with their built and natural environment and so return to them a feeling of community, control and ownership.</p>	<p>No specific targets or indicators identified.</p>	<p>The Local Plan should consider the objectives set out in the neighbourhood plan.</p>
Cuckney, Norton, Holbeck & Welbeck Neighbourhood Plan (Made 2017)		

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
<p>By 2031 the Neighbourhood Plan area will be thriving, vibrant and community led. It will value its rural environment and heritage and provide the whole community with opportunities to meet their housing, employment and social needs at every stage of their life. It will be a sustainable place where everyone can flourish and prosper.</p>	<p>No specific targets or indicators identified.</p>	<p>The Local Plan should consider the objectives set out in the neighbourhood plan.</p>
<p>Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council (2012) Core Strategy Development Plan Document</p>		
<p>The Local Development Framework forms part of the statutory development plan for Doncaster. The development plan informs decisions on planning applications and a range of implementation plans. As well as the Core Strategy, the Local Development Framework includes Development Plan Documents that allocate sites.</p>	<p>No specific targets or indicators identified.</p>	<p>The Local Plan should consider the objectives set out in the core strategy.</p>
<p>Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council (emerging) Local Plan</p>		
<p>The Council is now consulting on draft Policies and proposed Sites as well as a supporting evidence base for the inclusion in the Local Plan.</p> <p>The Borough Strategy sets out a long term vision for how Doncaster will be shaped.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Doncaster aims to be one of most successful boroughs in England and a gateway to opportunity locally, nationally and worldwide. • A strong local economy will support progressive, healthy, safe and vibrant communities. • All residents will be able to achieve their full potential in employment, education care and life chances. • Pride in Doncaster will have increased further”. 	<p>The plan is still being developed. As such, targets and indicators have not been identified yet.</p>	<p>There is potential for interaction between this Plan and the Bassetlaw Local Plan leading to cumulative effects.</p>

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
East Markham Neighbourhood Plan (Made 2018)		
Residents indicated strongly a wish to retain the rural character of the village. The community vision sets out to preserve and enhance the built, natural and historic environment of the Parish by protecting the distinctive character of East Markham ensuring that quality of life continues to improve for residents of all ages and backgrounds, whilst allowing for sustainable economic and social development.	No specific targets or indicators identified.	The Local Plan should consider the objectives set out in the neighbourhood plan.
Elkesley Neighbourhood Development Plan 2015-2028 (Made 2015)		
Elkesley Parish will develop and thrive, while retaining its rural character, creating a sustainable community, through the provision of a mix of housing types, local employment opportunities and the protection and enhancement of important community facilities and environmental assets. Elkesley Parish will become an area that is attractive for people to live, work and visit, for current and future generations.	No specific targets or indicators identified.	The Local Plan should consider the objectives set out in the neighbourhood plan.
Everton Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan 2019-2034 (Made 2021)		
The objectives cover a range of economic, social and environmental issues, including local economic growth, housing allocations and protection of landscape, all of which will ensure that Everton can grow sustainably. The objectives reflect the key issues for the community, especially in securing the long term future of those community and environmental assets most precious to local people, such as landscape and community facilities.	No specific targets or indicators identified.	The Local Plan should consider the objectives set out in the neighbourhood plan.
Harworth & Bircotes Neighbourhood Development Plan 2015-2028 (Made 2015)		

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
<p>In 14 years' time Harworth & Bircotes will be a thriving community, a place where people are proud to live. It will be a safe and happy place, an area that values its people and its environment. It will have a variety of homes, jobs, shops, schools, sustainable transport and recreational facilities; something for everyone. Harworth & Bircotes will be a place people want to move to.</p>	<p>No specific targets or indicators identified.</p>	<p>The Local Plan should consider the objectives set out in the neighbourhood plan.</p>
<p>Headon, Upton, Grove and Stokeham (HUGS) Neighbourhood Plan 2018 - 2035 (Made 2018)</p>		
<p>The HUGS neighbourhood plan includes a range of objectives to ensure new development will be located and designed so that it complements the existing character of the villages and enhances the strong identity with the surrounding landscape.</p>	<p>No specific targets or indicators identified.</p>	<p>The Local Plan should consider the objectives set out in the neighbourhood plan.</p>
<p>Hodsock and Langold Neighbourhood Plan (Made 2021)</p>		
<p>The Plan identifies social, environmental and economic issues in the area of Hodsock and Langold, and the issues form the basis for the Neighbourhood Plan and its associated planning policies. The policies in the Plan seek to influence the design of future development and to protect and enhance the natural and built environment.</p>	<p>No specific targets or indicators identified.</p>	<p>The Local Plan should consider the objectives set out in the neighbourhood plan.</p>
<p>Mansfield District Council (emerging) Local Plan (2013-2033)</p>		
<p>The Local Plan covers the plan period up to 2033 and once adopted will replace the Local Plan 'Saved Policies' 2006. Their vision sets out that by 2033 Mansfield will have continued its transformation to a healthier, greener and more vibrant place to live work and enjoy. The District will be a place of choice where people aspire to live with well designed, resilient neighbourhoods. A range of good quality housing will have been provided that meets the needs of all our growing communities.</p>	<p>The plan is still being developed. As such, targets and indicators have not been identified yet.</p>	<p>There is potential for interaction between this Plan and the Bassetlaw Local Plan leading to cumulative effects.</p>

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
The Council has recently published the Publication Draft in September 2018.		
Mattersey and Mattersey Thorpe Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2033 (Made 2019)		
This Neighbourhood Plan has been formed by the community of Mattersey and Mattersey Thorpe and aims to address a number of issues that cause greatest concern for the community. These include; integrated design with local amenity, local employment opportunities and protection of open green space.	No specific targets or indicators identified.	The Local Plan should consider the objectives set out in the neighbourhood plan.
Misterton Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2034 (Made 2019)		
The Misterton Neighbourhood Plan will take a positive approach to development, providing it is designed in accordance with the four community objectives set out in the Plan. These community objectives are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing. • Employment. • Community Facilities. • Environment. 	No specific targets or indicators identified.	The Local Plan should consider the objectives set out in the neighbourhood plan.
Misson Neighbourhood Plan 2016 – 2031 (Made 2017)		
The Neighbourhood Plan covers a range of objectives to ensure sustainable development in Misson during the period 2016 - 2031, addressing key issues identified by the local community. These include; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the design, location, and type of new housing; • protection of historic assets and built and landscape character; • protection and enhancement of social and economic vitality; and 	No specific targets or indicators identified.	The Local Plan should consider the objectives set out in the neighbourhood plan.

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> encouraging energy efficiency in new development. 		
Newark and Sherwood District Council (2011) Core Strategy		
<p>An area providing a high quality of life, made up of thriving sustainable urban and rural communities where people want to and can, live and work. These sustainable, balanced communities will feature good quality housing with a mix of different sizes, types and tenures which will address local needs.</p> <p>The District will have a successful, diverse economy by providing employment opportunities to a local workforce, equipped with a wide range of skills arising from improved education, learning and training and encouraging tourism potential.</p>	<p>Monitoring will indicate what impact the policies are having in respect of national, regional and local policy targets and other specific targets set out in the LDF.</p>	<p>There is potential for interaction between this Plan and the Bassetlaw Local Plan leading to cumulative effects.</p>
Newark and Sherwood District Council (2013) Allocations and Development Management Development Plan Document		
<p>Its main purpose is to allocate sufficient land for housing, employment and retail, to meet the needs of Newark and Sherwood to 2026 and beyond. The document also sets out amendments to urban boundaries and village envelopes, retail boundaries as well as sites requiring continued protection from development (open space and green infrastructure designations).</p>	<p>Monitoring will take place in the form of an Annual Monitoring Report on progress during the previous financial year.</p>	<p>There is potential for interaction between this Plan and the Bassetlaw Local Plan leading to cumulative effects.</p>
Newark and Sherwood District Council (2019) Plan Review, Amended Core Strategy		
<p>The main aim of this review is to ensure that the allocations and policies contained within the two DPDs continue to be appropriate, up-to-date and effective. The Inspector who examined the Allocations & Development Management DPD concluded that because the plan had been prepared during the recession that an early review should be conducted to test if the</p>	<p>No specific targets or indicators identified.</p>	<p>The Local Plan should consider the objectives set out in the plan review.</p>

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
market had recovered enough to continue to deliver the various elements of the plan.		
North East Derbyshire Local Plan 2014-2034 (Submission)		
North East Derbyshire's Local Plan covers the area of North East Derbyshire outside of the Peak District National Park and looks ahead to 2034. The Plan will be used to guide decisions on planning applications and areas where investment should be prioritised. Once adopted, it will become part of the development plan for North East Derbyshire and will replace the 'saved' policies of the 2005 Adopted North East Derbyshire District Local Plan. The Local Plan contains a vision, objectives and a planning strategy for Development, including sustainability objectives for issues such as housing allocations, public transport and tourism.	The Local Plan is yet to be adopted so key targets and indicators are yet to be clarified.	There is potential for interaction between this Plan and the Bassetlaw Local Plan leading to cumulative effects.
North Lincolnshire Core Strategy (2011)		
The Core Strategy's spatial vision provides the direction needed to deliver the spatial aspects of the Sustainable Community Strategy and the four shared ambitions up to 2026, which has been highlighted in chapter 3. The vision also takes into account the spatial aspects of other plans, strategies and programmes at regional, sub-regional and local level that deal with urban renaissance, housing, regeneration, economic development, the protection and enhancement of a world class environment including climate change, transport, investment, health, culture and safety, amongst other matters.	The Annual Monitoring Report contains a series of indicators and targets to assess the performance of the policies and whether they are being delivered in the correct manner.	There is potential for interaction between this Plan and the Bassetlaw Local Plan leading to cumulative effects.
Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan (Made 2021)		
The Plan guides development within the parish and provide direction for future development. Its objectives include to influence the location, scale, design and type of new housing in the area, designate Local Green Spaces and to protect and	No specific targets or indicators identified.	The Local Plan should consider the objectives set out in the Neighbourhood Plan.

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
enhance the environment, village amenities and important views in the village.		
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council (2014) Local Plan Core Strategy 2013-2028		
The Local Plan was adopted in September 2014. The Local Plan sets out the overall vision and objectives for growth in Rotherham to promote economic growth, achieve sustainable development and create sustainable communities for the plan period up to 2028.	The strategy focuses on economic and housing growth	There is potential for interaction between this Plan and the Bassetlaw Local Plan leading to cumulative effects.
Shireoaks Neighbourhood Development Plan 2016-2028 (Made 2016)		
The Shireoaks Neighbourhood Plan will take a positive approach to development so long as it is designed in accordance with the criteria in this Plan. All development over the Plan period will maximise the environmental assets in and around Shireoaks, improving access to the countryside and open spaces for residents and visitors.	No specific targets or indicators identified.	The Local Plan should consider the objectives set out in the neighbourhood plan.
Sturton Ward Neighbourhood Plan 2021-2037 (Made 2021 – Substantial Review)		
<p>This Neighbourhood Plan has been formed by people who have lived in Sturton Ward for many years and that local knowledge forms the backbone of the proposals. The policies focus on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Providing houses to meet the need of local people; b) Helping local businesses to grow; c) Supporting investment in community infrastructure; d) Protecting the landscape and biodiversity across the Plan area; and e) Setting out a renewable energy policy that is endorsed by local people. 	No specific targets or indicators identified.	The Local Plan should consider the objectives set out in the neighbourhood plan.

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
Sutton-cum-Lound Neighbourhood Plan (Made 2021 – Minor Review)		
<p>The Neighbourhood Plan covers a range of objectives to ensure sustainable development in Sutton cum Lound during the period 2016 - 2031, addressing key issues identified by the local community. These include; the design, location, and type of new housing, protection and enhancement of green spaces, enhancing opportunities for non-vehicular movement, and the protection of local character, heritage, views, and landscape setting.</p>	<p>No specific targets or indicators identified.</p>	<p>The Local Plan should consider the objectives set out in the neighbourhood plan.</p>
Treswell and Cottam Neighbourhood Plan (Made 2019)		
<p>The Neighbourhood Plan covers a range of objectives to ensure sustainable development in Treswell over the next 15 years, addressing key issues identified within the community. These include; bringing the sequential approach to development in flood areas, affordable housing provision and restricting the policy protecting significant views.</p>	<p>No specific targets or indicators identified.</p>	<p>The Local Plan should consider the objective set out in the neighbourhood plan.</p>
Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan (Made 2016)		
<p>The objectives cover a range of economic, social and environmental issues that together will ensure that Tuxford can grow sustainably. The objectives reflect the key issues for the community and the changes the local community wants to see, especially in securing the long term future of those community and environmental assets most precious to local people. They also reflect the aspirations of local residents to see well designed, sensitively sited development over the next 20 years.</p>	<p>No specific targets or indicators identified.</p>	<p>The Local Plan should consider the objectives set out in the neighbourhood plan.</p>
Village Design Statements (Lound, East Markham, South Leverton and North & South Wheatley Village)		

Key Objectives relevant to Local Plan & SA	Key Targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Commentary (how the SA Framework should incorporate the documents' requirements)
<p>The Village Design Statements (VDS) cover the villages of Lound, East Markham, South Leverton and North & South Wheatley Village. They cover the features of the natural and man-made environment which, together with the architecture of the buildings, give the villages their particular character. The VDS provide the decision makers and developers with local guidance reflecting local aspirations which is additional and complimentary to the statutory plans.</p>	<p>No specific targets or indicators identified.</p>	<p>The Local Plan should reference the guidance set out in the Village Design Statements.</p>
<p>Walkeringham Neighbourhood Plan (Made 2021)</p>		
<p>The Plan sets out a vision for Walkeringham to retain its quiet, rural character. It seeks to ensure future development is small scale and in keeping with the existing village, whilst minimising its environmental impact, maximising local employment opportunities and enhancing the social and economic vitality of the parish.</p>	<p>No specific targets or indicators identified.</p>	<p>The Local Plan should consider the objectives set out in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
<p>Woodland Trust Hannah Park Woodland Management Plan 2017-2022</p>		
<p>The Trust's corporate aims and management approach guide the management of all the Trust's properties. These determine basic management policies and methods, which apply to all sites unless specifically stated otherwise. Such policies include free public access; keeping local people informed of major proposed work; the retention of old trees and dead wood; and a desire for management to be as unobtrusive as possible.</p>	<p>No specific targets or indicators identified.</p>	<p>The Local Plan should consider the objectives set out in the management plan.</p>

Appendix 3

Baseline Information

Introduction

An essential part of the SA process is the identification of the current baseline conditions and their likely evolution. It is only with a knowledge of existing conditions, and a consideration of their likely evolution, that the effects of the Local Plan can be identified and appraised and its subsequent success or otherwise be monitored. The SEA Directive also requires that the evolution of the baseline conditions of the plan area (that would take place without the plan or programme) is identified, described and taken into account.

The SA Scoping Report included an analysis of the socio-economic and environmental baseline conditions for Bassetlaw District, along with how these are likely to change in the future. This informed the development of the SA Framework. This baseline has been updated where appropriate to reflect consultation responses to the Scoping Report.

The baseline analysis is presented for the following topic areas:

- Biodiversity, Green and Blue Infrastructure;
- Population and Community;
- Health and Wellbeing;
- Transport and Accessibility;
- Land Use, Geology and Soil;
- Water;
- Air Quality;
- Climate Change;
- Material Assets;
- Cultural Heritage; and
- Landscape.

Additionally, this section also presents a high level overview of the characteristics of the District's key settlements.

To inform the analysis, data has been drawn from a variety of sources, including: 2011 Census; Nomis; Bassetlaw District Council Annual Monitoring Report 2017 (AMR); the Council's existing plan evidence base; the Environment Agency; Historic England; Index of Multiple Deprivation 2015; Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra); and the Department for Energy and Climate Change (DECC).

The key sustainability issues arising from the review of baseline conditions are summarised at the end of each topic.

Bassetlaw District: An Overview

Bassetlaw is the northernmost District in Nottinghamshire (see **Figure A3.1**) covering an area of around 63,000 hectares (ha). It is bordered to the north by Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council and North Lincolnshire Council and to the east by West Lindsey District Council. To the south of the District is Newark and Sherwood District Council, with Mansfield District Council and Bolsover District Council to the south-west. Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council lies to the west of the District.

The District forms part of the Sheffield City Region with clear synergies, particularly in the western side of the District, in terms of economic growth, skills, transport and housing provision between it and the Doncaster, Rotherham and Sheffield conurbations.

Bassetlaw itself is a District of contrasts. The expansive rural area in the east of the District is characterised by a large number of villages and hamlets. While several of the larger villages have a reasonable range of services, including schools and health services, many have lost facilities over recent years and most rely on larger settlements, notably Retford and Gainsborough (in neighbouring West Lindsey), for major retail and other key services. With the exception of the four 'A' roads radiating out from Retford, and the A631 crossing the north of the District, this area is served chiefly by a network of minor roads. The East Coast Mainline runs north-south through Retford, linking it with Edinburgh, York, Newark, Peterborough and London.

The western edge of Bassetlaw is dominated by the town of Worksop and the three settlements of Harworth Bircotes, Carlton-in-Lindrick and Langold. The western part of Bassetlaw is well connected and has easy access to the strategic road network (the A1, M1 and M18); good rail links (east-west rail links connect Retford and Worksop with Lincoln and Sheffield while the Robin Hood Line provides a direct rail link from Worksop to Nottingham via Mansfield); close proximity to the Doncaster/Rotherham/Sheffield conurbation (and Robin Hood Airport); and a sizeable and flexible workforce.

The District's three largest settlements are Worksop, Retford and Harworth Bircotes. Of the remaining settlements in the District, the adopted Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD identifies the larger villages of Carlton in Lindrick/Langold, Tuxford and Misterton as local service centres.

A summary of the key characteristics of each settlement is provided in **Table A3.1**.

Table A3.1 Key Settlement Characteristics

Settlement	Key Baseline Characteristics
Worksop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estimated population of 44,790 (the District's largest settlement). • Principal town and main retail and employment centre for the District. • Provides leisure and recreation facilities for the surrounding area, as well as secondary and further education opportunities. • The A57 provides excellent links to the strategic road network. • The train station provides good rail links to Nottingham, Sheffield and Lincoln. • Bassetlaw Hospital is an important strategic asset. • Pockets of severe deprivation exist in the town. • A number of local wildlife sites are in close proximity to the town to the north, south and west. • Worksop Conservation Area includes a number of listed buildings and is identified as being 'at risk'. Other conservation areas include Mr Straw, Gateford and Shireoaks (which also contains a scheduled monument, registered park and garden and listed buildings including assets at risk). • The town is bisected east to west by the River Ryton and Flood Zones 2 and 3.
Retford	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estimated population of 22,411 (second largest town in Bassetlaw). • Provides a range of services, including secondary education and hospital provision, to settlements in the east of Bassetlaw. • Benefits from good north-south/east-west rail links. • Retained much of its character as a historic market town, with its centre based around the market square and shopping areas extending from it. • King's Park within Retford is a much used and valued public open space which contributes to the town's character. • Includes pockets of deprivation. • Sutton & Lound Gravel Pits Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) is located adjacent to the northern development boundary of the town. Local wildlife sites are also situated beyond the town's boundary to the north, east and west whilst Retford Cemetery Local Nature Reserve is situated to the west. • Includes two conservation areas. The Retford Conservation Area comprises the majority of the historic town centre and includes a number of listed buildings. Retford South Conservation Area

Settlement	Key Baseline Characteristics
	<p>is effectively the southern gateway to Retford and is characterised by the Great North Road, which has always acted as the main thoroughfare to Retford from the south.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Babworth Hall Registered Park and Garden is located to the west of the town. • Flood Zone 2/3 bisects the town from north to south along the River Idle.
Harworth Bircotes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estimated population of 7,948 (the District's third largest settlement). • Supports a significant number of services and facilities including a supermarket, secondary school, leisure centre and health centre. • Developed, in large part, to serve Harworth Colliery. Following closure of the Colliery in 2006, the town has been left with a large amount of brownfield land with potential for redevelopment (the largest single area in the District). • Contains pockets of deprivation and limited choice of housing. • Benefits from ready access to the strategic road network, notably the A1. • Potential synergies, in terms of labour supply and economic activity, with the Doncaster-Rotherham-Sheffield conurbation and Robin Hood Airport. • Settlement has few environmental constraints.
Carlton in Lindrick/Langold	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estimated population of 5,623. • Functionally linked settlements within the former mining area north of Worksop. Separated by the site of the former Firbeck Colliery and by Langold Country Park (a local wildlife sites and local nature reserve). • Together, the settlements have a good range of services, facilities and employment opportunities, as well as significant amounts of brownfield land for regeneration. • Includes pockets of deprivation, particularly in the Carlton ward. • Ancient woodland is located along the western boundary of Langold and to the south of Carlton in Lindrick. • Carlton in Lindrick Conservation Area is located to the south.
Tuxford	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estimated population of 2,649. • Small, former market town. • Provides a range of services and facilities for the rural communities in the southeast of Bassetlaw including a doctors' surgery and secondary school. • Supports two well-established industrial estates, providing job opportunities to the larger towns of Worksop, Retford, Harworth and Newark. • Majority of the town is designated as a conservation area.
Misterton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estimated population of 2,140 (the largest village in northeast Bassetlaw). • Provides access to local services and facilities, such as a doctor's surgery, pharmacy, post office and convenience store, for the surrounding rural communities. • Unlike other local service centres in the District, has seen significant residential growth over past years. • Settlement is heavily constrained by areas of flood risk to the north, east and west.


The District as a whole has a large number of important strengths, including location, connectivity, employment site availability and its valued natural and historic environment that contributes significantly to the quality of life in, and character of, the District. However, there are also issues which need to be addressed to ensure Bassetlaw's long term sustainability including, in particular, the economic, social and environmental effects of industrial decline. These strengths and issues are discussed further in the sections that follow.

Biodiversity, Green and Blue Infrastructure

Biodiversity

Biodiversity is defined as the variety of plants (flora) and animals (fauna) in an area, and their associated habitats. The importance of preserving biodiversity is recognised from an international to a local level. Biodiversity is important in its own right and has value in terms of quality of life and amenity.

Bassetlaw has a rich and varied natural environment including a range of sites designated for their habitat and conservation value. **Figure A3.2** shows designated nature conservation sites within and in close proximity to the local authority area.



**BASSETLAW SA
Baseline Analysis**

**Figure A3.2: Key
Biodiversity Assets**

-  Bassetlaw District Council
-  Site of Special Scientific Interest
-  Local Nature Reserve
-  Local Wildlife Site
-  Ancient woodland

Source: BDC, Natural England

Map Scale @ A4: 1:175,000



BASSETLAW
DISTRICT COUNCIL

Sites of European importance (Special Protection Areas (SPAs) and Special Areas of Conservation (SACs)) are designated to conserve natural habitats and species of wildlife which are rare, endangered or vulnerable in the European Community. In the UK, these form part of the 'Natura 2000' network of sites protected under the EC Habitats Directive (1992). There are no European designated sites in Bassetlaw District itself although Hatfield Moor SAC, Birklands and Bilaugh SAC and Thorne Moor SAC, Thorne and Hatfield Moors SPA are all within 15 km of the administrative boundary (see **Figure A3.3**).

The conservation objectives for all of the sites have been revised by Natural England in recent years to increase consistency of assessment and reporting. As a result, the high-level conservation objectives for all sites are effectively the same.

The objectives for SACs are:


“With regard to the SAC and the natural habitats and/or species for which the site has been designated (the ‘Qualifying Features’...), and subject to natural change; ensure that the integrity of the site is maintained or restored as appropriate, and ensure that the site contributes to achieving the Favourable Conservation Status of its Qualifying Features, by maintaining or restoring [as applicable to each site];

- the extent and distribution of the qualifying natural habitats
- the structure and function (including typical species) of the qualifying natural habitats
- the supporting processes on which the qualifying natural habitats rely.”

For SPAs the objectives are:

“With regard to the SPA and the individual species and/or assemblage of species for which the site has been classified (the ‘Qualifying Features’...), and subject to natural change; ensure that the integrity of the site is maintained or restored as appropriate, and ensure that the site contributes to achieving the aims of the Wild Birds Directive, by maintaining or restoring:

- the extent and distribution of the habitats of the qualifying features
- the structure and function of the habitats of the qualifying features
- the supporting processes on which the habitats of the qualifying features rely
- the population of each of the qualifying features, and,
- the distribution of the qualifying features within the site.”



BASSETLAW
SA Baseline Analysis

Figure A3.3: European Sites within 15km of Bassetlaw District



- Bassetlaw District Council
- 15km from Council boundary
- Special Area of Conservation
- Ramsar
- Special Protection Area
- Sherwood Forest Important Bird Area*
- Indicative core area of breeding of Nightjar and Woodlark

- Indicative prospective potential Special Protection Area (ppSPA)
 - Sherwood Forest Important Bird Area 5km buffer
- Source: Natural England, NWT
 * IBA boundary from 2018 is shown. IBAs outside of Sherwood Forest are not shown on this map as they have not been considered in the Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) Screening.
- Map Scale @ A4: 1:350,000

Natural England has prepared Site Improvement Plans (SIPs) for Thorne and Hatfield Moors¹ and Birklands and Bilaugh². The SIPs provide a high level overview of the issues (both current and predicted) affecting the condition of features on the sites and outlines the priority measures required to improve the condition of the features. Of potential relevance to the Local Plan, these issues include air pollution, public access and disturbance.

Sherwood Forest prospective potential SPA (ppSPA) covers large parts of Sherwood Forest, some of which extends in to Bassetlaw. The site potentially qualifies as a SPA because of the presence of breeding nightjar and woodlark. The populations in the Sherwood Forest region are believed to represent more than 1% of their total breeding populations in the UK. While referred to as a 'site' the site comprises a number of small areas which appear to provide optimal breeding habitat. As yet, no assessment has been made of the potential boundary of any future SPA. The Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA), which is being undertaken in parallel with the SA, will assess the potential for the Local Plan to have adverse effect on European sites (including SPAs and SACs) and will also consider the likely effects of the plan on the ppSPA. The results of the HRA will feed into the SA, where available and applicable.

There are 20 Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) located within the administrative area of Bassetlaw, covering an area of 1,381 hectares (ha). These are (all are designated for biological features unless stated otherwise):

- Ashton's Meadow.
- Barrow Hills Sandpit.
- Bevercotes Park.
- Castle Hill Wood.
- Chesterfield Canal.
- Claborough Tunnel.
- Clumber Park.
- Creswell Crags (geological).
- Dyscarr Wood.
- Gamston and Eaton Woods and Roadside Verges.
- Mattersey Hill Marsh.
- Mission Line Bank.
- Mission Training Area.
- Mother Drain, Misterton.
- River Idle Washlands.
- Scrooby Top Quarry (geological).
- Styrrup Quarry (geological).
- Sutton and Lound Gravel Pits.
- Treswell Wood.
- Welbeck Lake.

The conditions of each SSSI, as assessed by Natural England, are summarised in **Table A3.2**.

Table A3.2 Condition of SSSIs within Bassetlaw District

Site	Condition (% of area)
Ashton's Meadow	100% unfavourable but recovering
Barrow Hills Sandpit	100% unfavourable but recovering
Bevercotes Park	100% unfavourable but recovering

¹ Available from <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/6489780632158208> [Accessed October 2018].

² <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/6727956374224896> [Accessed October 2018].

Castle Hill Wood	100% unfavourable but recovering
Chesterfield Canal	100% unfavourable, no change
Clarborough Tunnel	100% unfavourable but recovering
Clumber Park	24.66% favourable 75.34% unfavourable but recovering
Creswell Crags	100% favourable
Dyscarr Wood	14.31% favourable 85.69% unfavourable but recovering
Gamston and Eaton Woods and roadside verges	0.86% favourable 99.14% unfavourable but recovering
Mattersey Hill Marsh	67.83% favourable 32.17% unfavourable and declining
Misson Line Bank	70.76% favourable 29.24% unfavourable but recovering
Misson Training Area	25.61% favourable 74.39% unfavourable but recovering
Mother Drain, Misterton	100% unfavourable but recovering
River Idle Washlands	5.17% favourable 69.27% unfavourable but recovering 25.56% unfavourable, no change
Scrooby Top Quarry	100% favourable
Styrrup Quarry	100% favourable
Sutton and Lound Gravel Pits	29.04% favourable 70.96% unfavourable but recovering
Treswell Wood	100% favourable
Welbeck Lake	90.43% favourable 9.57% unfavourable but recovering

Source: Natural England (various) *Designated Sites Condition Summaries* [Accessed August 2020].

In addition to the above international and national level designations, there are four Local Nature Reserves (LNRs) within Bassetlaw District (Retford Cemetery, Woodsetts Pond, Daneshill and Langold Country Park) and around 323 Local Wildlife Sites, which are non-statutory sites of importance for nature conservation value and contribute to the landscape character and distinctiveness of the District.

Between 2008 and 2017, the total area of land covered by Local Wildlife Sites in the District has increased from 4,080.12 ha to 4,300.55 ha (see **Table A3.3**). Note that the loss of land covered by Local Wildlife Sites between 2014 and 2015 was the result of a periodic review of the entirety of the District's Local Wildlife Site coverage, as opposed to a loss of land due to development.

Table A3.3 Area of Land Covered by Local Wildlife Designations (ha)

Year	April 2008	April 2009	April 2010	April 2011	April 2012	April 2013	April 2014	April 2015	April 2016	April 2017
Area of land covered by Local Wildlife Sites (ha)	4,080.12	4,177.99	4,106.00	4,144.14	4,150.41	4,310.81	4,356.60	4,298.79	4,300.17	4,300.55

Source: Bassetlaw District Council (various) *Annual Monitoring Reports 2008-2017*³.

The Nottinghamshire Biodiversity Action Plan⁴(LBAP) reviews the existing biodiversity in Nottinghamshire and develops Habitat Action Plans and Species Action Plans for priority species identified in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan. Species Action Plans have been developed for the following: Atlantic Salmon, Barn Owl, Bats, Black Poplar, Deptford Pink and the Dingy Skipper⁵ amongst others

³ The most recent Bassetlaw Annual Monitoring Report (2017-2018) does not report on the area of land covered by Local Wildlife Sites.

⁴ <http://www.nottsbag.org.uk/projects.htm#bap> [Accessed October 2018]

⁵ <http://www.nottsbag.org.uk/projects.htm#bap> [Accessed October 2018]

Green and Blue Infrastructure

Green infrastructure encompasses all “green” assets in an authority area, including parks, street trees, managed and unmanaged sites and designed and planted open spaces, whereas Blue Infrastructure includes all water spaces, including river corridors and waterbodies. Bassetlaw District’s green infrastructure network includes two Country Parks; Clumber Park and Langold Country Park, an extensive system of green corridors and several large environmental sites.

A Green Infrastructure Study⁶ for the District was completed in 2010 which identified Bassetlaw’s core green infrastructure assets. These assets include, for example: the Chesterfield Canal; the River Idle; the River Trent; the River Ryton; Treswell Wood; and Sutton and Lound Gravel Pits. The Study highlights two areas of strategic deficiency in the green infrastructure network, notably in the area that lies to the east of Retford and to the west of the Trent Washlands / River Trent and the central Idle Valley to the north of Retford, both of which are largely related to the need for better connectivity with the wider network. The Study also identifies opportunities for enhancing green infrastructure in the District, particularly where it may be delivered in conjunction with new development and at strategic locations.

Likely Evolution of the Baseline Without the Local Plan

Information in respect of the condition of the SSSIs and Local Wildlife Sites in the District suggests that biodiversity is improving, although threats remain. Threats to biodiversity identified in the Nottinghamshire LBAP⁷ are wide ranging and include:

- loss of, and damage to, wetland habitats species.
- loss of species diversity due to pollution.
- damage to soils, water and ecosystems caused by the inappropriate use of fertilisers and pesticides.
- the decline in the wildlife value of green space due to inappropriate management.
- loss of biodiversity through inappropriate woodland management, or lack of management.
- loss of wildlife sites and agricultural land to development.
- loss of, and damage to, urban wildlife sites through development.

There are a number of ongoing initiatives and projects in the District that together will help to conserve and enhance biodiversity and which would be expected to continue without the Local Plan. These include, for example, Trent Vale Landscape Partnership, Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust and Idle Valley Project, Sherwood Forest Regional Park and Natural England Higher Level Stewardship.

It is reasonable to assume that without the Local Plan, existing trends would continue. However, whilst national planning policy contained in the NPPF and local policy in the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD would help to ensure that new development protects and enhances biodiversity, a lack of up-to-date local policy support may result in the inappropriate location and design of development which could have a negative effect on overall biodiversity in the District. Further, opportunities may be lost to plan at the strategic level for green infrastructure provision which could provide biodiversity enhancements through, for example, habitat creation schemes.

Summary of Key Sustainability Issues

- The need to conserve and enhance biodiversity including sites designated for their nature conservation value.
- The need to maintain, restore, protect and expand the District’s priority habitats.
- The need to protect and increase populations of protected and priority species.
- The need to prevent the spread of invasive species.
- The need to adapt ecological communities to climate change.
- The need to safeguard and enhance existing green and blue infrastructure assets/networks.
- The need to enhance the green infrastructure network, addressing identified gaps, improving accessibility and encouraging multiple uses where appropriate.

⁶ Bassetlaw District Council (2010) *Bassetlaw District Council Green Infrastructure Study*. 2010.

⁷ <http://www.nottsbg.org.uk/projects.htm#bap> [Accessed October 2018]

- The need to improve the connectivity of green space.
- The need to prevent harm to geological conservation interests.

Population and Community

Demographics

As at the 2011 Census, Bassetlaw District had a population of 112,863, an increase of 4.8% since the 2001 Census when the population stood at 107,713. Over half of the District's population (67,509) resided in the settlements of Worksop and Retford. 2019 Office for National Statistics (ONS)⁸ mid-year population estimates indicate that the population had risen to 117,459, a 9.04% increase on the population estimate for 2011.

Of the total resident population, 49.6% are male and 50.4% are female (as at 2011). The age structure of the population is relatively similar to that of the East Midlands region and England as a whole (see **Table A3.4**). However, the percentage of people aged 0 to 15 is slightly lower than national and regional averages whilst the percentage of the population aged 65 and over is higher.

Table A3.4 Population by Age Group

Age Group	Bassetlaw (%)	East Midlands (%)	England (%)
0-15 years	17.6	18.5	19.0
16-24 years	10.3	12.0	11.6
25-49 years	31.3	32.5	34.3
50-64 years	17.4	15.9	15.2
65 and over	23.4	21.2	20.1

Source: ONS (2011) *2011 Census – Age structure – June 2011*

Using the ONS category descriptions, the largest ethnic group in Bassetlaw District is White British which accounts for 94.5% of the population, with the Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) population accounting for 5.5%. There was a 2.8% increase in BME residents in the District between 2001 and 2011.

Deprivation

The English Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) measures relative levels of deprivation in small areas of England called Lower Layer Super Output Areas (LSOA). Deprivation refers to an unmet need, which is caused by a lack of resources including for areas such as income, employment, health, education, skills, training, crime, access to housing and services and living environment.

The 2019 IMD⁹ ranked Bassetlaw 108th out of 317 local authorities (where a rank of 1 is the most deprived in the country and a rank of 317 is the least deprived). Particular issues affecting the District as identified through the IMD include crime, education, skills and training and employment.

Around 7% of LSOAs in the District rank within the top 10% most deprived areas nationally. The District's most deprived areas are concentrated within the urban area of Worksop, although pockets of deprivation also exist in other parts of the District including, for example, in Retford, Harworth and Carlton in Lindrick/Langold.

Housing

Bassetlaw is within a sub-regional housing market area that extends to include the adjoining Districts of Bolsover, Chesterfield and North East Derbyshire. The geography of the District means that its housing market, particularly to the south, is also influenced by adjoining towns including Mansfield and Alfreton.

According to the 2011 Census, the number of dwellings in the District had risen from 46,459 in 2001 to 49,401 in 2011, an increase of 6.3%. Between 2006 - 2018, a total of 4,025 dwellings were completed, equating to an average of 335 dwellings per annum¹⁰. In 2017/2018, there were 551 total completions, which represents an increase over the previous year when 462 dwellings were completed. The 551 completions for 2017/2018 was an overprovision of 270 homes when compared to housing target based on the Housing Delivery Test Measurement Rule Book. Of these completions 493


⁸ ONS. (2020). Mid-2019 Population Estimates. Available at: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/datasets/populationestimatesforukenglandandwalesscotlandandnorthernireland> [Accessed August 2020]

⁹ Available from <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/english-indices-of-deprivation-2019> [Accessed November 2019]

¹⁰ Bassetlaw District Council (2020) 2017-18 Annual Monitoring Report Sustainability Appraisal Report for the Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version Second Addendum May 2022: Appendices

were spread between the settlements of Worksop, Retford and Harworth & Bircotes. This more recent figure aligns to the level of likely future housing need set out in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (435-500 new homes per year over the period to 2031)¹¹. **Figure A3.4** shows the housing land supply position in Bassetlaw at April 2018. At this point, the Council was able to demonstrate a surplus of 973 dwellings in relation to the five-year housing supply in Bassetlaw.

Figure A3.4 Current Housing Supply and Future Housing Trajectory



Source: Bassetlaw District Council (2020) *Annual Monitoring Report 2017-2018*

The average household size in the District has decreased slightly from 2.35 persons per household in 2001 to 2.31 in 2011. In terms of tenure, **Table A3.5** highlights that the percentage of owner-occupied households in the District is slightly above national and regional averages.

Table A3.5 Housing Tenure

Tenure	Bassetlaw (%)	East Midlands (%)	England (%)
Owner- occupied	69.5	67.3	63.4
Rented from Council / housing association	15.9	15.8	17.7
Private / other rented	12.9	14.9	16.8
Living rent free	1.7	1.3	1.3

Source: ONS (2011) *2011 Census - Tenure*

The SHMA (2014) highlights that Bassetlaw has some of the cheapest housing in the East Midlands region. House prices over the period 1996 to 2007 (the pre-recession decade) increased by 178% (£80,000), although this level of growth was lower than across the East Midlands (188%) and England (186%) despite its low base – indicating weaker relative demand. From 2007 to 2012, house prices were broadly consistent (gaining just £25 in value) in Bassetlaw District. This compares with a 9% increase in house prices in England as a whole for the same period.

The average house price in Bassetlaw was £158,500 in the year end September 2019¹². The median housing affordability ratio refers to the ratio of median price paid for residential property to the median workplace-based gross

¹¹ GL Hearn (2014) *Strategic Housing Market Assessment: Bassetlaw Report*.

¹² ONS. (2020). House price to residence-based earnings ratio. Available at: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/housing/datasets/ratioofhousepricetoresidencebasedearningslowerquartileandmedian> [Accessed August 2020]

annual earnings for full-time workers. In 2018, Bassetlaw's ratio was 6.2, lower than the national average of 7.8. For the year period ending 2018 the housing affordability ratio for Bassetlaw increased from 5.9 to 6.2¹³.

The SHMA highlights that some 22.9% of all households cannot afford market housing – either rented or to buy – within Bassetlaw District without subsidy. According to the AMR¹⁴, a total of 26 affordable units were completed in the 2017-18 monitoring period, across two sites, a decrease from the 67 affordable units completed in 2016-17.

Economy

Bassetlaw is a largely rural District with a history of coal mining. Over the last 30 years, the District has seen the decline of its traditional industries, particularly in the west, which continues to suffer from the effects of the decline and cessation of coal mining and of traditional manufacturing. However, the District includes internationally recognised brands of food production, world class precision engineering and manufacturing.

Between April 2019 and March 2020, 83.6% of the District's population was economically active, higher than regional (79.7%) and national (79.1%) averages¹⁵. The unemployment rate was 3.6%, slightly lower than regional and national averages at 3.7% and 3.9% respectively. Data showing the impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic on local employment levels has not yet emerged, but it is likely that there will have been some effect.

There is a dominance of lower-value added employment in the District's labour market, characterised by jobs with low earnings and low skills requirements and high levels of part-time employment. Bassetlaw has a significantly lower than average number of people employed in occupations in the socio-economic classification (SOC) 2010 major groups 1-3, with a higher than average number of people employed in SOC 2010 major group 4-5 and 8-9, as shown in **Table A3.6**. Average gross weekly pay for full-time workers residing in Bassetlaw in 2019 was £553.00. This was slightly higher than the average for the East Midlands region (£547.40) and was lower than the average for Great Britain (£587.00).

Table A3.6 Employment Breakdown by Occupation

Occupation	Bassetlaw (%)	East Midlands (%)	Great Britain (%)
Soc 2010 Major Group 1-3 1. Managers and Senior Officials 2. Professional Occupations 3. Associate Professionals & Technical	36.2	43.0	48.0
Soc 2010 Major Group 4-5 4. Administrative & Secretarial 5. Skilled Trades Occupations	20.5	21.2	19.7
Soc 2010 Major Group 6-7 6. Caring, Leisure and Other Service Occupations 7. Sales and Customer Service Occupations	20.7	16.4	16.1
Soc 2010 Major Group 8-9 8. Process Plant & Machine Operatives 9. Elementary Occupations	22.6	19.3	16.3

Source: NOMIS (2020) *Labour Market Profile – Bassetlaw April 2019 – March 2020*.

Of the 58,000 jobs within the District (as at 2018)¹⁶, a large proportion are located in Worksop and Retford. The majority of jobs in the District are within the service sector, reflecting regional and national trends. However, despite a decline in traditional manufacturing, the District has a relatively high proportion of manufacturing jobs (18.4%), particularly when compared to the national average (8.1%). The number of jobs in this sector has grown over the period 2009-2018.

¹³ ONS. (2020). Housing affordability in England and Wales: 2018. Available at: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/housing/bulletins/housingaffordabilityinenglandandwales/2018> [Accessed August 2020]

¹⁴ Bassetlaw District Council. (2020). 2017-18 Annual Monitoring Report. Available at: <https://data.bassetlaw.gov.uk/media/7407/monitoring-report-17-18.pdf> [Accessed August 2020]

¹⁵ NOMIS (2020). Official Labour Market Statistics. Available at: <https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/lmp/la/1946157163/report.aspx?town=Bassetlaw> [Accessed August 2020]

¹⁶ NOMIS (2020). Official Labour Market Statistics. Available at: <https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/lmp/la/1946157163/report.aspx?town=Bassetlaw> [Accessed August 2020]

The number of enterprises in the District has increased year-on-year since 2011, from 3,275 to 4,020 in 2019 following a period of decline which broadly reflects the national trend of economic recovery. Like the East Midlands region as a whole, the majority of the District's enterprises (88.7%) are micro in scale (employing 0-9 people).

The AMR (2017-18)¹⁷ reports that the total amount of land committed for economic purposes across Bassetlaw in the 2017-18 monitoring period was 148ha . A total of 30.01ha was developed for economic purposes during the same period.

The economic strengths of the District that will help to attract and support future economic growth, are:

- good transport accessibility.
- strong growth and competitive advantages in transport and communications and distribution sectors in the last decade.
- some potential to capitalise on proximity to growth at Robin Hood Airport.
- good quality of life in rural areas.

The challenges to the District's ability to adapt and grow include:

- the District's lack of a clear business image and identity.
- its small local economy giving a smaller base from which to generate growth.
- its relatively low representation in office based sectors and knowledge based sectors.
- competing effects from nearby economic centres, such as Sheffield and Doncaster.
- a relatively lower rate of business start-ups.
- need for public sector funding to bring forward many employment sites and incubation/enterprise premises.
- low levels of inward investment and relocations from elsewhere.

Skills and Education

The decline of traditional industries such as manufacturing and the lack of economic opportunities can discourage people from attaining higher educational qualifications and therefore hinder skills development within the District. **Table A3.7** illustrates that compared with the East Midlands region and the national (Great Britain) average, levels of educational attainment in Bassetlaw are generally much lower. For the period January to December 2019, the educational attainment of pupils within Bassetlaw at the end of Key Stage 4 (GCSE or Equivalent) achieving 5+ A* - C (NVQ 2 and above) was 63.2%, below the regional average of 74.4% and the national average of 75.6%.

Table A3.7 Level of Qualification Obtained

Level	Bassetlaw (%)	East Midlands (%)	Great Britain (%)
NVQ 4 and above	16.3	34.1	40.3
NVQ 3 and above	39.1	56.4	58.5
NVQ 2 and above	63.2	74.4	75.6
NVQ 1 and above	80.3	85.5	85.6
Other qualifications	9.7	7.0	6.7
No qualifications	10.0	7.4	7.7

Source: Nomis (2020) *Qualifications January 2019 – December 2019*.

While there are primary schools in many of the smaller villages across the rural parts of the District, secondary schools and sixth form/further education colleges are generally located in larger settlements. There are no universities in Bassetlaw.

Community Facilities and Services

Larger community facilities and services such as schools and health care facilities are predominantly focused in the District's larger settlements such as Worksop, Retford and Harworth Bircotes and which provide a range of facilities and services for their own communities whilst providing a service focus and employment opportunities for the surrounding

¹⁷ Bassetlaw District Council. (2020). 2017-18 Annual Monitoring Report. Available at: <https://data.bassetlaw.gov.uk/media/7407/monitoring-report-17-18.pdf> [Accessed August 2020]
Sustainability Appraisal Report for the Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version Second Addendum
May 2022: Appendices

hinterlands. The District's next largest settlements including Carlton in Lindrick/Langold, Tuxford and Misterton also provide a range of shopping, employment and other facilities and services to principally meet local needs.

The findings of the Services and Facilities Study (2010)¹⁸ highlight that, particularly in rural areas, the smaller the settlement the fewer services and facilities it is likely to have. Therefore, the reliance and dependence on larger settlements for services and facilities is going to be high. However, a number of settlements that have relatively large populations, like South Leverton, only have a few services or facilities. In contrast, some smaller settlements, like Cuckney, have a large number of services and facilities that both serve the local population and the surrounding communities.

According to the most recent AMR that reported on the matter¹⁹, there was a total gain of 17,024.5 m² of community services/facilities space within the District during the 2016/17 period.

Bassetlaw, in many respects, forms an extension to the Yorkshire and Humberside region as the District is closer to Sheffield and Doncaster than it is to Nottingham to the south. This is reflected in shopping patterns within the District with most people looking to the Yorkshire towns and surrounding retail parks/malls/outlets for their non-food shopping requirements rather than Nottingham or smaller East Midland centres such as Lincoln, Mansfield or Chesterfield.

Major retail facilities in Worksop include the Priory Shopping Centre and Sandy Lane Retail Park. In addition, there are two large out-of-centre superstores. Worksop draws most of its trade from the town itself and the former mining communities to the north and west including Carlton, Whitwell and Creswell particularly for convenience goods. However, the catchment area for both categories of goods is curtailed by the proximity of competing centres. For convenience goods these include Doncaster to the north, Retford to the east, Mansfield to the south and Dinnington and Clowne to the west. For comparison goods, for which people are prepared to travel further albeit on less frequent trips, there are the same competing centres plus Sheffield and Meadowhall that are the main destinations for leakage, and Doncaster Lakeside Outlet Centre to a lesser extent. The retail park at Sandy Lane in Worksop is the largest bulky goods facility for some distance and draws some trade from further afield including Retford where there are few comparable outlets.

Retford town centre serves the surrounding rural communities, which tend to be smaller settlements with fewer local facilities than the villages in the west of the District. There are few retail facilities in Retford outside the town centre. Two large supermarkets on the periphery of the town centre help retain local convenience goods expenditure.

Retford draws most of its trade from the town itself and the surrounding rural communities. However, like Worksop, the catchment area for both categories of goods is curtailed by the proximity of competing centres and particularly for non-food. For convenience goods these include Doncaster to the north, Gainsborough to the east, Newark and Ollerton to the south and Worksop to the west. For comparison goods, there are the same competing centres plus Doncaster Lakeside Outlet Centre and to a lesser extent Sheffield and Meadowhall, Lincoln, Mansfield and Newark. The bulky goods retail warehouse offer in Retford is very limited and there is a high leakage rate for these classes of goods that normally generate fairly localised shopping patterns.

The Retail and Leisure Study (2017)²⁰ highlights that the level of retail diversity is broadly comparable to the town centres of Grantham and Boston. However, the Study also found that Worksop's vacancy rate (13.4%) was significantly lower than Grantham (17%), yet was slightly higher than Boston (10.7%). The Study concluded that Worksop offered a diverse range of retail units, yet held a slightly higher than average vacancy rate (13.4%) compared to the national average of all UK centres (11.2%).

The AMR sets out that planning permission was granted for 1347.2 m² of convenience goods floor space in the monitoring period 2017/18 in the District (although this permission has yet to be implemented), with comparison goods floor space having increased by 103.5 m² during the same period. The AMR also reported that during 2017/18, the number of vacant retail units decreased or stayed the same in identified town centres, and non-retail usage decreased for Worksop. Recent trends in the number of vacant retail units in Bassetlaw are shown in **Table A3.8**. It should be noted that Bassetlaw District Council prescribes a flexible approach to its town centres, as recognised by the NPPF. The existing trends on primary shopping frontages within the District suggest that the Councils flexible and sustainable approach is working.

¹⁸ Bassetlaw District Council (2010) Services and Facilities Study. Available from <http://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/media/1640/bsservicesfacilitiesstudy.pdf> [Accessed 31 October 2018].

¹⁹ Bassetlaw District Council. (2017). Annual Monitoring Report. Available at: <https://data.bassetlaw.gov.uk/media/754170/Whole-Document-AMR-2016-17-12-01-18-pdf.pdf> [Accessed September 2018]

²⁰ Nexus Planning. (2017). Bassetlaw District Retail and Leisure Study, Available at: <http://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/media/692215/Bassetlaw-District-Retail-Leisure-Study-by-Nexus-Planning-Main-Study.pdf> [Accessed September 2018]

Table A3.8 Vacant Retail Units

Monitoring Period	Worksop	Retford	Langold	Harworth	Tuxford
2011/12	39	17	2	5	2
2012/13	39	30	7	7	6
2013/14	34	14	3	3	2
2014/15	51	22	7	7	2
2015/16	40	21	4	4	0
2016/17	44	19	0	6	0
2017/18	38	19	0	1	0

Likely Evolution of the Baseline Without the Local Plan

The latest projections anticipate the District's population to increase to 132,705 by 2043 from 116,839 in 2018). The number of households Bassetlaw is expected to increase from 49,751 In 2018 to 53,877 in 2028, an increase of 4,126 during that period²¹²².

From April 2018 to March 31st 2019 the housing requirement for Bassetlaw using the Standard Method has been calculated as 306 dwellings per annum. However, for the purposes of calculating the five year land supply, the Council has applied a slightly higher figure (324 dwellings per annum) to take into consideration the Governments objective of delivering 300,000 dwellings per annum.)²³

The AMR²⁴ states that the District currently has a deliverable supply of 2,674 dwellings over the 2018-2023 period, which equates to a 7.9 year supply when assessed against the total five year housing target of 1,700 dwellings. This represents a surplus of 973 dwellings.

The Council's (2015) Regeneration and Growth Strategy 2014 – 2028 highlights that the local economy is challenged by its inherent low business base. In simple terms, there are not enough businesses. The Strategy sets out a 14 year plan to support the Council's economy which includes a vision for a prosperous future that will:

- strengthen the area's economic competitiveness, which will underpin development of sustainable growth;
- develop an appropriately educated and skilled workforce;
- support the innovation of enterprise that will help diversify the business base; and
- recognise the importance of strategic and sustainable areas of economic growth and investment.

The Nottinghamshire Growth Plan sets out the critical actions that will help drive positive change in Nottinghamshire and provides a framework to secure and guide resources for future investment. It sets out the following objectives:

- create an environment that allows businesses to flourish, where creativity and innovation are valued, investment is facilitated, entrepreneurs are encouraged and established businesses can prosper;
- forge Nottinghamshire's enviable infrastructure networks into one of the best connected counties, driving investment and creating new jobs; and
- increase the competitiveness of Nottinghamshire by creating the conditions to grow an increasingly skilled and productive workforce.

The District also sits within the wider contexts of the Sheffield City Region and the Derby & Derbyshire and Nottingham & Nottinghamshire (D2N2) area. The Sheffield City Region Local Enterprise Partnership Strategic Economic Plan (2014) sets out a 10 year plan for growth in the City Region and identifies that Worksop has a diverse economic base with a number of key visitor attractions such as Clumber Park and Sherwood Forest, whilst Retford is considered to benefit from access to the national railway network with strong economic links to Nottingham, Lincoln and Newark. The City Region is consulting on a new Strategic Economic Plan from August to September 2020. The D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership Strategic Economic Plan Vision 2030 (2020), meanwhile, sets out a 10 year plan for growth and identifies the counties of

²¹ ONS (2020) Population projections for local authorities. Available at:

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationprojections/datasets/localauthoritiesinenglandtable2>

²² ONS (2020) Household projections for England: 2018-based. Available at:

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationprojections/bulletins/householdprojectionsforengland/2018based>

²³ Bassetlaw District Council. (2020). 2017-18 Annual Monitoring Report. Available at:

<https://data.bassetlaw.gov.uk/media/7407/monitoring-report-17-18.pdf> [Accessed August 2020]

²⁴ Ibid.

Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire, as where most of the area's workforce resides with Worksop sitting as part of the network of major towns in the area.

To support economic growth in the District, the adopted Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD identifies a gross employment land target of 107 ha to 2028, in addition to requirements for new retail provision to strengthen local centres.

An update to the 2009 Retail and Leisure Study²⁵ has been undertaken and identifies that there is no capacity for additional convenience goods floorspace or comparison goods floorspace in Worksop for the period to 2028, although there is capacity for additional bulky goods floorspace. In Retford, the assessment concludes that there is capacity for additional convenience goods floorspace in the period to 2028 but no capacity for additional comparison goods or bulky goods floorspace.

The development of the Bassetlaw Plan ensures the effective delivery of housing, employment and community facilities and services. The Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan recognised that there is a need to undertake up-to-date policy research relating to (in particular) the amount, type and location of new development and a sufficient supply of site allocations to meet future requirements, the extent to which new development and its location meets the needs of the District's communities and businesses would be more uncertain as (to a large extent) the key decisions over where development is located would be left solely to the market. The development of the Bassetlaw Plan will ensure that the Council's Regeneration and Growth Strategy are fulfilled.

Key Sustainability Issues

- The need to meet the District's objectively assessed housing need including for affordable housing.
- The need to provide an adequate supply of land for housing.
- The need to make best use of, and improve, the quality of the existing housing stock.
- The need to diversify the local economy and support the delivery of the District's Regeneration and Growth Strategy, Nottinghamshire Growth Plan and Sheffield City Region and the D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership Strategic Economic Plans.
- The need to provide a range of quality sites, infrastructure and wider environment for business development.
- The need to support the development of innovative and knowledge-based businesses.
- The need to support the growth and development of existing businesses.
- The need to increase local employment opportunities, particularly in the aftermath of Brexit and the COVID-19 pandemic.
- The need to provide job opportunities in sustainable locations.
- The need to tackle deprivation, particularly in those areas of the District that are most deprived, and deliver regeneration.
- The need to raise educational attainment and skills in the local labour force.
- The need to maintain and enhance the vitality and viability of the District's town centres and larger villages.
- The need to safeguard existing community facilities and services (social capital) and ensure the timely delivery of new facilities to meet needs arising from new development.

Health and Wellbeing

Health

The 2019 Health Profile for Bassetlaw produced by Public Health England²⁶ highlights that the health of the District's population is varied when compared with the England average. About 16.2% (3,205) children live in low income families. Life expectancy for both men and women is also lower than the England average (see **Table A3.9**) (life expectancy also

²⁵ Nexus Planning (2017) *Retail and Leisure Study* Available from <http://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/media/1958/bassetlaw-District-retail-leisure-study-by-nexus-planning-main-study.pdf> [Accessed October 2018].

²⁶ Public Health England (2020) Local Authority Health Profiles. Available at: https://fingertips.phe.org.uk/profile/health-profiles/area-search-results/E12000004?search_type=list-child-areas&place_name=East%20Midlands [Accessed August 2020]

varies across the District itself and is 8.7 years lower for men and 6.9 years lower for women in the most deprived areas of Bassetlaw than in the least deprived areas).

Table A3.9 Life Expectancy in Bassetlaw

	Bassetlaw	English Average	English Worst	English Best
Male	78.7	79.6	74.5	83.9
Female	82.5	83.2	79.5	87.0

Source: Public Health England (2020) *Health Profile for Bassetlaw*.

The Health Profile highlights that the health of adults is generally better than the average for England in relation to the prevalence of the estimated diabetes and dementia diagnosis rate, but is worse than the national average in relation to hospital admission rate for alcohol-related conditions and obesity. In terms of their own perceptions, as at the 2011 Census, 6.7% of the District's residents reported their health as bad or very bad and 21.8% reported a long term illness or disability that impacts on their day to day activities, higher than the average in England (17.6%).

Bassetlaw Hospital, Worksop, is one of the key hospitals in the Doncaster and Bassetlaw Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust. The hospital has 305 beds and each year treats around 33,000 patients along with 38,000 emergencies in the A&E Department.

GP-patient ratio data²⁷ for the NHS Bassetlaw Clinical Commissioning Group highlights that, as at 2014, ratios were 1,672.39 patients per Full Time Equivalent (FTE) GP. This is above the UK average of 1,580 patients per FTE GP.

Open Space

The provision of open space, sports and recreational facilities can play a significant role in the promotion of healthy lifestyles. The Council undertook an open space, sport and recreation study in 2010 which was subsequently updated in 2012²⁸. The Open Space Study identifies a total of 234 green spaces totalling 350 ha which are summarised in **Table A3.10** by typology and shown in **Figure A3.5**.

Table A3.10 Provision of Open Space by Type

Typology	Current provision (ha)	Number of sites	Current provision (ha per 1,000 population)
Parks and gardens	70.93	5	1.2
Natural and semi-natural	112.96	17	1.44
Amenity greenspace	114.05	110	1.04
Play areas	15.04	66	0.16
Allotments	38.56	36	0.39
Total	351.54	234	4.23

Source: Bassetlaw District Council (2012) *Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study*.


Whilst the level of open space provision is significant, the Open Space Study highlights deficiencies in some typologies in some areas. These deficiencies are as follows:

- Amenity greenspace: Elkesley, Nether Langwith and Rampton were identified as having no access to amenity greenspace.
- Provision for children and young people: a catchment gap was identified in Harworth Bircotes.
- Allotments: minor gaps in provision were identified in Harworth Bircotes whilst Carlton-in-Lindrick and Misterton were considered to be not serviced by adequate provision.

No deficiencies in parks and gardens or natural and semi-natural greenspace were identified.

²⁷ See <http://www.gponline.com/exclusive-huge-variation-gp-patient-ratio-across-england-revealed/article/1327390> [Accessed October 2018].

²⁸ Bassetlaw District Council (2012) *Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study*
Sustainability Appraisal Report for the Bassetlaw Local
Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version Second Addendum
May 2022: Appendices



**BASSETLAW SA
Baseline Analysis**

Figure A3.5: Open Space



Source: BDC, Natural England

Map Scale @ A4: 1:175,000

Crime

Crime rates in Bassetlaw are relatively low compared with the national average and there has been an overall reduction in crime since 2020, from 1,058 offences to 981 offences between March 2020 and March 2021. Between April 2020 and April 2021, anti-social behaviour and violent crime were the most reported types of crime (3,740 offences and 3,041 offences, respectively)²⁹

Likely Evolution of the Baseline Without the Local Plan

The Sustainable Community Strategy sets out a vision for health that by 2020 Bassetlaw will “see the health of Bassetlaw residents improved and health inequalities reduced in the areas of highest deprivation”. The Nottinghamshire Sustainability and Transformation Plan (2016-2021)³⁰ identifies five high-impact areas for health including promoting wellbeing, prevention, independence and self-care, strengthening primary, community, social care and carer services, simplifying and improving urgent and emergency care, delivering technology enabled care and ensuring consistent, evidence-based pathways in planned care. The development of the Bassetlaw Plan will ensure the future provision of health facilities and services meets local needs and that new development does not give rise to adverse impacts on human health.

Policies contained in the existing Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD support crime reduction through, for example, the promotion of high quality design that includes crime prevention measures (see Policy DM4). This would be expected to continue in the absence of the Local Plan at least for the duration of the existing Development Plan period.

Key Sustainability Issues

- The need to protect the health and wellbeing of the District’s population.
- The need to promote healthy lifestyles.
- The need to tackle inequalities in health.
- The need to protect and enhance open space provision across the District.
- The need to improve access to green space.
- The need to support high quality design.
- The need to reduce crime levels, minimise risk and increase community safety.
- The need to safeguard existing health care facilities and services and ensure the timely delivery of new facilities and services to meet needs arising from new development.
- The need to plan for an ageing population.
- The need to address health inequalities.

Transport and Accessibility

Transport Infrastructure

Bassetlaw benefits from good connectivity to the strategic road network with the A1 providing linkages to the M18 and access to the M1 via the A57. The M1 connects Bassetlaw well with the rest of the UK and provides access to the M62 Trans-Pennine route. There are a number of other A-roads in the District with the A631 running across the north from Rotherham through to Gainsborough and the A60 running from Nottingham to Doncaster via Mansfield and Worksop. The A619 to the west, meanwhile, links Worksop to Chesterfield whilst the A614 runs south towards Nottingham. Three other A-roads also radiate out from Retford.

²⁹ UK Crime Stats (2021). Bassetlaw Crime Stats. Available at: <https://www.ukcrimestats.com/Constituency/65711> [Accessed June 2021]

³⁰ Nottinghamshire Sustainability and Transformation Plan 2016-2021. Available at: http://platform-ccg-live-eu-2.s3-eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/attachments/5594/original/The_Nottingham_and_Nottinghamshire_Full_STP_published_24_11_16_revised_1.12.16.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAJ3TZGA3TUZPPHIWQ&Expires=1537962176&Signature=%2B5dhL0zzezdKDCHHxvGhtiGR%2FvI%3D [Accessed September 2018]

The District has excellent rail links, both north-south and east-west. The East Coast Mainline runs through Retford linking London King's Cross and Edinburgh Waverly stations, via Stevenage, Peterborough, Grantham, Newark, Retford, Doncaster, York, Darlington, Durham, Newcastle, Berwick-upon-Tweed and Dunbar. East-west rail links between Lincoln and Sheffield also connect Retford and Worksop. The Robin Hood line provides a direct rail link starting from Worksop through Mansfield to Nottingham. From Nottingham or Sheffield, rail links are available to all the major cities in the UK, including Birmingham, Bristol, Leeds and Manchester.

A good bus service operates around the principal urban areas of Worksop and Retford. However, as with many rural areas, bus services are infrequent throughout the wider District, making access to services by car a necessity for most residents.

Bassetlaw is well served for air travel. The District is within a 45 minute drive time of East Midlands Airport, which serves over 30 European destinations, and is 20 minutes from Robin Hood Airport, which serves more than 35 European destinations. Gamston Airport, used for private, charter aircraft, is located to the south of Retford.

The local cycle network in Worksop and Retford makes cycling between residential areas, work and leisure possible, whilst National Cycle Network routes 6 and 647 connect Worksop to Sheffield to the west, Nottingham to the south and Lincoln to the east. Coverage elsewhere is more limited; expanding the network, and improving connectivity between home, work, shops and services particularly for short journeys, and also for leisure by non-car modes of transport continues to be a priority.

Movement

According to the 2011 Census, the average distance travelled to work by Bassetlaw residents was 17.6 km, which represents an increase from 15.4 km as at the 2001 Census. **Table A3.11** compares the distance travelled to work by the District's residents in 2001 and 2011 and highlights that the proportion of people travelling less than 10 km has decreased whilst the proportion travelling over 10 km has increased. The 2011 Census also illustrates that the primary mode of travelling to work is by car or van (44.2%) but that a significant proportion of people (20.1%, higher than the regional average of 22.1%) do not have access to a car.


Table A3.11 Distance Travelled to Work

Distance Travelled to Work	Number of People (2001)	% of People in Employment (2001)	Number of People (2011)	% of People in Employment (2011)
Less than 2 km	11,595	25.13	10,445	20.15
2 km to less than 5 km	7,044	15.26	7,309	14.1
5 km to less than 10 km	5,878	12.74	6,856	13.23
10 km to less than 20 km	7,142	15.48	9,313	17.97
20 km to less than 30 km	4,041	8.76	4,385	8.46
30 km to less than 40 km	1,564	3.39	1,843	3.56
40 km to less than 60 km	1,318	2.86	1,113	2.15
60 km and over	1,507	3.27	1,526	2.94
Working from home	4,278	9.27	5,525	10.66
Other	1,778	3.85	3,514	6.78

Source: ONS (2001) *Census 2001*; ONS (2011) *Census 2011*.

Commuting flows indicate that in 2011, a total of 16,220 workers commuted into Bassetlaw from other local authorities whilst 17,164 residents commuted out of the District. This represents a net outflow of 944 workers, suggesting a relatively high degree of self-containment. **Figure A3.7** shows the workplace origins and destinations of workers and residents travelling to and from Bassetlaw for 2011. It indicates that the majority of the District's residents commuted to Doncaster, Sheffield and Rotherham (6,945 people). Doncaster and Rotherham were also the origin of most in-commuters into the local authority area (4,395 people). It is likely that the recent shift towards working from home as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic will have influenced commuting patterns, but more up to date data showing this is not yet available.

Figure A3.6 Workplace Destinations



Source: NOMIS (2014) Location of usual residence and place of work by method of travel to work. Available from <http://www.nomisweb.co.uk/census/2011/WU01UK/chart/1132462277> [Accessed August 2015]

Likely Evolution of the Baseline Without the Local Plan

An increase in population and households in the District will in-turn generate additional transport movements. Based on existing trends, the majority of these movements are likely to be by car with a continuation of (net) out-commuting but also in-commuting. This could result in increased pressure on the local road network and public transport infrastructure.

A District-Wide Transport Study undertaken in 2010 (and updated in 2014 and 2019)³¹ concludes that, on the whole, the existing bus, rail, walking/cycling and highway networks within the District operate within capacity. However, help reduce traffic impacts a minimum target modal shift of 5% from car driving to sustainable modes is recommended to bring the average travel to work modal split across the district in line with the County average. Bus service enhancements, network and infrastructure improvements will therefore need to be identified on a site-by-site basis in order to achieve this target. The Study also identifies the following junctions as priorities for improvement:

- J1 - A60/A619 Roundabout, Worksop.
- J3 – A57/Sandy Lane Roundabout, Worksop.
- J4 – A57/Claylands Ave/Shireoaks Common Roundabout, Worksop.
- J5 - A57/B6034/Netherton Road Roundabout, Worksop.
- J17 - Blyth Road/Snape Lane Priority Junction, Harworth.
- J18 - Blyth Road/Scrooby Road/Bawtry Road/Main Street Mini-Roundabouts, Harworth.

The Nottinghamshire Local Transport Plan (LTP3) sets the framework for improvements to the transport infrastructure network in the District and wider County. The LTP would be expected to help deliver transport improvements and promote transport modes other than the private car. In this regard, the LTP sets out three goals:

- provide a reliable, resilient transport system which supports a thriving economy and growth whilst encouraging sustainable and healthy travel;
- improve access to key services, particularly enabling employment and training opportunities; and

³¹ YYG Transport Planning (2010;2014; and 2019) *District-Wide Transport Study (November 2010); Addendum Report (March 2014) and Update Study (January 2019)*

- iii. minimise the impacts of transport on people's lives, maximise opportunities to improve the environment and help tackle carbon emissions.

The Nottinghamshire Local Transport Plan Implementation Plan (2018/9-2020/1)³² identifies a number of priorities for transport investment in the District including major funding in respect to: the Gedling Access Road, D2N2 Sustainable Transport Programme, Enterprise Zone Sustainable Transport Package and the Midline Mainline Market Harborough rail speed improvements, as well as major highway maintenance and heavy rail infrastructure improvements.

In this context, it would be expected that some transport improvements would be delivered independently of planning policy. However, without an up-to-date Local Plan there would be a policy gap with regard to the location of future growth, particularly beyond the period of the adopted Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD. This gap could result in development being located in areas that are not well served by community facilities and services and jobs thereby leading to an increase in transport movements. Allied to this, without Local Plan policy coverage, opportunities may be missed to adopt a strategic approach to investment in transport infrastructure that reflects the priorities of the LTP.

Key Sustainability Issues

- The need to ensure timely investment in transport infrastructure and services.
- The need to support proposals contained in the Local Transport Plan and address highways capacity issues in the District.
- The need to capitalise on the District's good transport accessibility, links to Robin Hood Airport and the new Worksop Bus Station.
- The need to encourage alternative modes of transport to the private car
- The need to ensure that new development is accessible to community facilities and services and jobs so as to reduce the need to travel.
- The need to enhance the connectivity of more remote, rural settlements.
- The need to encourage walking and cycling.
- The need to protect and enhance the Public Rights of Way network.

Land Use, Geology and Soil

Land Use

In Bassetlaw District (as of 2018)³³, of all previously developed land, the majority of land was classified as residential (25%), industry and commerce (24%) or vacant (23%). In contrast, non-developed land use was primarily classified as either outdoor recreation (27%), vacant (25%), residential garden (17%) or agricultural (15%).

The most intensive areas of land-use within Bassetlaw are around the main urban areas of Worksop and Retford with the greatest variety of land-uses found here.

Government policy set out in the NPPF (paragraph 118) promotes and supports the development of under-utilised buildings and land, whilst giving substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield sites³⁴. According to land use change statistics published by DCLG³⁵, 58% of new residential dwellings were delivered on previously developed (brownfield) land in the District over the period 2013-2014. This is slightly lower than the national average of 59% and the rate for the period 2008-2011 (69%), although it is higher than the average for the period 1996 to 2011 (54.5%).

The greatest concentrations of derelict or vacant land are found in Worksop and Retford and on some more peripheral sites such as the former Firbeck and Shireoaks colliery sites.

³² <http://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/media/132199/ltpimplementationplan2018-2021.pdf> [Accessed October 2018]

³³ Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2018). Live tables on land use change: 2016 to 2017. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/live-tables-on-land-use-change-statistics> [Accessed September 2018]

³⁴ Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2018). NPPF


³⁵ Available from <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/live-tables-on-land-use-change-statistics> [Accessed October 2018].

Geology

Outside the urban areas, the geology of Bassetlaw is characterised by a Magnesian Limestone plateau which stretches from Worksop in the north towards Mansfield in the south and continues into Nottinghamshire. The soil on the limestone is lighter and easier to cultivate than the heavy clay of the coal measures.

Three of the District's SSSIs are designated for their geological interest, namely Creswell Crags, Scrooby Top Quarry and Styrrup Quarry. Creswell Crags is a site of national and international importance for Quaternary studies whilst Scrooby Top Quarry is a working quarry which provides accessible exposures of the Triassic Nottingham Castle Formation. Styrrup Quarry is a non-working quarry lying at the south-western edge of the village of Styrrup and is a key site for studies of Triassic fluvial sediments.

Regionally Important Geological and Geomorphological Sites (RIGS) are the most important places for geology and geomorphology outside statutorily protected land such as SSSI. There are currently a total of 24 RIGS in the District and these are shown in **Figure A3.7**.



- Bassetlaw District Council
- Regionally Important Geological Site

BASSETLAW SA
Baseline Analysis

Figure A3.7: Regionally Important Geological and Geomorphological Sites



Source: BDC

Map Scale @ A4: 1:175,000

Soils

The Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) system developed by Defra provides a method for assessing the quality of farmland. The system divides the quality of land into five categories, as well as non-agricultural and urban. The 'best and most versatile land' is defined by the NPPF as that which falls into Grades 1, 2 and sub-grade 3a.

A large proportion of Bassetlaw is classified as Grade 3 ('Good to Moderate') quality agricultural land, particularly to the east. However, it is important to note that ALC mapping does not distinguish between sub-grades 3a and 3b and in consequence, it is not possible to determine the extent to which this land constitutes that which is 'best and most versatile'. Running north to south through the District is a seam of Grade 2 ('Very Good') quality agricultural land with a small parcel of Grade 1 ('Excellent') quality agricultural land in the north east corner of the District. In addition, a significant proportion of land to the south of Worksop is classified as 'other land primarily in non-agricultural use'.

Paragraph 117 of the NPPF states that strategic policies should set out ways in which the Council can meet their objectively assessed needs, including ways in which make the most possible use of brownfield sites.

Likely Evolution of the Baseline Without the Local Plan

As set out above, national planning policy encourages the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed and also seeks to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land. However, where Councils do not have a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of housing against their housing requirements, the NPPF's presumption in favour of sustainable development can often outweigh other national and local policy constraints.

Without the Local Plan, national planning policy set out in the NPPF and extant Development Plan policy would apply and may help to ensure that new development is focused on brownfield land. However, without clear and up-to-date local planning policy relating to the location of future development and the provision of sites to meet local needs, the Council would have less control over where development takes place in this regard.

With regard to the District's geodiversity, it is noted that all three of the District's SSSIs designated for their geological interest are in favourable condition. It is expected that this trend would continue given the national protection afforded to SSSIs and existing policy contained in the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD which seek to restore or enhance designated sites including SSSIs and RIGS (see Policy DM9).


Key Sustainability Issues

- The need to encourage development on previously developed (brownfield) land.
- The need to make best use of existing buildings and infrastructure.
- The need to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land.
- The need to protect and enhance sites designated for their geological interest.

Water

Water Quality

The main waterbodies within Bassetlaw are the rivers Ryton, Idle, Trent, Meden, Maun, Poulter, Oldcotes Dyke and Chesterfield Canal. The District falls within the Humber River Basin District and is predominantly within the Idle and Torne catchment area (although the west of the District is within the Lower Trent and Erewash catchment area) (see **Figure A3.8**).



Bassetlaw District Council	Dee
Built up area	North West
Main rivers and canals	Northumbria
River Basin District	Severn
Humber	Solway Tweed
Anglian	

Source: European Environment Agency

Map Scale @ A4: 1:1,250,000

BASSETLAW SA
Baseline Analysis

Figure A3.8: The Humber River Basin District



The Humber River Basin Management Plan (RBMP)³⁶ reports that (as at 2015) only 15% of surface water bodies in the river basin District were at good or better ecological status/potential. For groundwater bodies, 75% were at good quantitative status with 51% at good chemical status. The RBMP highlights that the main reasons for not achieving good status or potential include:

- physical modifications - affecting 42% of water bodies in the river basin District;
- pollution from waste water – affecting 38% of water bodies in the river basin District;
- pollution from towns, cities and transport - affecting 16% of water bodies in the river basin District;
- changes to the natural flow and level of water - affecting 6% of water bodies in the river basin District;
- negative effects of invasive non-native species - affecting <1% of water bodies in the river basin District;
- pollution from rural areas - affecting 32% of water bodies in the river basin District; and
- pollution from abandoned mines - affecting 4% of water bodies in the river basin District.

The findings of the Bassetlaw Outline Water Cycle Study (WCS)³⁷ indicate that in general, water quality within the District is good and has complied with current water objectives over the latest EA reporting periods. However, phosphorus levels in the majority of watercourses are often high or very high and as such are assessed as poor under the Water Framework District (WFD). This means that improvements are required within these watercourses to reach WFD objectives of 'good ecological status' or 'potential'. None of the watercourses are currently achieving 'good ecological status' or 'good ecological potential' under the WFD, with phosphorus and invertebrates frequently being assessed as poor. However, under the WFD the majority of receiving watercourses are already achieving 'high ecological status' or 'potential' for ammonia and biochemical oxygen demand (BOD), and as such, future discharges will need to ensure there is no deterioration from this status.

Water Resources

There are two major aquifers underlying the District; the Lower Magnesian Limestone (LML) and the Sherwood Sandstone (SS). The LML outcrops along the western flank of the District, where it provides a baseflow contribution to various tributaries of the River Idle, including the River Poutler and River Ryton. There are several major groundwater supply abstractions within the District, with Source Protection Zones (SPZs) around these major public water supply abstraction sources. The presence of SPZs means that there is the potential for discharges from development areas in the west of the District in particular to affect the underlying major aquifers.³⁸

The Idle & Torne District Abstraction Licensing Strategy³⁹ has indicated that there is no surface water available for licensing in the catchment. The Lower Trent and Erewash Abstraction Licensing Strategy⁴⁰, meanwhile, indicates that surface water and groundwater abstractions are restricted in some areas (although not within Bassetlaw).

Bassetlaw is served by two water companies, Severn Trent Water and Anglian Water. The west of the District falls predominantly within the Severn Trent Water Nottinghamshire Water Resource Zone (WRZ) which is supplied from local groundwater sources as well as from transfers from the Strategic Grid WRZ. The west of the District is principally within the Anglian Water West Lincolnshire WRZ.

The Environment Agency (2013) report 'Water Stress Areas - Final Classifications'⁴¹ identifies the Anglian Water area as being in 'serious water stress'. This is reiterated in the Anglian Water Water Resources Management Plan (2019)⁴², which states that the Anglian Water area is an area of 'serious water stress', is environmentally sensitive and experiencing fast growth.

³⁶ Defra and the Environment Agency (2015) River Basin Management Plan Humber River Basin District. Available from https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/500465/Humber_RBD_Part_1_river_basin_management_plan.pdf [Accessed October 2018].

³⁷ Scott Wilson (2011) Bassetlaw Outline Water Cycle Study Final Report. Available from <https://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/media/105075/BSWCSPart1.pdf> [Accessed September 2018].

³⁸ Scott Wilson (2011) Bassetlaw Outline Water Cycle Study Final Report. Available from <https://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/media/105075/BSWCSPart1.pdf> [Accessed September 2018].

³⁹ Environment Agency (2013) Idle & Torne Abstraction Licensing Strategy. February 2013.

⁴⁰ Environment Agency (2013) Lower Trent & Erewash Abstraction Licensing Strategy. February 2013.

⁴¹ Environment Agency (2013) Water Stress Areas - Final Classifications. Available from https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/244333/water-stressed-classification-2013.pdf [Accessed 27 September 2018].

⁴² Anglian Water (2018). Revised Draft Water Management Plan. Available at: https://www.anglianwater.co.uk/_assets/media/Anglian_Water_revised_dWRMP_2019.pdf [Accessed September 2018]

Flood Risk

The NPPF seeks to ensure that flood risk is taken into account at the plan making stage in order to avoid inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding and to direct development away from areas at highest risk. **Figure A3.9** shows the prevalence of Flood Zones 2 and 3 across the District.

The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA)⁴³ for the District indicates that the main flood risk within Bassetlaw is from fluvial flooding. In Worksop, the River Ryton, flowing from west to east, passes through culverts in the town centre that are generally too small to carry a 1 in 100 annual chance flood, which means that water backs up and floods out onto the surrounding land, some of which is in the town centre. Areas of particular concern include Central Avenue, King Street, Allen Street, Hardy Street, Shelley Street and Priorswell Road. In Retford, the River Idle flows from south to north with one of its key tributaries, Retford Beck, joining from the east. The Idle has few formal defences as it flows through the town, with some areas susceptible to a 1 in 20 year annual flood chance, and few features to prevent a 1 in 100 year annual chance flood spilling over and affecting properties around Chancery Lane. Some backing up of floodwater occurs at culverts under Albert Road and Bridgegate in the town centre. Lower reaches of Retford Beck are heavily culverted and lack capacity to convey flows, resulting in flooding at culvert entrances.

The SFRA assesses the risk of pluvial (drainage) flooding as being a 'medium' risk. It is expected that during moderate rainfall events the drainage system capacity is likely to be exceeded in some areas and further development in these areas will exacerbate this problem. Surface water runoff is also assessed as being of medium risk due to the topography of the District. Sturton Le Steeple and Beckingham and other villages located on heavy clay soils are more likely to be prone to surface run-off problems.

According to land use change statistics published by DCLG⁴⁴, 3% of new residential dwellings were built in Flood Zone 3 in the period 2016 to 2017, compared to a national average of 5%.

Likely Evolution of the Baseline Without the Local Plan

The growth in local population is expected to increase demand on water resources, which has the potential to affect water resource availability and quality. The Severn Trent Water (2018) Draft Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP)⁴⁵ highlights that without future investment, supply/demand shortfalls in the Strategic Grid, Nottinghamshire and North Staffordshire WRZs will be experienced. In addition, they will face some significant supply shortfalls in the long term as a result of the need to reduce abstraction from unsustainable sources, the potential impacts of climate change and other environmental pressures. The Anglian Water (2015) WRMP⁴⁶ identifies the Anglian Water West Lincolnshire WRZ as being in surplus over the plan period. However, measures contained in the WRMPs would be expected to help ensure that future demands in this regard are met whilst extant Development Plan policy would help promote water conservation measures in new development. Further, other plans and programmes including the River Idle Sub-Catchment Action Plan and Humber RBMP as well as bodies such as the Trent Rivers Trust would be expected to help conserve and enhance waterbodies in the District in the absence of the Local Plan.

The WCS (although from 2011) indicates that two of the District's waste water treatment works (WwTWs) (North Wheatley and Rampton) are already exceeding their volumetric consents and that under future growth conditions, three other WwTWs (Gamston, Harworth and Norton) are also likely to exceed their existing flow consents. The WCS indicates that investment is also likely to be required at Retford WwTWs, whilst Worksop WwTWs is likely to be the most constrained in terms of treating wastewater from future growth. In consequence, a failure to plan strategically for new development and ensure the timely investment in infrastructure could place pressure on existing treatment facilities resulting in adverse water quality and wider environmental effects.

Taking into account national planning policy set out in the NPPF and extant Development Plan policy (see, for example, Policy DM12 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD), together with the measures contained in the Humber River Basin District Flood Risk Management Plan⁴⁷, it is not expected that the baseline with regard to flood risk would change significantly without the Local Plan (although flood risk may increase as a result of climate change). Notwithstanding, up-to-date local planning policy would help to ensure that new development is located away

⁴³ Strategic Flood Risk Assessment: <http://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/planning-and-building/planning-services/planning-policy/core-strategy-and-development-policies/background-studies/strategic-flood-risk-assessment-sfra/>

⁴⁴ Available from <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/live-tables-on-land-use-change-statistics> [Accessed September 2018].

⁴⁵ Available from <http://www.severntrent.com/future/future-plans-and-strategy/water-resources-management-plan> [Accessed September 2018]


⁴⁶ Available from http://www.anglianwater.co.uk/_assets/media/WRMP_2015.pdf [Accessed September 2018].

⁴⁷ Environment Agency (2016) Humber River Basin District Flood Risk Management Plan 2015 – 2021. Available from https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/507115/LIT_10205_HUMBER_FRMP_PART_A.pdf [Accessed September 2018].

from flood risk areas and could help to ensure that any investment in flood defence infrastructure required to accommodate development is identified and delivered in a timely manner.

Key Sustainability Issues

- The need to protect and enhance the quality of the District's water sources.
- The need to promote the efficient use of water resources.
- The need to ensure the timely provision of new water services infrastructure to meet demand arising from new development.
- The need to locate new development away from areas of flood risk, taking into account the effects of climate change.
- The need to ensure the timely provision of flood defence/management infrastructure.
- The need to encourage the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems.
- The need to manage surface water to greenfield run off rates.



BASSETLAW SA
Baseline Analysis

Figure A3.9: Areas of Flood Risk



- Bassetlaw District Council
- Flood zone 2
- Flood zone 3

Source: Environment Agency

Map Scale @ A4: 1:175,000

Air Quality

Legislative frameworks and guidance in relation to air quality have been established at both the international and UK levels. Policies aim to reduce exposure to specific pollutants by reducing emissions and setting targets for air quality.

The UK's National Air Quality Strategy⁴⁸ sets health based standards for eight key pollutants and objectives for achieving them. This is to ensure a level of ambient air quality in public places that is safe for human health and quality of life. It also recognises that specific action at the local level may be needed depending on the scale and nature of the air quality problem. Additional guidance is provided in the Clean Air Strategy 2019 which represents the aim of reducing by 50% the number of people who live in locations where the WHO guideline level of 10 µg/m³ for PM_{2.5} concentrations is exceeded by 2025.

Local authorities have a duty to undertake a full review and assessment of air quality in accordance with the National Air Quality Strategy. Where there is a likelihood of a national air quality objective being exceeded, the Council must declare an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) and prepare an Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) setting out the measures it intends to put in place in pursuit of the objectives.

The main source of air pollution in Bassetlaw is road traffic emissions. Other pollution sources, including commercial, industrial and domestic sources, also make a contribution to background pollution concentrations. There are currently no AQMAs in Bassetlaw, which may largely be attributed to the relatively low population density and subsequent low concentrations of development. However, the Council's 2019 Air Quality Annual Status Report⁴⁹ identifies that there are several streets within the District that have been highlighted as having elevated levels of nitrogen dioxide. These streets are currently under detailed assessment.

Likely Evolution of the Baseline Without the Local Plan

Improvements to air quality do not solely rely on planning policy as other changes can be made. The more densely populated areas of Worksop, Langold, Carlton, Harworth, Bircotes, Retford, Rhodesia, Shireoaks, Tuxford, Blyth and Elkesley are designated as smoke control areas for example whilst the 2019 Air Quality Annual Status Report includes a number of proposed initiatives to promote air quality in Bassetlaw.

However, an increase in population and households in the District will in-turn generate additional transport movements and associated emissions to air. Without up-to-date local planning policy, new development may be located in areas that are not well served by community facilities and services and jobs thereby increasing traffic movements. Further, through the Local Plan, opportunities may be realised to help address existing issues of congestion.

Key Sustainability Issues

- The need to minimise the emission of pollutants to air.

⁴⁸ The Air Quality Strategy for England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, Volume 1. Available from https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/69336/pb12654-air-quality-strategy-vol1-070712.pdf [Accessed April 2015]

⁴⁹ Bassetlaw District Council (2019) 2019 Air Quality Annual Status Report. Available from <https://data.bassetlaw.gov.uk/media/714796/PPC-Annual-Status-report-2017-.pdf> [Accessed September 2019]

Climate Change

Rising global temperatures will bring changes in weather patterns, rising sea levels and increased frequency and intensity of extreme weather. The effects of climate change will be experienced internationally, nationally and locally with certain regions being particularly vulnerable. The 2018 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) identified a reduced timeframe to act to keep world temperature rises to 1.5 degrees Celsius before 2050 in line with the Paris Agreement⁵⁰.

In 2012, Climate East Midlands⁵¹ created a case study on Bassetlaw District Council and how it was managing extreme weather impacts. The case study described how the Council has responded to the impacts of extreme weather on its services and has embedded adaptation into a number of its processes in order to improve its resilience (including through, for example, flood mitigation works). It highlights that the District has experienced ten severe weather events since 2006, including flooding in 2007, which flooded 200 homes and left 750 properties without power. Heat waves and the 2009-10 winter conditions also caused varied disruption in the District.

Carbon dioxide (CO₂) is identified as being one of the most important of the greenhouse gases which are being produced by human activity and contributing to climate change. According to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), stabilising CO₂ concentrations at 450 parts per million (ppm) (that is 85 ppm above 2007 levels and 170 ppm above pre-industrial levels) in the long term would require the reduction of emissions worldwide to below 1990 levels within a few decades.

The policy and legislative context in relation to climate change has been established at the international level (Kyoto and Paris Agreements) and has been transposed into European, national and local legislation, strategies and policies. The 2015 United Nations Climate Change Conference (COP 21) negotiated the Paris Agreement⁵², a global agreement with the goal of keeping the increase in the global average temperature to well below 2 °C (above pre-industrial levels) and to increase global capacity to adapt to the adverse impacts of climate change and foster climate resilience and low carbon development.

Reducing CO₂ emissions in the atmosphere is a national target to reduce climatic impact. This is driven by the Climate Change Act (2008), which sets a legally binding target of at least a 34% reduction in UK emissions by 2020 and, as per an amendment made in 2019, a target of net zero (i.e. 100% reduction in emissions) by 2050, against a 1990 baseline.

The Tyndall Centre⁵³ has undertaken work to calculate the 'fair' contribution of local authorities towards the Paris Climate Change Agreement. Based on the analysis undertaken the following recommendations have been made for Bassetlaw:

- The District should stay within a maximum cumulative carbon dioxide emissions budget of 4.8 million tonnes (MtCO₂) for the period of 2020 to 2100. At 2017 CO₂ emission levels, Bassetlaw would use this entire budget within 6 years from 2020.
- The Borough should also initiate an immediate programme of carbon dioxide mitigation to deliver cuts in emissions averaging a minimum of -13.8% per year to deliver a Paris aligned carbon budget.
- The Borough should reach zero or near zero carbon no later than 2041.

Table A3.12 shows Bassetlaw's per capita CO₂ emissions for the period 2008 to 2018. The District's emissions have fluctuated over this period (reflecting in part the economic recession) but have consistently been higher than national, regional and county averages. In 2018 (the latest reporting period), per capita emissions stood at 6.7 tonnes CO₂ per person compared to 5.2 tonnes nationally, 6.1 tonnes regionally and 5.9 tonnes at the County level.

Table A3.12 CO₂ Emissions Per Capita 2008-2018 (tonnes CO₂ per person)

	Bassetlaw	Nottinghamshire	East Midlands	England
2008	9.3	7.7	8.6	8.0
2009	8.3	7.0	7.8	7.2
2010	8.6	7.3	8.1	7.4

⁵⁰ United Nations Treaty Collection (2016) Paris Agreement

⁵¹ Climate East Midlands (2012) Managing extreme weather impacts in Bassetlaw District Council. Available from <http://www.climate-em.org.uk/images/uploads/CEM-Bassetlaw-7.pdf> [Accessed September 2018]

⁵² See <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2015/cop21/eng/l09.pdf> [Accessed October 2018].

⁵³ Tyndall Centre (2020) Setting Climate Commitments for South Tyneside: Quantifying the implications of the United Nations Paris Agreement for South Tyneside. Available from: <https://carbonbudget.manchester.ac.uk/reports/E07000171/>

	Bassetlaw	Nottinghamshire	East Midlands	England
2011	7.9	6.7	7.4	6.7
2012	8.3	6.9	7.6	7.0
2013	8.1	6.8	7.5	6.8
2014	7.5	6.3	6.9	6.1
2015	7.6	6.2	6.7	5.9
2016	7.2	5.8	6.3	5.4
2017	6.9	6.1	6.2	5.3
2018	6.7	5.9	6.1	5.2

Source: Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy (202) *UK local authority and regional carbon dioxide emissions national statistics: 2005 to 2018* .

As **Table A3.13** highlights, the main source of CO₂ emissions in the District is transport with 370.4 kilotonnes generated in this sector in 2018.

Table A3.13 CO₂ Emissions by Source 2008-2018 (kt CO₂)

	Industry and Commercial	Domestic	Transport	Total
2008	384.1	287.4	354.7	1,039.0
2009	310.0	263.9	338.7	925.6
2010	324.4	284.8	338.0	958.5
2011	288.6	249.3	339.2	887.5
2012	332.4	262.6	338.9	943.9
2013	319.0	257.9	336.1	920.9
2014	288.3	219.8	352.3	867.5
2015	285.2	212.5	369.7	873.2
2016	253.1	202.5	372.8	834.6
2017	234.6	192.8	376.0	808.3
2018	219.7	192.2	370.4	786.3

Source: Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy (2020) *UK local authority and regional carbon dioxide emissions national statistics: 2005 to 2018*.

The prudent use of fossil fuels and reducing levels of energy consumption will help to achieve lower CO₂ emissions. Between 2005 and 2016, Bassetlaw's total energy consumption reduced from 4,137.3 GWh to 3,158.7 GWh. This represents a reduction in energy consumption of 23.7%, which is higher than the decrease in emissions at the regional level (15.2%) and the national (UK) level (11.5%) over the same period.

In 2016, transport was the largest consuming sector of energy equating to 42.2% of all energy consumed. In comparison, the industrial and commercial sector consumed 28.9% of all energy whilst the domestic sector consumed 26.8%. This differs to the regional trend, where energy consumption is more balanced across the sectors, and the national (UK) average, where industry and commercial is the dominant consuming sector closely followed by transport and then domestic.⁵⁴

Two coal-fired power stations are located in the District (Cottam and West Burton A) and one gas-fired power station (West Burton B). Together, the power stations have a capacity of 5,305 MW and will contribute to emissions of CO₂ in the District, although the UK Government has recently announced that all coal-fired power stations are to be closed by 2025⁵⁵.


Measures to prevent or minimise the adverse effects of climate change include: efficient use of scarce water resources; adapting building codes to future climate conditions and extreme weather events; building flood defences and raising the levels of dykes; more climate resilient crop selection (e.g. drought-tolerant species); the provision of green infrastructure (which can support flood alleviation and urban cooling); and renewable and low carbon energy generation.

⁵⁴ Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy, [Sub-national Total Energy Consumption Statistics 2005-2016](#)

⁵⁵ See Amber Rudd's speech on a new direction for UK energy policy. Available from <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/amber-rudd-s-speech-on-a-new-direction-for-uk-energy-policy> [Accessed October 2018].

The UK Government considers the development of a low carbon economy and energy sources as essential to preventing climate change. As of 2018, the East Midlands region generated 5,400.1 GWh of electricity from renewable sources from a total of 72,037.4 GWh for England as a whole⁵⁶. According to the most recent AMR that reported on this matter, the total amount of renewable energy capacity permitted across Bassetlaw in the period 2016/17 was 63.5 MW. This figure has decreased compared to the period of 2014/15 which was 87.3 MW and represented the largest consented capacity over the previous 4 year monitoring periods (see **Figure A3.10**).

Figure A3.10 Total Amount of Renewable Energy Capacity Permitted by Year (MW)



Source: Bassetlaw District Council (2016) *Annual Monitoring Report 2016-2017*

Likely Evolution of the Baseline Without the Local Plan

In general, climate change projections (through UK Climate Projections 18 (UKCP18)) indicate a greater chance of hotter, drier summers and warmer, wetter winters in the UK. The UK has experienced a general trend towards warmer average temperatures in recent years with the most recent decade (2009–2018) being on average 0.3C warmer than the 1981–2010 average and 0.9C warmer than 1961–1990. The 21st century is reported so far as being warmer than the previous three centuries.

Heavy rainfall and flooding events have been demonstrated to have increased potential to occur in the UK as the climate has generally become wetter. For example, the highest rainfall totals over a five day period are 4% higher during the most recent decade (2008-2017) compared to 1961-1990. Furthermore, the amount of rain from extremely wet days has increased by 17% when comparing the same time periods. In addition, there is a slight increase in the longest sequence of consecutive wet days for the UK^{57,58}. UKCP18 projections for the Humber River Basin identify the following main changes (relative to 1981-2000) to the climate up to 2020-2039:

- Increase in mean winter temperature by 0.8C.
- Increase in mean summer temperature by 1.0C.
- Increase in mean winter precipitation by 3.0%.

Decrease in mean summer precipitation by 5.0%⁵⁹. Climate change is occurring and will continue regardless of local policy intervention. However, national policy on climate change, extant Development Plan policy and other plans and programmes such as the Council's Climate Change Strategy (2013), alongside the progressive tightening up of Building Regulations, will help to ensure that new development is located and designed to adapt to the effects of climate change and that measures are in place to mitigate climate change. Notwithstanding, without the Local Plan the Council is likely to have less control over, in particular, the location of new development which could exacerbate climate change impacts

⁵⁶ Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy (2018) Regional Renewable Statistics. Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/regional-renewable-statistics>

⁵⁷ Met Office (2018) UKCP18 Climate Change Over Land

⁵⁸ Royal Meteorological Society (2019) State of the UK Climate 2018

⁵⁹ Met Office (2018) UKCP18 Key Results. [Available online at: www.metoffice.gov.uk/research/approach/collaboration/ukcp/key-results] The following parameters were used: Region – Humber River Basin; Time Horizon; 2030-2049; Emissions Scenario – RCP6.0; 50th percentile change.

and mean that opportunities to mitigate effects (for example, through reducing transport movements, tree planting and District-scale renewable energy solutions) may be missed.

The Renewable Energy and Low Carbon Study for Bassetlaw (2010)⁶⁰ identifies the potential for renewable schemes to deliver approximately from 473,000 MWh to 5,200 MWh. However, this will require a step change in renewable energy provision and without strong local policy support, there is a risk that this potential may not be realised. The Study makes a number of recommendations (including policy recommendations) to deliver the low and zero carbon aspirations for the District, including:

- The Council needs to set out a clear framework which gives relative certainty. Action should be prioritised on strategic sites, Council and public sector property and assets.
- A set of priority District heating schemes should be drawn up by the Council and its partners and further feasibility work carried out.
- Should the Council agree to lead installation of a District heating network then it is recommended that they explore the option of establishing a Local Development Order (LDO) in order to add certainty to the development process and potentially speed up delivery.
- The Council and its partners should undertake further work to explore the role for the local authority to link housing development to energy supply delivery.

Key Sustainability Issues

- The need to ensure that new development is adaptable to the effects of climate change.
- The need to mitigate climate change including through increased renewable energy provision and encouraging more sustainable modes of transport.

Material Assets

Waste

While Bassetlaw District Council is the waste collection authority for the area it is Nottinghamshire County Council who is responsible for waste management. Bassetlaw is the lowest performing local authority in the East Midlands in terms of recycling rates. In 2018/19 25% of waste was recycled. This is compared to a 60% recycling rate in Derbyshire Dales which is the best performing local authority in the region⁶¹.

According to the Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Waste Local Plan Authority Monitoring Report⁶², as at March 2019 there was a total capacity for 4.2 million tonnes waste treatment per annum in the area. Of this, capacity for 760,000 tonnes waste treatment per annum was not in operation. Recycling facilities in the area have a total capacity for 3.14 million tonnes. In March 2019, Nottinghamshire County Council published a Minerals and Waste Development Scheme, which sets out the County Council's programme for the preparation of the Waste and Minerals Local Plans.⁶³ In Bassetlaw, waste management facilities include a number of household waste recycling centres, a materials recovery facility, waste transfer stations, biomass and recycling facilities.

Minerals

Government policy promotes the general conservation of minerals whilst at the same time ensuring an adequate supply is available to meet needs. Mineral resources are not distributed evenly across the country and some areas are able to provide greater amounts of certain minerals than they actually use.

Contained within the solid and drift formations in Nottinghamshire is a rich and diverse assemblage of mineral resources, which have enabled the County to become one of the largest mineral producers in Great Britain. Deposits of coal, sand and gravel and gypsum are of national importance. Deposits of limestone, clay and oil are also exploited.

⁶⁰ AECOM (2010) *Bassetlaw Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Study*. February 2010.

⁶¹ Defra (2020) Local authority collected waste management - annual results

⁶² Nottinghamshire County Council (2019) *Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Waste Local Plan*.

⁶³ Nottinghamshire County Council (2019) [Nottinghamshire Minerals and Waste Development Scheme](#)

A Local Aggregates Assessment⁶⁴ has been produced to inform the new Minerals Local Plan by Nottinghamshire County Council and will, replace the existing Minerals Local Plan (adopted in 2005). This Assessment sets out the current and future situation in Nottinghamshire with regard to all aspects of aggregate supply.

The Assessment highlights that production of sand and gravel has averaged 1.53 million tonnes between 2008 and 2017. The figures indicate a predominantly downward trend between 2008-2013, with a recovery starting in 2010 continuing through to 2017. This pattern mirrors that of the whole East Midlands region. The production of sand and gravel in 2015 was estimated to be 1.52 million tonnes (an increase on the previous year).

The average annual sales of Sherwood Sandstone for the 10 year period 2008 to 2017 is 0.37 million tonnes. Similarly, the average annual sales of Aggregate Limestone for the 10 year period 2008 to 2017 is 0.002 million tonnes. Since 2009, the production of Aggregate Limestone in Nottingham and Nottinghamshire has ceased.

There are a number of productive oil and gas fields in Nottinghamshire. These include Bothamsall active oil field in Bassetlaw District.⁶⁵

Likely Evolution of the Baseline Without the Local Plan

Waste generation in the District is expected to increase, commensurate with population growth. This could place pressure on existing waste management facilities, although it is envisaged that recycling/reuse rates would increase. The adopted Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Waste Core Strategy (2013)⁶⁶ estimates that, by 2031, approximately 5,000,000 tonnes of controlled waste will arise per annum across the County. Meeting the ambitious local recycling and recovery targets of the Waste Core Strategy (to achieve 70% recycling or composting of all waste by 2025) will depend on the development of the further waste facilities that have the treatment capacity of 1 million tonnes, for recycling or recovery of municipal, commercial or industrial waste. In this context, Policy WCS4 of the Waste Core Strategy sets out that smaller/medium sized waste treatment facilities will be supported in, or close to, the built up areas of Nottingham, Mansfield/Ashfield, Newark, Retford and Worksop.

New development (both within the District and nationally) may place pressure on local mineral assets to support construction. In this regard, the Local Aggregates Assessment identifies that the issue for Nottinghamshire and Nottingham is the long term provision of sand and gravel. Once adopted, the new Minerals Local Plan will set out the overall approach to future minerals provision in Nottinghamshire up to 2030. Consultation was undertaken on the preferred approach to the Local Plan in October 2013 and which identifies a number of potential new and extended minerals sites in the Bassetlaw⁶⁷.

With regard to oil and gas, there are currently extant permissions granted by the County Council for coalbed methane exploration in the District. An application has also been submitted by Island Gas Ltd seeking planning permission from the County Council to install monitoring boreholes associated with exploratory shale gas drilling on land off Springs Road, to the north-east of Misson in Bassetlaw.⁶⁸

Overall, planning for waste and minerals is a County function and in consequence, the baseline would not be expected to change significantly without the Local Plan. However, policies in the Local Plan could support the objectives of the adopted Waste Core Strategy and the emerging Minerals Local Plan including by, for example, promoting the provision of on-site recycling facilities and the sustainable use of materials in new development.

Key Sustainability Issues

- The need to minimise waste arisings and encourage reuse and recycling.
- The need to promote the efficient use of mineral resources.
- The need to ensure the protection of the District's mineral resources from inappropriate development, in accordance with the emerging Minerals Local Plan.

⁶⁴ Nottinghamshire County Council and Nottingham City Council (2019) *Local Aggregate Assessment 2019*.

⁶⁵ Nottinghamshire County Council (2014) *Onshore Oil and Gas in Nottinghamshire: Frequently Asked Questions*. Available from <http://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/media/105912/onshore-oil-and-gas-in-nottinghamshire-faq-revised-july-2014-1.pdf> [Accessed October 2018].

⁶⁶ Nottinghamshire County Council and Nottingham City Council (2013) *Replacement Waste Local Plan. Waste Core Strategy*.

⁶⁷ For further information see <http://nottinghamshire.jdi-consult.net/localplan/readdoc.php?docid=160&chapter=3&docelemid=d24729#d24729> [Accessed October 2018].

⁶⁸ For further information see <http://site.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/theCouncil/democracy/planning/fracking-shale-gas/latest-news/> [Accessed October 2018].

- The need to promote resource efficiency through sustainable design and construction techniques to minimise resource depletion and waste creation.

Cultural Heritage

Bassetlaw has a rich cultural heritage that has shaped the built environment from the monastical centre of Worksop Priory and the Dukery estates of Welbeck Abbey and Clumber Park to the revolutionary Chesterfield Canal. The District's heritage is reflected by the number of statutory designations, the distribution of which is shown in **Figure A3.11**.

The National Heritage List for England⁶⁹ includes 1,067 listed building entries (comprising 33 Grade I, 48 Grade II*, 962 Grade II listed buildings and 24 Scheduled Monuments), the second highest number of listed buildings in Nottinghamshire.

The oldest designations in the District relate to the archaeology of Bassetlaw. The District's earlier settlements that are no longer identified by buildings such as post Norman Conquest motte and bailey castles and deserted medieval villages are recognised scheduled monuments (there are 24 sites currently designated as scheduled monuments in the District). One of the County's main attractions is Clumber Park, originally the ducal seat of the Duke of Norfolk and one of the estates that form the Dukeries. The landscaped parkland at Clumber is one of four registered parks and gardens in Bassetlaw.

Historic settlements in Bassetlaw, including parts of the towns of Worksop and Retford, are designated conservation areas. Many of the rural villages in the District are also designated as conservation areas, ensuring the protection of many vernacular buildings. In total, the District has 32 conservation areas.

There are also many buildings within the District which are not listed, but which contribute to the character of the area. These are identified in the Historic Environment Record maintained by Nottinghamshire County Council.

Within the District, there are currently ten building or structure entries, eight place of worship entries, one archaeological entry, one park and garden entry, and two conservation area entries on the Historic England Heritage At Risk Register⁷⁰. These are listed in **Table A3.15**.

⁶⁹ See <https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/> [Accessed September 2018].

⁷⁰ Historic England (2019) Heritage at Risk Register 2019 - Midlands
Sustainability Appraisal Report for the Bassetlaw Local
Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version Second Addendum
May 2022: Appendices

Table A3.15 Historic Assets 'At Risk'

Building or structure entries and of worship entries	Archaeological entries	Park and garden entries	Conservation areas entries
Worksop Priory gatehouse, Cheapside, Worksop. Church of St Giles, Main Street, Darlton. Church of St Oswald, Main Street, Dunham-on-Trent. Church of St Peter, Rectory Lane, Gamston. Hodssock Priory Gatehouse, Hodssock. Gateway and walls from Manor Farm to churchyard, Torksey Street, Rampton. East stable and outbuildings at Shireoaks Hall, Thorpe Lane, Shireoaks. Shireoaks Hall, Thorpe Lane, Shireoaks. West stable at Shireoaks Hall, Thorpe Lane, Shireoaks. Arch at Serlby Park, Serlby Road, Serlby, Styrrup with Oldcotes. Methodist Church, Grove Street. Parish Church of St Michael the Archangel, Bridgegate, West Retford. Church of St Swithun, Churchgate, East Retford. Church of All Saints, Church Street, Beckingham. Church of St Giles, Piper Lane, Carburton. Church of St Peter and St Paul, North Green, East Drayton. Church of All Saints, Church Street, Misterton. Church of St Matthew, Main Street, Normanton on Trent.	Roman fort and a section of Roman road 350m north west of Holly House Farm, Scaftworth.	Shireoaks Hall, Shireoaks.	Nether Langwith, Langwith. Worksop

Source: Historic England (2019) *Heritage At Risk Register*

Due to the lack of monitoring of Grade II listed buildings which make up the majority of listed buildings in Bassetlaw, Nottinghamshire County Council has conducted its own survey of Bassetlaw and all other Districts in the County to produce the Nottinghamshire Register of Buildings at Risk. This Register identifies a total of 73 buildings at risk in the District comprising 13 assets deemed 'vulnerable', 41 'at risk' and 19 'extreme'. This is greater than any other District in the County.


Likely Evolution of the Baseline without the Local Plan

It is reasonable to assume that the majority of the District's designated heritage assets would be protected without the Local Plan (since works to them invariably require consent). However, elements which contribute to their significance could be harmed through inappropriate development in their vicinity. Opportunities to enhance assets may also be missed. Further, other non-designated elements which contribute to the character of the area could be harmed without an up-to-date policy framework. Notwithstanding, it is recognised that national planning policy set out in the NPPF and extant Development Plan policy and associated guidance would together provide a high level of protection in this regard.

Key Sustainability Issues

- The need to protect and enhance the District's cultural heritage assets and their settings.
- The need to avoid harm to designated heritage assets and their settings.

- The need to recognise the value of non-designated heritage assets and protect these where possible, taking into account the requirements of the NPPF.
- The need to tackle heritage at risk.
- The need to recognise the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of landscapes and townscapes.



**BASSETLAW SA
Baseline Analysis**

Figure A3.11: Designated Cultural Heritage Assets

- | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Bassetlaw District Council | Listed Buildings (by grade) |
| Registered Parks and Gardens | |
| Conservation Area | |
| Scheduled Monument | I |
| | II* |
| | II |

Source: BDC, Historic England

Map Scale @ A4: 1:175,000



BASSETLAW
DISTRICT COUNCIL

Landscape

The landscape of Bassetlaw is varied and heavily influenced by its underlying geology. The District comprises the following five National Landscape Character Areas (NCA)⁷¹ and which are shown in **Figure A3.12**:

- Southern Magnesian Limestone.
- Humberhead Levels.
- Northern Lincolnshire Edge with Coversands.
- Trent and Belvoir Vales.
- Sherwood.

The Southern Magnesian Limestone NCA is mainly defined by the underlying Permian Zechstein Group, formerly known as the Magnesian Limestone. It creates a very long and thin NCA that stretches from Thornborough in the north down through north Derbyshire to the outskirts of Nottingham further south. The limestone creates a ridge, or narrow belt of elevated land, running north-south through the NCA, forming a prominent landscape feature.


The Humberhead Levels is a flat, low-lying and large scale agricultural landscape bounded to the west by the low ridge of the Southern Magnesian Limestone and to the east by the Yorkshire Wolds (North of the Humber) and the Northern Lincolnshire Edge with Coversands (south of the Humber). To the north it merges into the slightly undulating landscape of the Vale of York, at the line of the Escrick Moraine, and in the south it merges in to the Trent and Belvoir Vales and Sherwood.

The Northern Lincolnshire Edge with Coversands comprises a ridge of Jurassic limestone running north from Lincoln to the Humber Estuary. The scarp slope rises prominently from adjacent low-lying land, forming the Edge or Cliff, and giving panoramic views out, in particular to the west. In the north is a second, lower scarp of ironstone.

The Trent and Belvoir Vales is characterised by undulating, strongly rural and predominantly arable farmland, centred on the River Trent. A low-lying rural landscape with relatively little woodland cover, the NCA offers long, open views. Newark-on-Trent lies at the centre with Grantham, Nottingham, Lincoln and Gainsborough on the peripheries. The southern and eastern edges of the Vales are defined by the adjoining escarpments of the Lincolnshire Edge and the Leicestershire and Nottinghamshire Wolds NCA. To the west, the escarpment of a broad ridge of rolling landscape defines the boundary with the neighbouring Sherwood and Humberhead Levels NCAs.

The Sherwood NCA extends north from Nottingham, principally coinciding with an outcrop of sandstone which forms a belt of gently rolling hills. Historically it was managed as woodland and remains a well wooded area. The oak and birch wood pasture in the heartland of Sherwood Forest and more recent pine plantations, contribute strongly to the sense of place. Large estate parklands, heathland, open arable land and a strong mining heritage also characterise the area. The area contains the settlements of Mansfield, Worksop, Retford and Ollerton around its peripheries and sits on an aquifer that provides water to the area.

⁷¹ Natural England has divided England into 159 distinct natural areas. These can be viewed at - <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-character-area-profiles-data-for-local-decision-making/national-character-area-profiles> [Accessed October 2018]



▭ Bassetlaw District Council

National Character Areas

- Humberhead Levels
- Northern Lincolnshire Edge With Coversands
- Sherwood
- Southern Magnesian Limestone
- Trent And Belvoir Vales

Source: Natural England

Map Scale @ A4: 1:175,000

BASSETLAW SA
Baseline Analysis

Figure A3.12: National Character Areas



At a county level, Regional Character Areas (RCA) have been defined by Nottinghamshire County Council (see **Figure A3.13**). While the RCAs relate to the NCAs, which cover much broader areas, they do not have exactly the same boundaries and have been created using the 'Living Landscapes Project' methodology. A total of five RCAs fall within Bassetlaw: Sherwood; Magnesian Limestone Ridge; Idle Lowlands; Mid-Nottinghamshire Farmlands; and Trent Washlands. The Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment (2009)⁷² provides an overview of each RCA which is reproduced below.

The Sherwood RCA is characterised by a wide and diverse range of landscapes including the heartland of the historic Sherwood Forest and the extensive parklands and large estates of the Dukeries. The region runs northwards from Nottingham to the lowlands of the River Idle. It is located between the heavily populated Magnesian Limestone Ridge and Nottinghamshire Coalfield regions to the west, and the more rural areas of the Mid- Nottinghamshire Farmlands region to the east.

The Magnesian Limestone Ridge RCA forms the southernmost part of a narrow limestone ridge that extends from Nottingham along the western edge of the County to Oldcotes, then northwards through Yorkshire. This region forms a distinct belt of rising ground along the eastern fringe of the Yorkshire and Nottinghamshire/Derbyshire Coalfields. In the central and southern parts of the region, coalfield influences spread onto the limestone ridge and large mining settlements with their associated pit heaps, now restored, are now a prominent feature in the landscape.

The Idle Lowlands RCA forms the southern part of an extensive low-lying region which extends northwards from Bassetlaw to the Humber Estuary. Much of this region consists of sparsely inhabited levels and former carrlands, which are now intensively cultivated for arable production. Within Bassetlaw, the Idle Lowlands are closely associated with the basin of the River Idle and its tributary, the Ryton.


The Mid-Nottinghamshire Farmlands RCA forms a discrete area within Nottinghamshire, extending in a broad band from the edge of Nottingham north to the Idle Lowlands. It is bounded to the west by the Sherwood region and to the east by the lowlands of the Trent Washlands. Small, nucleated villages, isolated farmsteads and quiet country lanes are important components of the region's character, along with undulating landform, hedged fields and woodland.

The Trent Washlands RCA forms a low-lying agricultural region associated with the broad valleys of the Trent and Soar, characterised by productive arable farming, meadowlands, small nucleated villages, market towns and cities, power stations and quarries.

There are no national landscape designations affecting the District.

⁷² Bassetlaw District Council (2009) *Landscape Character Assessment – Bassetlaw, Nottinghamshire*. Available from <http://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/media/1952/bslandscapecharacteroverview.pdf> [Accessed September 2018].

Figure A3.13 Regional Character Areas



Source: Bassetlaw District Council (2009) *Landscape Character Assessment – Bassetlaw, Nottinghamshire*.

Likely Evolution of the Baseline without the Local Plan

Bassetlaw's Landscape Character Assessment divides landscape units into Policy Zones according to their characteristic features, their condition and sensitivity, indicating whether actions affecting each area should seek to conserve, reinforce, restore or create landscape features and components. The Assessment indicates that large swathes of Bassetlaw, notably the area east of Retford and to the south of Worksop, should be conserved. Whilst areas requiring conservation should ensure protection of features of importance, it does not preclude new forms of development altogether. Only a small number of landscape Policy Zones require landscape creation.⁷³

New development is likely to place pressure on the landscape of the District. Whilst national planning policy set out in the NPPF and existing Development Plan policy would continue to offer some protection and guidance, there is the potential that development could be inappropriately sited and designed without an up-to-date policy framework. This could adversely affect the landscape and townscape character of the area. Further, opportunities may not be realised to enhance landscape and townscape character through, for example, the provision of green infrastructure or the adoption of high quality design standards which reflects local character.

Key Sustainability Issues

- The need to conserve and enhance the District's landscape character.
- The need to protect the character of rural areas.
- The need to promote high quality design that respects local character.
- The need to maximise opportunities associated with new development to enhance townscape character and the quality of urban environments.

Key Sustainability Issues

From the analysis of the baseline presented in the preceding sections, a number of key sustainability issues affecting the District have been identified. These issues are summarised in **Table A3.16**.

Table A3.16 Key Sustainability Issues

Topic	Key Sustainability Issues
Biodiversity, Green and Blue Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need to conserve and enhance biodiversity including sites designated for their nature conservation value. • The need to maintain, restore, protect and expand the District's priority habitats. • The need to protect and increase populations of protected and priority species. • The need to prevent the spread of invasive species. • The need to adapt ecological communities to climate change. • The need to safeguard and enhance existing green and blue infrastructure assets/networks. • The need to enhance the green infrastructure network, addressing identified gaps, improving accessibility and encouraging multiple uses where appropriate. • The need to improve the connectivity of green space. • The need to prevent harm to geological conservation interests.
Population and Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need to meet the District's objectively assessed housing need including for affordable housing. • The need to provide an adequate supply of land for housing. • The need to make best use of, and improve, the quality of the existing housing stock. • The need to diversify the local economy and support the delivery of the District's Regeneration and Growth Strategy, Nottinghamshire Growth Plan and Sheffield City Region and the D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership Strategic Economic Plans. • The need to provide a range of quality sites, infrastructure and wider environment for business development. • The need to support the development of innovative and knowledge-based businesses. • The need to support the growth and development of existing businesses. • The need to increase local employment opportunities. • The need to provide job opportunities in sustainable locations. • The need to tackle deprivation, particularly in those areas of the District that are most deprived, and deliver regeneration. • The need to raise educational attainment and skills in the local labour force.

⁷³Bassetlaw District Council (2009) *Landscape Character Assessment*. Available at: <http://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/media/1952/bslandscapecharacteroverview.pdf> [Accessed September 2018]

Topic	Key Sustainability Issues
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need to maintain and enhance the vitality and viability of the District's town centres and larger villages. The need to safeguard existing community facilities and services (social capital) and ensure the timely delivery of new facilities to meet needs arising from new development.
Health and Wellbeing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need to protect the health and wellbeing of the District's population. The need to promote healthy lifestyles. The need to tackle inequalities in health. The need to protect and enhance open space provision across the District. The need to improve access to green space. The need to support high quality design. The need to reduce crime levels, minimise risk and increase community safety. The need to safeguard existing health care facilities and services and ensure the timely delivery of new facilities and services to meet needs arising from new development. The need to plan for an ageing population. The need to address health inequalities.
Transport and Accessibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need to ensure timely investment in transport infrastructure and services. The need to support proposals contained in the Local Transport Plan and address highways capacity issues in the District. The need to capitalise on the District's good transport accessibility, links to Robin Hood Airport and the new Worksop Bus Station. The need to encourage alternative modes of transport to the private car. The need to ensure that new development is accessible to community facilities and services and jobs so as to reduce the need to travel. The need to enhance the connectivity of more remote, rural settlements. The need to encourage walking and cycling. The need to protect and enhance the Public Rights of Way network.
Land Use, Geology and Soil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need to encourage development on previously developed (brownfield) land. The need to make best use of existing buildings and infrastructure. The need to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land. The need to protect and enhance sites designated for their geological interest.
Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need to protect and enhance the quality of the District's water sources. The need to promote the efficient use of water resources. The need to ensure the timely provision of new water services infrastructure to meet demand arising from new development. The need to locate new development away from areas of flood risk, taking into account the effects of climate change. The need to ensure the timely provision of flood defence/management infrastructure. The need to encourage the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems. The need to manage surface water to greenfield run off rates.
Air Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need to minimise the emission of air pollutants.
Climate Change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need to ensure that new development is adaptable to the effects of climate change. The need to mitigate climate change including through increased renewable energy provision.
Material Assets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need to minimise waste arisings and encourage reuse and recycling. The need to promote the efficient use of mineral resources. The need to ensure the protection of the District's mineral resources from inappropriate development, in accordance with the emerging Minerals Local Plan. The need to promote resource efficiency through sustainable design and construction techniques to minimise resource depletion and waste creation.
Cultural Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need to protect and enhance the District's cultural heritage assets and their settings. The need to avoid harm to designated heritage assets and their settings. The need to recognise the value of non-designated heritage assets and protect these where possible, taking into account the requirements of the NPPF. The need to tackle heritage at risk. The need to recognise the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of landscapes and townscape.
Landscape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need to conserve and enhance the District's landscape character. The need to protect the character of rural areas. The need to promote high quality design that respects local character. The need to maximise opportunities associated with new development to enhance townscape character and the quality of urban environments.

Appendix 4
SA Matrices for Policy Options (January 2019)

Table A4.1 Spatial Options

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1 : Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
<p>1. Biodiversity: To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	+/-	+/-	+/-	-?	++/-	++/-	+/-	+/-	<p>Option 1 Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>There are no internationally designated sites within Bassetlaw, however, there are 20 SSSIs located mostly in the Sherwood area to the south of Worksop (around the Clumber and Welbeck estates) and north of Retford, along the Idle Valley. The south western portion of the District also includes the indicative Sherwood Forest ppSPA. There are over 300 Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) covering approximately 4000ha widely distributed across Bassetlaw. The areas identified as the focal points for many of these environmental assets are, however, not regarded as sustainable locations for new development in the current Core Strategy and include large areas that are at significant risk of flooding.</p> <p>Worksop is notably constrained to the south due to the concentration of environmental assets located here, including nationally important sites. Development in Worksop and nearby villages may increase pressure on these areas as recreational destinations and this area is within or in close proximity to the indicative Sherwood Forest ppSPA. However, there is a significant network of locally important sites stretching to the north of the town, up towards Carlton-in-Lindrick. The flooded former mineral extraction sites to the north of Retford are particularly significant as habitat for breeding birds, therefore is sensitive to development occurring along the River Idle. Coal mining around Harworth & Bircotes has, until recently, led to significant ongoing change in the environment, resulting in a lack of designated sites. This area is therefore, in ecological terms, less sensitive to the potential effects of development.</p> <p>Higher levels of growth in areas with higher existing population concentrations will generally support access to existing open spaces, although growth of these areas may also result in loss of existing accessible urban fringe countryside.</p> <p>A wide spread of population growth across a number of different settlements will increase likelihood of development impacts on locally designated sites, with increased risk of habitat fragmentation and loss of non-designated features of interest. However, with a potentially broad range of sites and locations to deliver site allocations there is the opportunity to avoid significant adverse impacts on sensitive areas and seek opportunities for habitat creation and enhancement.</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>There are three SSSIs designated for their geological interest; Creswell Crags, Styrrup Quarry and Scrooby Top Quarry. Given the location of these sites they are highly unlikely to be subject to development pressures under this option.</p> <p>There are a number of Local Geological Sites (LGSs) throughout the District, including in the towns of Worksop, Retford and Harworth & Bircotes. The limited range of locations considered appropriate for development under this option may lead to increased development pressures on these sites</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Careful consideration to be given to selection of sites and general directions of growth taking account of the sensitivity of particular areas, such as land to the south of Worksop and to the north of Retford. • Local Plans should plan positively for green infrastructure and Development Management (DM) policies will avoid/mitigate any adverse impacts of development schemes. • Identify specific opportunities for green infrastructure enhancement through site allocations and support existing initiatives through ongoing work with key stakeholders (i.e. Notts Wildlife Trust, RSPB etc). <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In a land rich District there are a great many options for development in areas that are less sensitive or significant in biodiversity terms. • All development will to some extent result in loss or fragmentation of habitat and migration routes. • Limited brownfield land availability means that new development will predominantly occur on greenfield sites. It is assumed that greenfield sites typically support greater biodiversity. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear how strongly the market will support a brownfield first approach, given the additional remediation costs involved. • The exact location of future development in each settlement is unknown at this stage. • The total amount growth to be delivered over the plan period is not known at this stage. <p>Option 2 Likely Sustainability Effects:</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>When compared to Option 1 this option has the potential to spread new development amongst a wider range of settlements. This may decrease pressure to develop on environmentally sensitive areas around Worksop and Retford. When compared to the current Core Strategy this Option will increase the number of villages that are considered appropriate for new development, with potential impacts on species and habitats across a wider area including the indicative Sherwood Forest ppSPA, if villages to the south west were allocated a high level of development. Development in some of the smaller villages has potential to increase habitat fragmentation through removal of hedgerows and tree belts that form existing field boundaries.</p> <p>Other settlements that are not identified as key locations for growth in Option 1 do have some significant sites that need to be carefully considered when identifying potential allocations. Notably, Carlton-in-Lindrick and Langold have a strong network of woodland and open spaces to the west of the built-up areas, including Dyscarr Wood (SSSI), Carlton and Wallingwells Wood (Ancient Woodland) and Langold Country Park (Local Nature Reserve). Also some of the land surrounding the former Firbeck Colliery site has naturally regenerated and is designated as a LWS. Similarly, Lound is located immediately adjacent to the Sutton and Lound Gravel Pits SSSI.</p> <p>Supporting further residential growth in rural areas facilitates greater access to the countryside, specifically for recreation and has the potential for individual developments to contribute to enhancement of identified green infrastructure nodes and corridors.</p> <p>There are three SSSIs designated for their geological interest; Creswell Crags, Styrrup Quarry and Scrooby Top Quarry. The wider distribution of growth supported through this option has the potential to result in further adverse impacts on these SSSIs, particularly Scrooby Top Quarry SSSI which is located in close proximity to the A638 to the north west of the District.</p> <p>Additionally the wider distribution of growth envisaged under this option may lead to increased pressure on LGSs in a wider range of locations.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • Application of a criteria-based policy for determining suitability of prospective development sites in rural villages. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1.

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • It remains unclear at this stage what the proportion of growth to be allocated to rural areas will be. <p>Option 3</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>This option will incur far more focused impacts on biodiversity, principally focusing new development in and around Harworth & Bircotes, Blyth, Ranby, Worksop (east), Elkelsley, Gamston (airport), and Tuxford/East Markham/Markham Moor. With a specific focus on distribution and warehousing employment development it is possible that this option, in addition to residential development, will result in a disproportionate land-take. As with other options, this will primarily involve loss of greenfield land and loss of undesignated areas of habitat. Furthermore, the A1 carriageway itself creates a significant barrier for movement of people and wildlife. The edge-effects of large scale residential development (pet predation, curtilage creep, recreational pressure and light pollution), particularly in villages, is likely to have adverse impacts on habitats.</p> <p>This option will minimise impacts on nationally important designated sites, with none identified in close proximity to the key settlements that would accommodate the majority of the growth proposed. Nonetheless, there are still a significant number of locally important sites that may be affected. It is noted, however, that the south east of the District (including Tuxford and East Markham), when compared to the rest of Bassetlaw, may be regarded as having a deficit of strategic green infrastructure. This option therefore presents a significant opportunity for creation and enhancement in association with new developments.</p> <p>The remainder of the District will remain relatively unaffected by new development. This has potential for environmental assets to mature naturally. However, this option also limits potential for investment and enhancement that can be derived from development.</p> <p>This option would likely avoid impacts on the geological SSSIs though some LGSs may still be affected by development pressures. Some of the LGSs in the District (including Warsop Colliery Line Cutting, Old River Cliff and Styrrup Quarry) are located along the A1 corridor and on roads which connect directly to the corridor.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1 Uncertain about the extent of impacts of current traffic and associated air/noise pollution arising from the A1. This means it is difficult to predict the impacts of increased traffic in this part of the District. It remains unclear at this stage what the proportion of growth to be allocated to each settlement will be. <p>Option 4</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>This option would involve significant greenfield development, particularly compared with Option 1 and Option 2. However, this option would also have far more focused impacts on biodiversity. Even the possibility of developing a new settlement, be it on greenfield or brownfield land that is not associated with an existing village, raises the possibility of specific impacts on biodiversity.</p> <p>Development in some of the villages has potential to increase habitat fragmentation through removal of hedgerows and tree belts that form existing field boundaries. While very few settlements are in close proximity to SSSIs, a number have LWSs on the edge of or in close proximity to the defined built-up areas. The edge-effects of large scale residential development (pet predation, curtilage creep, recreational pressure and light pollution), particularly in villages, is likely to have adverse impacts on habitats.</p> <p>Whilst locations for growth have not yet been defined the south east of the District (including Tuxford and East Markham), when compared to the rest of Bassetlaw, is notable insofar as its having a deficit of strategic green infrastructure. This potentially therefore presents a significant creation and enhancement opportunities in association with new developments.</p> <p>The remainder of the District will remain relatively unaffected by development. This has potential for environmental assets to mature naturally, but likewise also to limit potential for investment and enhancement that can be derived from development.</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>This option would likely avoid impact on geological SSSIs but may result in development pressure on land surrounding LGSs considering the wider spread of these features in the District.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • Careful consideration to be given to selection of sites and general directions of growth taking account of the sensitivity of particular areas. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • It is unclear at this stage where growth will be allocated therefore it is not possible to determine the specific effects on the natural environment. <p>Option 5</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>The effects of developments on the edge of the existing urban areas in Bassetlaw will be very focused. The biggest challenge will be to avoid adverse impacts on the assets of greatest significance (such as Clumber Park), due to the options available. Compared to Option 1 the impacts of this option are likely to be amplified in Worksop and Retford. The edge-effects of large scale residential development (pet predation, curtilage creep, recreational pressure and light pollution), is likely to have adverse impacts on habitats and any urban extensions around Worksop could fall within, or in close proximity to, the indicative Sherwood Forest ppSPA. With development focused in Worksop and Retford alone these effects and those of on other non-designated features would be much more pronounced and more difficult to mitigate in the long term. This should be weighed, however, against the limited impact on the rest of the District.</p> <p>This approach would fail to acknowledge the availability of sites/locations of less significance and sensitivity. Furthermore this approach would be likely to result in loss of sites that are of multifunctional green infrastructure value and accessible urban fringe countryside that is highly valued by existing residents.</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>Conversely, however, the sites that could be considered under this option would offer significant opportunity for specific habitat creation along with well-designed and integrated green infrastructure features.</p> <p>By focussing development at the settlement edges of Worksop and/or Retford this option would avoid impact on geological SSSIs but may result in development pressure on land surrounding LGSs. Carlton Forest Quarry, Sandhill Lake, Worksop Sand Pit, Toll Bar Cottage, Woodsetts Quarry Pond Bolham Mill, Thrumpton Goods Yard and Bolham Lane are LGSs which are located within or in close proximity to one of these settlements.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • Require strategic sites to deliver specific green infrastructure enhancements. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Option 6</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>This option has the potential to spread new development amongst a wider range of settlements and sites of differing scales. By having a choice of sites on which to allocate growth there is scope to avoid significant impacts on the most sensitive sites. Both the spread and potential scale of sites will give rise to opportunities to make connections to existing defined green infrastructure nodes and corridors. Furthermore, this option may present a high number of opportunities for the redevelopment of brownfield sites given that the growth supported would include urban extensions on the edge of the District's largest settlements as well supporting urban intensification.</p> <p>Because this option integrates elements of all of the other options there are some aspects that will lead to specific impacts. One such example will be from allocating a significant proportion of distribution and</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>warehousing-based employment development on the A1 corridor, resulting in a disproportionate greenfield land-take.</p> <p>Delivery of a large scale urban extension will have amplified effects on the part of Worksop and/or Retford in which it is located and any urban extensions around Worksop could fall within or in close proximity to the indicative Sherwood Forest ppSPA. Development taking the form of large scale urban extensions may present opportunities for habitat creation along with well-designed and integrated green infrastructure features.</p> <p>The prospect of developing a new settlement (be it on greenfield or brownfield land) that is not associated with an existing village, raises the possibility of specific impacts on biodiversity at locations which currently do not include any development at all. Distributing growth to a wider range of villages than is currently supported in the existing Core Strategy will have potential impacts on species and habitats across a wider area. Increasing scope for development in rural Bassetlaw has potential to increase habitat fragmentation through removal of hedgerows and tree belts that form existing field boundaries. In contrast, distributing growth to a wider range of settlements provides more opportunity to avoid development at the most sensitive sites.</p> <p>This option may see some additional development pressures around at land around Scrooby Top Quarry SSSI. The inclusion of a wide range of settlements to accommodate growth may also lead to development pressures on a greater number of LGSs.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1 • Application of a criteria-based policy for determining suitability of prospective development sites in rural villages. • Require strategic sites to deliver specific green infrastructure enhancements. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1 • Greater reliance on greenfield sites will result in loss of vegetation affecting surface runoff rates and reduced interception. <p>Uncertainties:</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1 • The total amount growth to be delivered over the plan period is not known at this stage. • It remains unclear at this stage what the proportion of growth to be allocated to rural areas will be. <p>Option 7 Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>This option would involve significant greenfield development, particularly compared with Option 1 and Option 2 given that it would allow for a more even spread of development through the District which is to include all settlements. By adopting this approach it is expected that greater impact would result in terms of biodiversity and designated nature conservation sites in the District.</p> <p>Spreading development across most of the villages (with all settlements to contribute to District growth to a cap of 20%) has potential to increase habitat fragmentation particularly at the more rural villages through removal of hedgerows and tree belts that form existing field boundaries. While this approach may result in development being distributed to avoid concentrating growth in close proximity to the more sensitive biodiversity sites in the District, it is considered likely that a high level of development provided at rural village locations may result in the loss of more greenfield land than might otherwise be the case at the larger settlements of the District. This judgement has been made with consideration for the historical patterns of development, which is likely to result in more brownfield land being available at larger settlements.</p> <p>This option would distribute some growth towards the south western villages and therefore is likely to have adverse impacts on Welbeck Lake SSSI and Clumber Park SSSI. Similarly, growth at the south eastern villages may result in adverse impacts in relation to Castle Hill Wood SSSI and Treswell Wood SSSI. The south western portion of the District also includes the indicative Sherwood Forest ppSPA. It is noted that significant effects might be avoided as this approach would allow for the highest levels of development at the larger settlements of the District. Many of the rural villages have LWSs on the edge of or in close proximity to their settlement edges. The edge-effects of new residential development (pet predation, curtilage creep, recreational pressure and light pollution), particularly in villages, is likely to have adverse impacts on habitats.</p> <p>Whilst locations for growth have not yet been defined, the south east of the District (including Tuxford and East Markham), when compared to the rest of Bassetlaw, is notable insofar as its having a deficit of strategic green infrastructure. As such providing development spread through rural villages including those to the</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>south east may present significant GI creation and enhancement opportunities in association with new developments.</p> <p>Given that this approach would result in a significant proportion of new development occurring at the more rural settlements of the District with all settlements potentially contributing to the District growth target up to a cap of 20%. As such it is expected that new growth over the plan period would affect many locations which have been identified as being sensitive in terms of biodiversity. This approach may help to encourage the proliferation of the green infrastructure network across a wider area of the District, however this will be dependent upon the design of new proposals which come forward as well as issues such as viability, which will ultimately influence whether or not these types of improvement can be derived from development. It is noted that this approach would not result in the creation of new settlements which would otherwise have the potential to result in significant loss of greenfield land concentrated at one location.</p> <p>The inclusion of a wide range of settlements to provide development over the plan period as part of this option may lead to development pressures on a greater number of LGSs. This wider distribution of growth has the potential to adversely impact upon the SSSI of geological importance at Creswell Craggs, Styrrup Quarry and Scrooby Top Quarry. Conversely allowing new development in a wider range of settlements gives greater scope to take a sequential approach to the assessment of site suitability.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • Careful consideration to be given to selection of sites particularly at the rural villages of the District taking account of the sensitivity of particular areas. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • While this option provides proportionate levels of development at all settlements in the District at this stage it is uncertain in relation to the precise level of growth to be delivered at each settlement and to determine the specific effects on the natural environment. • It is uncertain whether the level of development at rural settlements would be of a scale to support new green infrastructure provision.

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>Option 8</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>a significant level of greenfield development, it is expected to be less than that which would be required to support Option 7 given that a higher level of development is to be apportioned to the larger settlements in the District. This would include Worksop as a sub-regional centre, Retford as a rural hub and Harworth & Bircotes as Bassetlaw's Main Regeneration Settlement the larger settlements in the District, where the historical pattern of development is likely to provide increased opportunities for the re-use of previously developed land. Furthermore the smallest and most rural settlements of the District (which currently are likely to experience less habitat disturbance and fragmentation given their smaller populations) would not accommodate higher levels of growth unless land was to be allocated through Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <p>This option would result in dispersal of development across many of the District's settlements, however the level of growth will be proportionate to settlement size. It is expected that this approach would have a reduced potential to increase habitat fragmentation particularly at the more rural villages, given that minimal growth would result at these locations. When compared to Option 7 this option would allocate a less wide spread of development at the smaller settlements to the south west of the District which would help to reduce adverse impacts on Welbeck Lake SSSI and Clumber Park SSSI. The south western portion of the District also includes the indicative Sherwood Forest ppSPA. The reduced distribution of development around the smaller and more rural south eastern villages would help to reduce the scope for adverse impacts in relation to Castle Hill Wood SSSI and Treswell Wood SSSI. This option would also allow for growth at new settlements. While this would result in the loss of a large area of greenfield land, this type of growth is to be guided by the principles of Garden Villages which should help to mitigate adverse impacts relating to habitat fragmentation in the wider area.</p> <p>The provision of new settlements in the District is likely to result in new growth of a scale to support the incorporation of elements of green infrastructure. This is particularly likely given that the development is to be guided by the principles of Garden Villages, which includes provision of GI. Whilst an element of growth would be delivered towards the south eastern smaller settlements of the District (including Tuxford and East Markham), where a deficiency in strategic green infrastructure has been noted, it is uncertain whether the smaller level of growth which would be supported at these settlements would support the provision of new elements of green infrastructure.</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>This approach would support the provision of new development at the more rural settlements of the District. It would allow for development which is of a level to be proportionate to the size of these settlements with those settlements which have been identified as playing a specific role in the District accommodating higher levels of growth. Growth of up to 20% is to be supported at most settlements with the exception of the smallest and most rural. As such it is expected that any adverse effects on biodiversity sites in close proximity to the smaller settlements of the District may be minimised. This approach may help to encourage the proliferation of the green infrastructure network across a wider area of the District. The delivery of large scale development that follows the principles of Garden Villages may be of particular benefit in terms of the incorporation of green infrastructure. This will ultimately be dependent upon the design of new proposals which come forward.</p> <p>The inclusion of a wide range of settlements to provide development over the plan period as part of this option may lead to development pressures on a greater number of LGSs as well as the SSSIs of geological importance at Creswell Crags, Scooby Top Quarry and Styrrup Quarry. Conversely allowing new development in a wider range of settlements gives greater scope to take a sequential approach to the assessment of site suitability.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • Careful consideration to be given to selection of sites particularly at the rural villages of the District taking account of the sensitivity of particular areas. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • While this option provides proportionate levels of development at most of the settlements in the District apart from those which are smallest and most isolated at this stage it is uncertain in relation to the precise level of growth to be delivered at each settlement and to determine the specific effects on the natural environment.
2. Housing: To ensure	+	++	+?	+/-	+	++	++	++	<p>Option 1</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
that the District's housing needs are met.									<p>Housing completions in Bassetlaw have varied between 241 and 514 dwellings over the past ten years.</p> <p>This option will be able to meet the required objectively assessed need. The range of settlements in which sites would be allocated should meet a range of needs and market demands, delivering dwellings in, or on the edge of, towns and villages. Focused intervention in Harworth & Bircotes will broaden the type and tenure of houses in this area. However high levels of existing commitments in Harworth & Bircotes may constrain the delivery of housing in the short-medium term.</p> <p>This option would continue to constrain the range of rural settlements eligible for residential development, resulting in the needs of other villages remaining unmet.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide specific policy support for housing that meets the needs of the elderly and other groups. • Site allocations and criteria based policies will deliver sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. • Development Management policies will require the application of good design and layout policies. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The level of housing growth has been considered as part of the appraisal of housing and employment growth options and is unlikely to be influenced by the overall spatial strategy. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear how strongly the market will support a brownfield first approach, given the additional remediation costs involved. • The exact location of future development in each settlement is unknown at this stage. • The total amount growth to be delivered over the plan period is not known at this stage. <p>Option 2</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>Compared to Option 1 this would see development take place in a wider range of rural settlements, allowing the housing needs of these villages to be met. This option will be able to meet the required objectively assessed need.</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>Additionally urban intensification schemes would increase the range of market needs met, by meeting the needs of those who prioritise a town centre location.</p> <p>Expanding the range of locations in which residential development would take place would also increase the range of affordable housing available.</p> <p>Compared to Option 1 this option would likely be more reliant on greenfield, with a positive effect on viability and, in turn, affordable housing delivery.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Option 3</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>Compared to Options 1 and 2 this would see new housing development concentrated in a smaller range of settlements. This raises questions about whether there is sufficient land available in these locations to meet the objectively assessed need. Additionally concentrating new development in a smaller range of settlements may limit market appeal with potential adverse impacts on delivery. This approach fails to meet existing needs within Retford and Worksop, by diverting development away from Retford altogether and promoting development only to the east of Worksop.</p> <p>Compared to Option 1 this option would likely be more reliant on greenfield, with a positive effect on viability and, in turn, affordable housing delivery.</p> <p>The A1 Corridor (the old Great North Road) is traditionally a popular route used by the travelling community. Providing sites along this corridor may help to meet the needs of these groups.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1. <p>Option 4</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>Compared to Option 1 this option would likely be more reliant on greenfield, with a positive effect on viability and, in turn, affordable housing delivery.</p> <p>This approach fails to meet existing needs within Retford and Worksop, by diverting large scale development away from the towns. This option would focus the provision of affordable housing in rural areas of the District.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1. Possible locations for a new village are currently unknown. <p>Option 5</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>Compared to Options 1 to 4 this would see new housing development concentrated entirely around the edge of Worksop and Retford. This raises questions about whether there is sufficient land available in these locations to meet the objectively assessed need.</p> <p>This option would severely restrict residential development in the rural area, resulting in unmet needs. The range of affordable housing delivered would also be restricted.</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>Compared to Option 1 this option would likely be more reliant on greenfield, with a positive effect on viability and, in turn, overall affordable housing delivery. Viability would be further supported by the large scale of development proposed.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Option 6</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>This option would allow for new residential development on the widest range of sites, meeting the needs of different groups. This option will be able to meet the objectively assessed need and will provide flexibility in where development can come forward.</p> <p>This option would see development take place in a wider range of rural settlements, allowing the housing needs of these villages to be met. This also applies to the provision of sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.</p> <p>Additionally urban intensification schemes would increase the range of market needs met, by provision of housing for those who prioritise a town centre location.</p> <p>The development of large scale urban extensions on greenfield land may be more viable in terms of delivering affordable housing.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extent to which new housing development meets local needs will be dependent on the mix of housing delivered (in terms of size, type and tenure). This is currently unknown. • Exact location of sites for new housing development is currently unknown. <p>Option 7</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>By providing a wider distribution of development across most of the settlements in the District this option will help to avoid overburdening areas with land availability and suitability constraints. This option is expected to result in delivery of a high level of new development on greenfield land, which is likely to be more viable in terms of affordable housing delivery, particularly at rural locations.</p> <p>While this approach would not prioritise the concentration of development at Retford and Worksop, it would still provide planned growth commensurate to settlement size at these and all other locations. Option 7 would in effect still result in the larger settlements delivering the greatest number of new homes. As such this option would generally respond to the existing housing needs at these settlements.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • The extent to which new housing development meets local needs will be dependent on the mix of housing delivered (in terms of size, type and tenure). This is currently unknown. • Exact location of sites for new housing development is currently unknown. <p>Option 8</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>This option would provide distribution of development which is proportionate to settlement size with growth up to 20% across all but the smallest and most isolated rural settlements. New settlements in the District are also to be supported as to be guided by the principles of Garden Villages. As much of the development will be delivered on greenfield land and this may increase viability in terms of affordable housing delivery, particularly throughout the more rural locations. At these types of locations there will historically have been lower levels of development meaning a higher proportion of land is greenfield. which is proportionate to settlement size is furthermore expected to provide flexibility in terms of where development can come forward and potentially in terms of site size.</p> <p>This option would apportion higher levels of development towards Worksop as a sub-regional centre, Retford as a rural hub and Harworth and Bircotes as Bassetlaw's Main Regeneration Settlement, ensuring that the existing needs at these settlements would be met.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The level of housing growth has been considered as part of the appraisal of housing and employment growth options and is unlikely to be influenced by the overall spatial strategy. As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • The extent to which new housing development meets local needs will be dependent on the mix of housing delivered (in terms of size, type and tenure). This is currently unknown. • Exact location of sites for new housing development is currently unknown.
<p>3. Economy and Skills: To promote a strong economy which</p>	+	+?/-	+/-	+/-	+	++?	+++/-	+++?	<p>Option 1</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>Bassetlaw is continuing to regenerate its economic base following the structural decline of coalmining in the area. Following the closure of Harworth Colliery there are now no remaining pits in Bassetlaw. However, the District includes internationally recognised brands in food production, along with established engineering and manufacturing.</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
offers high quality local employment opportunities.									<p>The decline of traditional industries and lack of economic opportunity is reflected in Bassetlaw's economy, being dominated by lower-skilled jobs with low end earnings. Educational attainment levels are generally lower than national and regional averages. While a large number of people of working age commute out of Bassetlaw for work, the District exhibits a high retention rate with over 60% of residents working within the area.</p> <p>This option provides a flexible approach to economic development. It recognises the roles of Worksop and Retford as the main centres of employment in Bassetlaw and continues to support the economic regeneration of Harworth & Bircotes. Rural diversification is widely supported, although this is subject to the need to be in a specific location. Land for economic development would not be allocated in rural areas.</p> <p>Focusing largely on employment growth around existing population concentrations facilitates access to new and existing employment, education and training opportunities.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure of delivery of existing permissions that are currently contributing to growth targets under this option will result in the need for additional allocations as contingency measures. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The relationship between the number of jobs created by new employment development and the quantity of land required. • During the lifetime of the plan there is high dependency on the delivery of development on sites with existing permissions. • The extent to which job creation is locally significant will depend on the type of jobs created and the recruitment policies of prospective employers. <p>Option 2 Likely Sustainability Effects:</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>This option carries many similarities to Option 1, with the exception of limiting rural employment opportunities to the settlements identified as part of the functional clusters⁷⁴. The likely effect of this approach would be to ensure that jobs are located in closer proximity to the potential workforce. This would facilitate ease of access to new and existing employment, education and training opportunities. However, this pattern of development would restrict opportunities for farm diversification which may adversely affect the long term viability of farming enterprises in the District.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Option 3</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>The overall aim of this option is to locate economic growth so as to maximise potential benefits associated with ease of access to the strategic road network. This will prioritise growth of particular types of employment (warehousing and distribution), in which Bassetlaw has a strong track record. However, this has the potential to limit the diversity of opportunity available in the local economy and reinforce the existing trend of low-skilled/low income labour.</p> <p>Development in these areas does not make best use of existing concentrations of the existing population (potential workforce), particularly those in Worksop and Retford. Similarly, limiting growth in the villages to the east of the District has the potential limit regeneration of these settlements and limit their long-term vitality. Additionally, with the A1 in such close proximity to the main growth areas there is increased likelihood of residents travelling further, to larger centres outside of Bassetlaw.</p> <p>Warehousing and distribution enterprises do not necessarily provide a high number of jobs, relative to the amount of land that is developed. Any allocations that are made along the A1 corridor may be of limited</p>

⁷⁴ Bassetlaw Rural Settlement Study (2016)

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>interest to other types of enterprise, therefore does not offer the flexibility of other options. Furthermore, this option will do little to promote a low carbon economy with a greater dependency on road vehicle movements.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Option 4</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>This option would allocate significant growth in rural service centres and support economic development in the wider rural area, but would also allow continuation of market led economic development based on demand in the urban areas.</p> <p>This option would give strong support for rural diversification which with the potential to attract a broader range of employers could support the diversification of the local economy more generally. However, by locating a significant amount of residential development away from the existing centres of population and employment there may be adverse effects on accessibility to jobs.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • There is no evidence to suggest that rural areas are desirable or viable for significant economic investment <p>Option 5</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>Sustainable urban extensions in Worksop and Retford would place a significant emphasis on development of new enterprises in these towns. This would facilitate ease of access to new and existing employment, education and training opportunities.</p> <p>Although this strategy would not undermine continued economic development in other settlements across the District and throughout the rural area, it does not actively support it.</p> <p>Focusing economic growth in the existing urban areas has the potential to deliver greater diversity of employment types. Similarly, concentrating growth in the towns has the potential to support clustering of particular industries.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • It is unclear if there is sufficient land available to support large scale allocations for both residential development and economic development. <p>Option 6</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>This option provides the most flexible approach to new economic development in Bassetlaw. It recognises the roles of Worksop and Retford as the main centres of employment and continues to support the economic regeneration of Harworth & Bircotes. Sustainable urban extensions in Worksop and Retford would place a significant emphasis on development of new enterprises here and would facilitate ease of access to new and existing employment, education and training opportunities.</p> <p>Rural diversification is widely supported both within functional clusters and outside of these areas where there is clear need for a specific location. Land for economic development would not be allocated in rural</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>areas, which could potentially concentrate new employment opportunities in areas where a higher number of residents will have access to them. This approach may however mean that those residents at rural locations would be provided with limited access to nearby employment opportunities.</p> <p>This option recognises the significant role the A1 plays in the local economy and seeks to maximise the benefits that can be derived from locating specific types of business along the A1 corridor.</p> <p>The support this option provides for the creation of new settlements is expected to result in the delivery of some new employment opportunities, as the relatively large scale of development will help to promote a degree of self-sufficiency.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure of delivery of existing permissions that are currently contributing to growth targets under this option will result in the need for additional allocations as contingency measures. • Large scale employers locating on the A1 corridor will be expected to contribute to provision of means by which the existing population can access new jobs. • Development Management policies will need to provide criteria to control development in rural areas outside of defined functional clusters. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extent to which job creation is locally significant will depend on the type of jobs created and the recruitment policies of prospective employers. • As per Option 1. <p>Option 7</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>This option would provide for a more even distribution of development across the District over the plan period with the larger settlements still to deliver the highest levels of growth. As such, it would result in allocations in</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>the rural service centres which would support economic development in the wider rural area, while also providing new development at the large settlements which traditionally support the largest number of employment opportunities.</p> <p>This option would support a level of rural diversification with the potential to attract a broader range of employers partly by supporting population increases at the smaller settlements which may help to stimulate economic growth. The approach also continues support for economic growth at the more developed locations of the District given that the provision of new development is to be commensurate to settlement size.</p> <p>However it is expected by that allowing for growth at all of the settlements in the District this option will deliver growth at the more rural and isolated villages of the District where existing employment opportunities will be less accessible. Furthermore, development at these locations would likely need to be supported by infrastructure improvements to allow for future economic growth.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • Development Management policies will need to provide criteria to control development in rural areas outside of defined functional clusters. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extent to which job creation is locally significant will depend on the type of jobs created and the recruitment policies of prospective employers. • As per Option 1. • There is no evidence to suggest that rural areas are desirable or viable for significant economic investment. <p>Option 8</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>While this option would provide for a more equal distribution of development across the District over the plan period the level of development to be delivered is to be commensurate of areas that play specific roles in the District. As such, while this approach would provide a level of development at the rural service centres to support economic development in the wider rural area, it would focus more growth at Worksop as a sub-</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>regional centre, Retford as a rural hub and Harworth and Bircotes as Bassetlaw's Main Regeneration Settlement. This option would not support a high level of growth at the strong transport corridor along the A1 which could otherwise support warehouse provision in the District. It is expected however that this approach may help to improve the District's economic growth in a wider context given that these locations are accessible to a higher number of residents and benefit from relatively strong transport links..</p> <p>Supporting a level of growth which is proportionate to settlement size is expected to allow for a level of rural diversification in the District with the potential to attract a broader range of employers, partly by supporting population increases at the smaller settlements, which can stimulate economic growth. This approach would not support allocation at the smallest and most isolated rural settlements and development at these locations is likely to be achieved through the Neighbourhood Plan process. It is therefore expected that development at the more remote locations of the District would be of a reduced scale thereby limiting the number of residents at locations that are not accessible to existing employment opportunities. The support this option provides for the creation of new settlements guided by Garden Village principles is expected to result in the delivery of some new employment opportunities, as the relatively large scale of development will help to promote a degree of self-sufficiency.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1 • Development Management policies will need to provide criteria to control development in rural areas outside of defined functional clusters. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extent to which job creation is locally significant will depend on the type of jobs created and the recruitment policies of prospective employers. • As per Option 1. • There is no evidence to suggest that rural areas are desirable or viable for significant economic investment.
4. Regeneration and Social Inclusion:	++/-	++	+/-	++/--	++/--	++	++/-	++	<p>Option 1</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all									<p>Option 1 focuses new development on defined service centres, including both the towns and villages, supporting access to and sustaining the viability of services and facilities.</p> <p>With a significant proportion of growth to be delivered in both Worksop and Retford this option facilitates ease of access to existing services and cultural activities, whilst potentially supporting their enhancement. High levels of development in the towns will also generate significant contributions to infrastructure enhancements. Large scale extensions, creating mixed communities have the potential to increase social cohesion.</p> <p>Additionally continuing to promote significant development in Harworth & Bircotes will support efforts to regenerate this ex-coliery town.</p> <p>Where residential development is supported in the villages there is potential for enhancement of local service provision. However this option does not account for any change in circumstance related to service provision, whereby loss of a key service may render a village less sustainable than at the point of its designation as a service centre. In the long term this can affect the suitability for residential development</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New residential development will be expected to contribute to the provision of school places. • Development Management policy seeking to restrict loss of community facilities. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a strong relationship between service provision and size of resident population. Significant increases in localised residential population would be expected to support the delivery of new services and retail provision. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Localised impact of changing service provision over the plan period. <p>Option 2</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>Option 2 disperses development to a wider range of rural settlements but continues to use access to services as a key indicator of sustainability and suitability for accommodating residential development. The functional geography approach recognises the interdependence of rural settlements in terms of service provision. This would allow a greater proportion of new development to take place in rural areas, supporting the viability of</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>rural service provision and seeking to address inequalities in the rural area. Although some villages will continue to be regarded as unsuitable for development, this is on the basis that limited existing service provision does not provide a sound basis for social cohesion.</p> <p>While this option would not continue to pursue growth at the same rate as the Core Strategy's 'step-change' for Harworth, it would nevertheless deliver proportionate growth, relative to permitted developments which will be delivered over the lifetime of the plan.</p> <p>Additionally urban intensification schemes in both Worksop and Retford would facilitate ease of access to existing services and cultural activities.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Option 3</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>Although focussed on a smaller range of settlements, Option 3 does focus significant new development on identified service centres. This would support access to and sustain the viability of existing services and facilities in these centres. Subject to the level of growth allocated in each settlement, there is potential for new development to support new services and facilities. However development in these areas does not make best use of existing concentrations of services and facilities, particularly those in Worksop and Retford. Similarly, limiting growth in the villages to the east of the District has the potential to limit regeneration of these settlements and limit their long-term vitality. Additionally, with the A1 in such close proximity to the main growth areas there is increased likelihood of residents travelling further, to larger centres outside of Bassetlaw.</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>Continuing to promote significant development in Harworth & Bircotes will support efforts to regenerate this ex-coliery town. However reduced levels of growth in Worksop and Retford may restrict opportunities for regeneration in these towns.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Option 4</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>Option 4 focuses significant new development on rural service centres, continuing to use access to services as a key indicator of sustainability and suitability for accommodating residential development. This would allow a greater proportion of new development to take place in rural areas, supporting the viability of rural service provision.</p> <p>The allocation of a large scale development in the form of a new village would be expected to include the provision of associated services and facilities. A factor in the choice of location would also be the extent to which these additional services would benefit the surrounding area. This may have a beneficial impact on social cohesion and reduce inequalities in rural areas.</p> <p>However, development in these areas does not make best use of existing concentrations of services and facilities, particularly those in Worksop and Retford. It also fails to address issues of deprivation within the towns.</p> <p>Furthermore, this option would do little to address continued redevelopment and regeneration of Bassetlaw's former collieries and the communities surrounding them.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • Development of a significant scale will result in need for key infrastructure, including, but not limited to, education and healthcare. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Option 5</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>This option presents significant opportunity to enhance service provision within Worksop and Retford, both as part of large scale urban extensions and through increased threshold population triggering greater demand. A significant level of growth in Worksop, in particular, would almost certainly require delivery of a new Secondary School. Population growth within these towns will enhance the vitality and viability of community services and facilities, along with retail and leisure in the town centres and any new/existing local centres alike.</p> <p>Large scale extensions to Worksop and Retford enhance the scope for securing investment for key regeneration projects and reducing inequalities within the towns.</p> <p>Conversely, limiting growth in the villages throughout the District has the potential to limit regeneration of these settlements, limiting their long-term vitality and reinforcing rural inequalities. Furthermore, this option would do little to address continued redevelopment and regeneration of Bassetlaw's former collieries and the communities surrounding them.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • Development of a significant scale will result in need for key infrastructure, including, but not limited to, education and healthcare. <p>Uncertainties:</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1. <p>Option 5</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>This option presents significant opportunity to enhance service provision within Worksop and Retford through large scale urban extensions. Growth within these towns will enhance the vitality and viability of community services and facilities, along with retail and leisure in the town centres and any new/existing local centres alike. Large scale extensions to Worksop and Retford also enhance the scope for securing investment for key regeneration projects and reducing inequalities within the towns.</p> <p>This option disperses development to a wider range of rural settlements but continues to use access to services as a key indicator of sustainability and suitability for accommodating residential development. The functional geography approach, which is incorporated in this option, recognises the interdependence of rural settlements in terms of service provision. This would allow a greater proportion of new development to come forward in rural areas, supporting the viability of rural service provision and seeking to address inequalities in the rural area. Although some villages will continue to be regarded as unsuitable for development, this is on the basis that limited existing service provision does not provide a sound basis for social cohesion.</p> <p>Establishing a new village or significantly extending an existing settlement has the scope for positive impacts for the rural area by increasing potential viability of new services and facilities – especially if this results in a new functional cluster. This effect depends on whether any new services and facilities provided would be located as to serve existing residents as well as those of the new settlement.</p> <p>While this option would not continue to pursue growth at the same rate as the Core Strategy’s ‘step-change’ for Harworth, it would nevertheless deliver proportionate growth, relative to permitted developments, which will be delivered over the lifetime of the plan.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New residential development will be expected to contribute to the provision of school places. Development Management policy seeking to restrict loss of community facilities.

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a strong relationship between service provision and size of resident population. Significant increases in localised residential population would be expected to support the delivery of new services and retail provision. • Development of a significant scale will result in need for key infrastructure, including, but not limited to, education and healthcare. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Localised impact As per Option 1. <p>Option 7</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>Option 7 would allow for allocation of new growth over the plan period at all settlements commensurate to settlement size. As such, a greater proportion of new development would take place in rural areas, supporting the viability of rural service provision. This would include settlements which are the most isolated and have the lowest service offer in the District.</p> <p>While there would be noted benefits in terms of maintaining and fostering the improved viability of services and facilities at the smaller settlements of the District this option would provide more housing at locations with more limited provision of services and facilities. This includes the most rural and isolated settlements in the District. Furthermore, development in these areas would fail to make best use of existing concentrations of services and facilities. While this option would provide higher levels of development at the larger settlements, failure to prioritise development at these locations would also fail to specifically address issues of deprivation within the larger towns of Worksop, Retford and Harworth and Bircotes in particular.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1. <p>Option 8</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>Option 8 would allow for new growth over the plan period at most settlements in the District apart from the smallest and most isolated. As such, this option would allow for new development in rural areas, supporting the viability of rural service provision. Option 8 also allows for the creation of new settlements, led by Garden Village principles, which, together with the critical mass provided by this scale of development, would support the delivery of new services and facilities.</p> <p>While this option would allow for growth to be distributed throughout the District, levels of growth to be delivered at settlements is to recognise the specific role these settlements play in Bassetlaw. As such, levels of growth will be provided to support Worksop as a sub-regional centre, Retford as a rural hub, and Harworth and Bircotes as Bassetlaw's Main Regeneration Settlement. As such, the highest levels of growth are to be provided at settlements which are most likely to have an appropriate scale of existing services and facilities, considering their size in relation to the smaller and more rural settlements. Furthermore development would not be actively supported at a large scale within the more isolated and smaller villages of the District unless guided by the Neighbourhood Planning process thereby reducing the potential for new residents to experience difficulties in accessing services and facilities. Prioritising development at the settlements noted above would also specifically help to address issues of deprivation within the larger towns in particular.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1. Development of a significant scale at any new settlements will result in need for key infrastructure, including, but not limited to, education and healthcare. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1.
5. Health and	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-?	++/-	++/-?	++/-?	++	Option 1

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
<p>Wellbeing: To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>									<p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>Existing residents within Bassetlaw perceive that the District is well served in terms of open space and opportunities for recreation⁷⁵. However, the overall health of residents in the District is recognised as being poor in comparison to regional and national averages. Obesity and lack of physical activity are recognised as key problems. Furthermore there is evidence to suggest that the number of residents per GP exceeds the national average.</p> <p>The distribution of growth proposed under Option 1 will continue to support the viability of existing services and facilities by focusing new development in existing service centres. However, this option will limit regeneration of some villages and exacerbate health inequalities in rural areas.</p> <p>The continued regeneration of Harworth & Bircotes will contribute to improvement of local health services and recreational facilities</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development proposals will be required to demonstrate how they will support the health and wellbeing of future residents through provision of and/or connectivity to open space and recreational facilities. • In specific cases development proposals will be required to demonstrate how they meet the needs of an ageing population. • Development Management policies will ensure that open space and/or health facilities are provided on site or contributions are sought for off-site provision • Development Management policies and site allocations will seek to ensure that development is not located in close proximity to unsuitable neighbouring uses <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is potential for the construction and operation of new development to have a negative effect on the health and wellbeing of residents in close proximity to development sites and along transport routes within the District <p>Uncertainties:</p>

⁷⁵ Bassetlaw Open Space Study (2012)

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Without knowing exact locations of sites and the design and layout of development proposals it is not possible to identify specific green infrastructure enhancements or predict impacts on crime/anti-social behaviour, or the ability to meet the needs of an ageing population <p><u>Option 2</u></p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>A wider distribution of rural residential development proposed in Option 2 will facilitate ease of access to the countryside for future residents. This has scope for development of new green infrastructure that can link to the existing identified strategic green infrastructure network. Conversely, however, increasing the rural population, spread over a wider area, will reduce accessibility to existing healthcare facilities. This pattern of growth will result in need for more dispersed healthcare provision with potential implications for viability.</p> <p>There are a high proportion of elderly people living in Bassetlaw's rural settlements. This already presents a challenge in terms of reducing rural inequalities and providing access to services. Increasing rural development has the potential to address this by increasing the viability of rural service provision.</p> <p>Focusing new development in rural areas does not make best use of existing concentrations of healthcare services and recreational facilities that currently exist primarily in Worksop and Retford.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1. There is no certainty that growth of existing villages will lead to improved healthcare service provision in rural areas. <p><u>Option 3</u></p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>Under this option it will be imperative to carefully consider the proximity of new residential development to the A1 carriageway, as residential areas are among the most sensitive to the effects of reduced air quality and noise that is associated with high volumes of road traffic.</p> <p>Focusing new development along the A1 corridor does not make best use of existing concentrations of healthcare services and recreational facilities that exist primarily in Worksop and Retford. Similarly, limiting growth in the villages to the east of the District has the potential to limit regeneration of these settlements and limit their long-term vitality.</p> <p>Focusing significant levels of new development in existing settlements along the A1 has potential to support development of new green infrastructure that can link to the existing identified strategic green infrastructure network.</p> <p>This option will also support the continued regeneration of Harworth & Bircotes will contribute to improvement of local health services and recreational facilities.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Option 4</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>Significant growth of rural residential development proposed in Option 4 will facilitate ease of access to the countryside for future residents. This has scope for development of new green infrastructure that can link to the existing identified strategic green infrastructure network.</p> <p>Expansion of existing service centres and the potential creation of a new settlement may boost the viability of existing rural healthcare services and present opportunity for provision of new services. Increased provision</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>in rural areas could make a significant contribution to reducing rural inequalities – particularly for elderly residents.</p> <p>Focusing new development in rural areas does not, however, make best use of existing concentrations of healthcare services and recreational facilities that currently exist primarily in Worksop and Retford. Rather, it may exacerbate existing problems, particularly for elderly residents, associated with access to services.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Options 1. <p>Option 5</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>This option will ensure new residents have ease of access to existing healthcare services and recreational facilities located in Worksop and Retford, while developer contributions will feed directly in to enhancement of existing services. The scale of urban extensions that would come forward under this option would also most likely ensure delivery of new services and facilities as part of development.</p> <p>This approach would be likely to result in loss of sites that are of multifunctional green infrastructure value and accessible urban fringe countryside that is highly valued by existing residents. However, large scale urban extensions provide significant opportunity for green infrastructure creation and enhancement around and within sites.</p> <p>Careful consideration of urban extension layout and design could help contribute to reductions in anti-social behaviour often associated with urban fringe areas, whilst also enhancing pedestrian and cycling connectivity to the existing built-up area. This option will, however, limit regeneration of some villages and exacerbate health inequalities in rural areas</p> <p>Mitigation:</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • Urban extensions may be required to include specific accommodation that meets the needs of the elderly. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Option 6</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>This option will ensure that new residents in urban extensions have ease of access to existing healthcare services and recreational facilities located in Worksop and Retford, while developer contributions will feed directly in to enhancement of existing services. The scale of urban extensions that would come forward under this option would also most likely ensure delivery of new services and facilities as part of development.</p> <p>Urban extensions would be likely to result in loss of sites containing multifunctional green infrastructure and accessible urban fringe countryside that provides a recreational resource for existing residents. However, large scale urban extensions provide significant opportunity for green infrastructure creation and enhancement around and within sites. The scale of growth involved may also help to support the provision of new healthcare facilities.</p> <p>Careful consideration of urban extension layout and design could help contribute to reductions in anti-social behaviour often associated with urban fringe areas, whilst also enhancing pedestrian and cycling connectivity to the existing built-up area.</p> <p>This option will also support the continued regeneration of Harworth & Bircotes will contribute to improvement of local health services and recreational facilities.</p> <p>A wider distribution of rural residential development will facilitate ease of access to the countryside for future residents. This wider distribution of development has scope for development of new green infrastructure that can link to the existing identified strategic green infrastructure network which has been identified in the Bassetlaw Green Infrastructure Study (May 2010).</p> <p>Expansion of rural settlements and the potential creation of a new settlement may boost the viability of existing rural healthcare services and present opportunity for provision of new services. Increased provision</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>in rural areas could make a significant contribution to reducing rural inequalities – particularly for elderly residents.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Management policies and site allocations will seek to ensure that development is not located in close proximity to unsuitable neighbouring uses As per Option 1. • Urban extensions may be required to include specific accommodation that meets the needs of the elderly. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is potential for the construction and operation of new development to have a negative effect on the health and wellbeing of residents in close proximity to development sites and along transport routes within the District. • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • There is no certainty that growth of existing villages will lead to improved healthcare service provision in rural areas. <p>Option 7</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>By allowing for a more evenly distributed pattern of growth in the District it is expected that this option would result in the loss of a high level of greenfield land. This approach could also help to provide a good level of access to the countryside for some new residents, given that a level of growth would be supported at the smaller rural settlements. This wider distribution of development has scope for the delivery of new green infrastructure that can link to the existing identified strategic green infrastructure network.</p> <p>This approach is likely to support the expansion of existing rural service offer, including rural healthcare services. As such, this approach would help to reduce rural inequalities – particularly for elderly residents given that healthcare and other services at these rural locations are likely to be more accessible.</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>While this approach would result in a high level of development at the larger settlements it does not account for the role various settlements play within the District. As such, Option 7 would not provide development in line with the level of services and facilities provided currently at settlements and therefore would not make best use of existing concentrations of healthcare services and recreational facilities; particularly at Worksop and Retford where they are primarily focussed. This approach may result in the delivery of a portion of the new development over the plan period being located where existing services and facilities are less accessible. This is particularly likely to be case at the smallest and most isolated settlements of the District.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Management policies and site allocations will seek to ensure that development is not located in close proximity to unsuitable neighbouring uses As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • There is no certainty that growth of existing villages will lead to improved healthcare service provision in rural areas. <p>Option 8</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>By allowing for a more evenly distributed pattern of growth in the District, as well as allowing for the creation of new settlements in the District, it is expected that this option would result in the loss of a high level of greenfield land, but could also help to improve access to the countryside for future residents. New development provided in this manner has scope for the delivery of new green infrastructure that can link to the existing identified strategic green infrastructure network. It is expected that this approach would thereby result in a mix of positive and negative effects in relation to improving accessibility the countryside and green infrastructure assets which may provide opportunities for residents to partake of healthier lifestyle choices.</p> <p>This approach is likely to support the expansion of existing rural service offer including rural healthcare services. The provision of a new settlement in line with Garden Village principles is likely to incorporate new services and facilities including healthcare, especially considering the scale of such development. As such,</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>this approach would help to improve the offer of services within the District in general and to reduce rural health inequalities. This is particularly likely to be the case for elderly residents, given that healthcare and other services at these rural locations are likely to be more accessible.</p> <p>Option 8 would deliver levels of growth to settlements in Bassetlaw in line with the various roles they play within the District. It would not support growth within the smallest and most isolate settlements of the District. The level of development delivered at Worksop as a sub-regional centre, and Retford as a rural hub in particular, as well as Harworth and Bircotes as Bassetlaw's Main Regeneration Settlement, which contain the highest service offer is to be reflective of the specific roles they play in the District. This option would therefore help to guide development to locations which would make the best use of existing concentrations of healthcare services and recreational facilities.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development Management policies and site allocations will seek to ensure that development is not located in close proximity to unsuitable neighbouring uses. As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1 <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1. There is no certainty that growth of existing villages will lead to improved healthcare service provision in rural areas.
<p>6. Transport: To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment</p>	+	++/-	--	-	+	++/-	+/-	++/-	<p>Option 1</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>Bassetlaw is well connected to the strategic road network, with the A1 and A57 running roughly north-south and east-west respectively. Both the A57 and A619 provide easy access to the M1, to the west. To the east there are good road links towards Gainsborough and Lincoln.</p> <p>The District also has excellent rail links, with the East Coast Mainline linking Retford to London and the North, whilst the Sheffield-Lincoln line includes stops in Worksop, Retford and Shireoaks. Additionally the Robin-Hood Line links Worksop directly to Mansfield and Nottingham.</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
in infrastructure with growth.									<p>Retford and Worksop are well served by buses though more rural parts of the District do not have access to frequent bus services.</p> <p>National Cycle Route 6 runs through the western part of Bassetlaw.</p> <p>Concentrating most development in the urban areas of Worksop, Retford and Harworth & Bircotes has the potential to cluster housing and employment development in close proximity, thereby giving residents greater choice of transport modes, reducing reliance on private vehicles.</p> <p>However, when compared to Worksop and Retford, Harworth & Bircotes does not benefit from either a well-established network of cycle routes, or direct access to rail links. Additionally significant development around the town may cause highways capacity issues on the A631, running between Bawtry and Tickhill.</p> <p>In particular significant growth around Worksop has the potential to exacerbate highway capacity issues along the A57, specifically to the west, through Rotherham Borough, toward the M1 and Sheffield.</p> <p>Equally, development in rural areas would continue to be limited to defined service centres, which provide a range of services, helping to minimise travel by private vehicle. However it is still likely that even limited new development in rural areas will increase the number of trips made by private vehicle.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Management will require large scale new developments to demonstrate how they integrate with existing transport networks, with a particular emphasis on enhancing connectivity to non-car modes of travel. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exact location of new development is currently unknown. • Behaviour of future residents cannot be predicted. <p>Option 2</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>When compared to Option 1 this option has the potential to distribute new development amongst a wider range of settlements, particularly leading to a more dispersed pattern of rural development, where residents will be more reliant on private vehicles, and may need to travel further, to access key services and employment.</p> <p>Conversely this option would still see the majority of new development located in the District's towns, with opportunities for urban intensification. In particular urban intensification schemes would provide opportunities to locate new development within walking distance of key services, including rail and bus links. While this has potential to reduce trip generation it may exacerbate existing congestion problems should residents choose to use private vehicles.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Option 3</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>When compared to Options 1 and 2 this option concentrates new development in a small number of settlements along the A1 corridor. This would concentrate additional private vehicles movements in a small number of places and on the A1, the road with the most capacity to accommodate additional vehicles. This should minimise any additional road congestion within the District's towns. However this approach would significantly increase the volume of traffic on the A1 itself and surrounding routes, with the potential to generate congestion at peak times.</p> <p>Additionally this option would direct development away from settlements with easy access to rail links. Furthermore the focus on warehousing and distribution employment uses would lead to increased HGV movements.</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>It is acknowledged that the National Cycle Network runs through this area but does not represent the most logical connection between new areas of housing and employment growth. This option would focus investment on improvements to the A1 and surrounding routes.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1 • New development would be expected to contribute to the reinforcement of existing, and the development of new, cycle and pedestrian infrastructure. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p><u>Option 4</u></p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>When compared to Options 1 and 2 will see significant new development in rural areas. Locating new development away from established centres of employment and service provision would increase the number and distance of trips made by private vehicle.</p> <p>Compared to Option 3 this would lead to a more dispersed pattern of road usage, and would be less likely to exacerbate existing congestion problems in and around Worksop and Retford.</p> <p>Conversely this option also has the potential to bring new services and employment opportunities to the rural area, thereby minimising the need to travel. Particularly a large scale development in the form of a new village would be expected to provide some day-to-day services.</p> <p>Additionally this option would direct development away from settlements with easy access to rail links. However significant new development in the rural area has the potential to support the provision of new cycling and pedestrian infrastructure.</p> <p>Compared to other options this approach has the greatest potential to enhance connectivity of more rural settlements, including supporting the use of existing rural bus services.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • New development would be expected to contribute to the reinforcement of existing, and the development of new, cycle and pedestrian infrastructure. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • The possible locations for new villages are currently unknown. The proximity to a town is likely to have a significant bearing on the frequency of bus services to any such development and the likelihood of residents using other forms of transport. <p>Option 5</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>Concentrating most development on the edge of Worksop and Retford has the potential to reduce reliance on private vehicles, by giving residents greater choice of differing modes of transport. Particularly, compared to Options 1, 3 and 4 this option would have greater potential to encourage greater use of rail links, including between Worksop and Retford. Additionally the large scale of development proposed has the potential to increase availability of services and employment, with a corresponding reduction in localised trip generation.</p> <p>However, significant growth around Worksop has the potential to exacerbate highway capacity issues along the A57, specifically to the west, through Rotherham Borough, toward the M1 and Sheffield. Increased levels of growth in Worksop and Retford would also be expected to increase congestion through the towns.</p> <p>This would target investment in the existing road network around the towns, potentially increasing capacity for existing users as well as facilitating the trips generated by new housing and employment</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • New development would be expected to contribute to the reinforcement of existing, and the development of new, cycle and pedestrian infrastructure <p>Assumptions:</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Option 6</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>This option draws together elements from Options 2-5, and therefore has a range of impacts associated with each different element.</p> <p>The urban intensification and large scale urban extension elements of this option would have the greatest potential to encourage greater use of rail links, including between Worksop and Retford. Additionally, the large scale of development proposed through urban extensions has the potential to increase availability of services and employment, with a corresponding reduction in the need to travel by car.</p> <p>This option also has the potential to bring new services and employment opportunities to rural areas by directing more development to the rural area, thereby minimising the need to travel. In particular, a new village would be expected to provide some day-to-day services.</p> <p>Significant growth around Worksop has the potential to exacerbate highway capacity issues along the A57, specifically to the west, through Rotherham Borough, toward the M1 and Sheffield. Increased levels of growth in Worksop and/or Retford would also be expected to increase congestion through the towns.</p> <p>New employment development along the A1 Corridor, focussed on warehousing and distribution employment uses, could lead to increased HGV movements along this route. Furthermore increased housing growth in the rural area is still likely to increase the number and distance of trips made by private vehicle.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Management will require large scale new developments to demonstrate how they integrate with existing transport networks, with a particular emphasis on enhancing connectivity to non-car modes of travel. • As per Option 1.

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New development would be expected to contribute to the reinforcement of existing, and the development of new, cycle and pedestrian infrastructure. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Behaviour of future residents cannot be predicted. • The possible locations for new villages are currently unknown. The proximity to a town is likely to have a significant bearing on the frequency of bus services to any such development and the likelihood of residents using other forms of transport. <p>Option 7</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>This option would provide for a more even distribution of growth throughout the District. While this approach would result in a high level of growth at the larger settlements of the District, some development would also be provided at the smallest and isolated settlement, which would increase the number and distance of trips made by private vehicle.</p> <p>This approach would lead to a more dispersed pattern of road usage given the wider distribution of growth allowed for, but considering that higher levels of development would still result at the larger settlements congestion problems in and around Worksop and Retford might still be amplified.</p> <p>This option may result in the scale of development at rural locations which is likely to support new services and employment opportunities to rural areas which would help to limit the need for residents at these locations to travel.</p> <p>The high level of development which would be promoted at the larger settlements would provide a large number of residents with access to the rail stations at Worksop and Retford. The wider distribution of development to include rural areas has the potential to support the provision of new cycling and pedestrian infrastructure. This option is also likely to help enhance connectivity of more rural settlements, including supporting the use of existing rural bus services.</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • New development would be expected to contribute to the reinforcement of existing, and the development of new, cycle and pedestrian infrastructure. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Option 8</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>By promoting a more even distribution of growth throughout the District, with consideration for the specific role various settlements play this option builds on the approach of Option 7 and it is likely to help to reduce the need to travel. This effect is likely given that higher levels of growth are likely to be directed to settlements that provide the highest service and employment offer. It is expected that providing new settlements in the District in line with Garden Village principles will result in growth which will be relatively self-sufficient and will therefore limit the increase in number of journeys which new residents will need to take to meet their daily and weekly needs. New residents still may need to travel to and from these locations and overall effects on travel habits will be dependent to a degree upon the incorporation of new transport infrastructure.</p> <p>Option 8 would still result in a dispersed pattern of road usage given the wider distribution of growth allowed for, but the scale of development at the larger settlements could still amplify congestion problems in and around Worksop and Retford.</p> <p>This option may result in a scale of development at rural locations which is likely to support new services and employment opportunities to rural areas, thereby minimising the need to travel.</p> <p>This approach would focus higher levels of development towards those settlements that have a recognised important role in terms of service provision in the District. As such, much of the new development over the plan period is likely to be provided at locations with access to the rail stations at Worksop and Retford or key bus routes. At the same time, the relatively even distribution of development, to include rural areas as well as the development of new settlements in line with Garden Village principles, has the potential to support the</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>provision of new cycling and pedestrian infrastructure. This option is also likely to help enhance connectivity of more rural settlements, including supporting the use of existing rural bus services</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • New development would be expected to contribute to the reinforcement of existing, and the development of new, cycle and pedestrian infrastructure. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • The possible locations for new villages are currently unknown. The proximity to a town is likely to have a significant bearing on the frequency of bus services to any such development and the likelihood of residents using other forms of transport.
<p>7. Land Use and Soils: To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	-	-	-	-?	-	-?	-	-	<p>Option 1⁷⁶</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>A large proportion (91.9%) of Bassetlaw is classified as greenfield land.</p> <p>The baseline information highlights that remaining brownfield land in the District is concentrated Worksop, Retford and the former colliery sites; most of these have planning permission for redevelopment or have transitioned to other uses.</p> <p>This option concentrates new development in the District's towns, giving ample opportunity to utilise brownfield sites. In particular the regeneration focus of the Core Strategy on Harworth & Bircotes emphasis the redevelopment of the former colliery. However past success in redeveloping brownfield land means that this supply is now limited, such that most new development would still need to take place on greenfield land.</p>

⁷⁶ Note that in the previous SA these assessments for all options referred to geological SSSIs and RIGS. However, these are relative to SA objective 1, rather than SA objective 4 and therefore the aspects of these assessments considering geological and geomorphological designations have been moved to the assessment of SA objective 1.

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>There is an extremely limited amount of Grade 1 agricultural located in the northernmost part of the District. A large proportion of agricultural land in Bassetlaw is identified as Grade 3. There is a band of Grade 2 agricultural land running North and South of Retford, either side of the River Idle.</p> <p>The concentration of development in Worksop and Harworth & Bircotes would avoid development on best and most versatile agricultural land. However significant development around Retford will inevitably involve loss of some Grade 2 land.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the larger settlements outside of Worksop and Retford the Core Strategy prioritises the development of brownfield sites in advance of greenfield allocations. This approach could be extended to the emerging Bassetlaw Plan. • Where remediation of contaminated sites may hinder viability Development Management policies should provide flexibility to negotiate appropriate solutions, in order to support the re-use of brownfield land. • Development Management policies will seek to protect geological features of recognised importance. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The publication of the Brownfield Land Register may help encourage residential development on brownfield land, making an indirect contribution to the delivery of the overall housing target, thereby supporting the delivery of the plan. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear how strongly the market will support a brownfield first approach, given the additional remediation costs involved. • Not possible to differentiate between Grade 3a and 3b agricultural land. • The exact location of future development in each settlement is unknown at this stage. • The total amount growth to be delivered over the plan period is not known at this stage. <p>Option 2</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>This option expands the range of settlements considered suitable for development. Compared to Option 1 this option would support re-use of brownfield land in some settlements currently considered unsuitable for</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>development in the Core Strategy. However this option would also see development on greenfield land in a wider range of locations.</p> <p>Increased development in the rural parts of Bassetlaw would result in greater likelihood of loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. However the wider range of locations would also increase the choice of sites available to develop, allowing a more stringent approach to be taken to site selection.</p> <p>Whilst the existing Core Strategy rules out development in Scrooby and Styrrup taking a functional geography approach may see some development take place in these settlements. This may result in development pressures on land surrounding Scrooby Top Quarry and Styrrup Quarry SSSIs.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Option 3</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>With a specific focus on distribution and warehousing employment development it is possible that this option, in addition to residential development, will result in a disproportionate land-take. As with other options, this will primarily involve loss of greenfield land. Furthermore this approach would limit the potential to utilise brownfield land around Retford and the western edge of Worksop, though it would see brownfield land at Harworth & Bircotes prioritised.</p> <p>This option would see the concentration of growth in a number of settlements that are surrounded by Grade 2 agricultural land, particularly to the south of the District, around Markham Moor, East Markham, Gamston and Tuxford. This would likely lead to the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • To minimise the loss of Grade 2 agricultural land a sequential approach, prioritising agricultural land of lower grade, would be adopted. <p>Assumptions:</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Option 4</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>Compared to Options 1 and 2 this approach would fail to maximise the opportunities associated with focusing development in the urban areas, and the higher volume of brownfield land available in these locations. It is expected that this would lead to higher losses of greenfield land.</p> <p>Depending on the possible locations identified, a new village could either utilise a brownfield site, reducing the use of greenfield land, or may significantly increase the use of greenfield land. Similarly a new village may help avoid the need to develop best and most versatile agricultural land, or may result in further loss.</p> <p>The overall loss of greenfield land associated with this option would also be likely to lead to more widespread loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. In particular the existing local and rural service centres of Tuxford, East Markham, Gamston, Sutton-cum-Lound are surrounded by Grade 2 agricultural land, some of which would be likely to be developed under this option.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • To minimise the loss of Grade 2 agricultural land a sequential approach, prioritising agricultural land of lower grade, would be adopted. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • The possible locations for a new village and its associated impacts on land use are not yet known. <p>Option 5</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>While focusing development on the urban areas might be expected to promote the use of brownfield land, this option's emphasis on extensions to Worksop and Retford does not necessarily make use of previously developed sites. Typically these sites are located more centrally around the town centres and would not be of a sufficient scale to accommodate the larger developments proposed under this option. Consequently, when compared to other options, this may lead a greater area of greenfield land being developed. This would also limit opportunities to remediate contaminated land.</p> <p>Land to the west of Worksop, and to the north and south of Retford is classed as Grade 2 agricultural land. This option would be likely to lead to significant loss of best and most versatile agricultural land, with limited alternative options for distributing the level of growth required by the plan.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • To minimise the loss of Grade 2 agricultural land a sequential approach, prioritising agricultural land of lower grade, would be adopted. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Option 6</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>This option has the potential to distribute new development amongst a wider range of settlements, allowing priority to be given to the reuse of previously developed land, and thereby minimising development of greenfield land. This would maximise opportunities to remediate contaminated land. However, the scale of development likely to be required by the plan, and the limited supply of brownfield land available, will still necessitate the development of significant quantities of greenfield land.</p> <p>Because this option integrates elements of all of the other options there are some features that will incur specific impacts, which have been identified for these other options. One such example will be from allocating</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>a significant proportion of distribution and warehousing-based employment development on the A1 corridor, resulting in a disproportionate greenfield land-take. Equally it is accepted that any large urban extensions will take place on greenfield land, due to a lack of suitable brownfield sites. Increased development in the rural parts of Bassetlaw would result in greater likelihood of loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> <p>Land to the west of Worksop, and to the north and south of Retford is classed as Grade 2 agricultural land. This option would be likely to lead to significant loss of best and most versatile agricultural land, with limited alternative options for distributing the level of growth required by the plan.</p> <p>As with Option 4, it is noted that the impacts of a new village uncertain until the location is determined.</p> <p>Conversely allowing new development in a wider range of settlements gives greater scope to take a sequential approach to the assessment of site suitability.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Management policies will seek to protect geological features of recognised importance. • As per Option 1. • To minimise the loss of Grade 2 agricultural land a sequential approach, prioritising agricultural land of lower grade, would be adopted. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The publication of the Brownfield Land Register may help encourage residential development on brownfield land, making an indirect contribution to the delivery of the overall housing target, thereby supporting the delivery of the plan. • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The total amount growth to be delivered over the plan period is not known at this stage. • As per Option 1. <p><u>Option 7</u></p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>While this option would distribute development more evenly throughout the District and therefore could present an increased range of sites to be developed. The provision of new development at more rural locations, including at the smallest and more rural settlements, however is likely to result in an increase in the amount of greenfield land which is developed. This approach is also likely to result in a greater loss of best and most versatile agricultural land at rural locations. This outcome is likely with additional consideration for the scale of development likely to be required by the plan, and the limited supply of brownfield land available.</p> <p>Option 7 would still provide a high level of development by the larger settlements of the District and as such areas of Grade 2 agricultural land to the west of Worksop, and to the north and south of Retford are likely to be adversely affected.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the larger settlements outside of Worksop and Retford the Core Strategy prioritises the development of brownfield sites in advance of greenfield allocations. This approach could be extended to the emerging Bassetlaw Plan. • Development Management policies will seek to protect geological features of recognised importance. • To minimise the loss of Grade 2 agricultural land a sequential approach, prioritising agricultural land of lower grade, would be adopted. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The publication of the Brownfield Land Register may help encourage residential development on brownfield land, making an indirect contribution to the delivery of the overall housing target, thereby supporting the delivery of the plan. • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The total amount growth to be delivered over the plan period is not known at this stage. • As per Option 1.

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>Option 8</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>While this option would distribute development more evenly throughout the District, with consideration for the specific roles of settlements in Bassetlaw and therefore could present an increased range of sites to be developed. The provision of new development at more rural locations is however likely to result in the development of larger amounts of greenfield land. This approach is likely to result in a greater loss of best and most versatile agricultural land at rural locations. This outcome is likely considering the scale of development likely to be required by the plan, and the limited supply of brownfield land available.</p> <p>Option 8 would also result in the provision of a higher level of development at the larger settlements of the District and as such areas of Grade 2 agricultural land to the west of Worksop, and to the north and south of Retford are likely to be adversely affected.</p> <p>While the extent of greenfield land developed in creating new settlements will ultimately be dependent on the precise location of such settlements, it is expected that this type of development could result in the loss of a large amount of greenfield land. It is considered unlikely that a brownfield site suitable for the provision of the scale of development required for a new settlement could be identified in the District.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Management policies will seek to protect geological features of recognised importance. • As per Option 1. • To minimise the loss of Grade 2 agricultural land a sequential approach, prioritising agricultural land of lower grade, would be adopted. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The publication of the Brownfield Land Register may help encourage residential development on brownfield land, making an indirect contribution to the delivery of the overall housing target, thereby supporting the delivery of the plan. • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The total amount growth to be delivered over the plan period is not known at this stage. As per Option 1.
8. Water: To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<p>Option 1</p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>The Rivers Ryton and Idle are the principal watercourses flowing through Bassetlaw, with the River Trent acting as the eastern-most boundary to the District. Small sections of the rivers Meden, Maun and Poulter also flow across the south of the District. The only waterway of note within Bassetlaw is the Chesterfield canal. It spans the width of Bassetlaw with the section of the canal to the northeast of Retford, between Welham and Misterton, being regarded as the most important for biodiversity and is designated as a SSSI. This part of the canal supports a rare aquatic plant community characteristic of the brackish, eutrophic (nutrient-rich) water.</p> <p>There are a significant number of water bodies within Bassetlaw. Of particular note, the lakes at Clumber, Welbeck and Langold are all man-made and were intended to be integral parts of landscaped parklands. Other notable water bodies include Sandhill Lake in Worksop, the Ash Lagoons at Sutton and Lound Gravel Pits and Daneshill Lake. These are primarily the result of mineral excavation sites that have since been flooded.</p> <p>Development around both Worksop and Retford has the potential to increase run-off into the Rivers Ryton and Idle, and the Chesterfield Canal, with greater potential for localised impacts on water quality</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development Management policies will require additional run-off generated by new development to be managed on site. Development Management policies will restrict (with regard to Source Protection Zones) potentially polluting uses in the vicinity of water extraction points. Development on sites in the vicinity of watercourses may be expected to contribute to the delivery of specific improvements to those watercourses. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The surface water run-off generated by development will be dependent on the type of soil. In particular areas of clay soil will be more vulnerable to surface-water run-off.

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New development will increase water resource usage, both during construction and operation. This has been considered as part of the appraisal of housing and employment growth options and is unlikely to be influenced by the overall spatial strategy. • It is assumed that the Council will continue to liaise with Severn Trent Water over infrastructure requirements for future development. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The specific uses of individual sites are not yet known. <p><u>Option 2</u></p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p> <p>When compared to Option 1 this option has the potential to distribute new development amongst a wider range of settlements, particularly leading to a more dispersed pattern of rural development. In general terms this has the potential to generate increased surface water run-off into a wider range of watercourses.</p> <p>Urban intensification within both Worksop and Retford has the potential to increase run-off into the Rivers Ryton and Idle, and the Chesterfield Canal, with greater potential for localised impacts on water quality.</p> <p>Increased rural development would more likely require new sewage treatment facilities, in order to curtail reliance upon individual property-based solutions such as septic tanks</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • Possible locations for new villages are currently unknown. <p><u>Option 3</u></p> <p>Likely Sustainability Effects:</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>With a specific focus on distribution and warehousing employment development it is possible that this option, in addition to residential development, will result in a disproportionate land-take. As with other options, this will primarily involve loss of greenfield land. This would lead to greater surface water run-off when compared to other options.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p><u>Option 4</u></p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>Compared to Options 1 and 2 this option would rely more heavily on the development of greenfield land, as opposed to previously land developed land. This has the potential to lead to greater surface water run-off when compared to other options.</p> <p>Increased rural development and, particularly, the development of new settlements would more likely require new sewage treatment facilities, in order to curtail reliance upon individual property-based solutions such as septic tanks.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1.

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p><u>Option 5</u></p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>Large scale development around both Worksop and Retford has the potential to increase run-off into the Rivers Ryton and Idle, and the Chesterfield Canal, with greater potential for localised impacts on water quality.</p> <p>Significant levels of growth in Worksop and Retford may give rise to greater pressure on existing water and sewage treatment infrastructure.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p><u>Option 6</u></p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>Compared to the other options this option has a wider range of impacts. Both increased rural development on greenfield land and employment development focussed on warehousing and distribution along the A1 Corridor have the potential to result in a large increase in the amount of surface water run-off.</p> <p>Increased rural development and, particularly, the development of new settlements would more likely require new sewage treatment facilities, in order to curtail reliance upon individual property-based solutions, such as septic tanks.</p> <p>Large scale development around and within both Worksop and Retford, the majority of which is likely to occur at greenfield sites, has the potential to increase run-off into the Rivers Ryton and Idle, and the Chesterfield Canal, with greater potential for localised impacts on water quality. Significant levels of growth in Worksop and Retford may give rise to greater pressure on existing water and sewage treatment infrastructure.</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Management policies will require additional run-off generated by new development to be managed on site. • Development Management policies will restrict (with regard to Source Protection Zones) potentially polluting uses in the vicinity of water extraction points. • Development on sites in the vicinity of watercourses may be expected to contribute to the delivery of specific improvements to those watercourses. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The surface water run-off generated by development will be dependent on the type of soil. In particular, areas of clay soil will be more vulnerable to surface-water run-off. • New development will increase water resource usage, both during construction and operation. This has been considered as part of the appraisal of housing and employment growth options and is unlikely to be influenced by the overall spatial strategy. • It is assumed that the Council will continue to liaise with Severn Trent Water over infrastructure requirements for future development. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The specific uses of individual sites are not yet known. • The exact locations of new development sites are unknown. <p>Option 7</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>This option would provide growth over the plan period through a more distributed approach, which includes the smallest and more isolated settlements. While it is noted that the wide distribution of development may mean that some sites may be of a small scale, the cumulative effect is expected to be a high level of development occurring on greenfield land. It is likely that rural development on greenfield land would increase surface water run-off and this has the potential to result in pollutants being carried to nearby water courses.</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>By allowing for a high level of rural development new sewage treatment facilities may be required, in order to minimise reliance upon individual property-based solutions such as septic tanks.</p> <p>This option would also allow for a high level of growth around both Worksop and Retford, the majority of which is likely to occur at greenfield sites and this has the potential to increase run-off into the Rivers Ryton and Idle, and the Chesterfield Canal, with greater potential for localised impacts on water quality. Significant levels of growth in Worksop and Retford may give rise to greater pressure on existing water and sewage treatment infrastructure.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development on sites in the vicinity of watercourses may be expected to contribute to the delivery of specific improvements to those watercourses. • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is assumed that the Council will continue to liaise with Severn Trent Water over infrastructure requirements for future development. • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The specific uses of individual sites are not yet known. • As per Option 1. <p><u>Option 8</u></p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>While this approach takes account of the specific role of settlements in the District, it would still provide growth over the plan period through a distributed approach and thereby is likely to result in a high level of development on greenfield land. Furthermore, this option would allow for the development of new settlements in the District, which is likely to result in a high level of greenfield land take in the District. It is likely that rural</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>development and the provision of new settlements on large areas of greenfield land would increase surface water run-off and this has the potential to result in pollutants being carried to nearby water courses.</p> <p>By allowing for a high level of rural development, particularly at new settlements, new sewage treatment facilities may be required in order to minimise reliance on individual property-based solutions, such as septic tanks. It is recognised that new settlements may be of a scale as to support the provision of such infrastructure.</p> <p>This option would also allow for a high level of growth around and within both Worksop and Retford, the majority of which is likely to occur at greenfield sites and this has the potential to increase run-off into the Rivers Ryton and Idle, and the Chesterfield Canal, with greater potential for localised impacts on water quality. Significant levels of growth in Worksop and Retford may give rise to greater pressure on existing water and sewage treatment infrastructure.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development on sites in the vicinity of watercourses may be expected to contribute to the delivery of specific improvements to those watercourses. • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is assumed that the Council will continue to liaise with Severn Trent Water over infrastructure requirements for future development. • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The specific uses of individual sites are not yet known. • As per Option 1.
9. Flood Risk: To minimise flood risk and	0?	0?	+	-?	-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	<p>Option 1</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.									<p>The Bassetlaw Strategic Flood Risk Assessment shows a logical relationship between the areas at risk of flooding and the location of watercourses. Generally land adjacent to the river channels and other low-lying tracts of land are at greatest risk.</p> <p>The flood events of 2007 also indicated that significant parts of Bassetlaw are vulnerable to flooding resulting from surface water drainage capacity problems. However this has prompted focused improvements to drainage in specific areas of need, for example Walkeringham and North Leverton with Hablesthorpe.</p> <p>The current Core Strategy's definition of sustainable settlements for new growth does not take account of flood risk. Instead this is managed through a stringent Development Management that embeds a sequential test. As such, while this does not eradicate the possibility of development occurring in flood risk areas, it does help to minimise the risk of flooding to existing and new development/ infrastructure. Similarly this helps ensure that new development does not give rise to flood risk elsewhere. Additionally the current Core Strategy requires the integration of SUDs into new development, in order to manage additional surface water run-off on site.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Management policies will restrict development in flood zones 2 and 3 unless it can be demonstrated that there are no sequentially preferable sites. • Development Management policies will require additional run-off generated by new development to be managed on site. • All developments are now required to include SUDs. • Plan policies likely to require new development in areas at risk of flooding resulting from surface water drainage capacity problems to demonstrate that they will not exacerbate such problems. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bassetlaw is a land rich District, with an abundant supply of sites in areas that are not at risk of flooding (sequentially preferable sites). As such there is no pressing need to allocate sites in flood risk areas. • All sites will be accompanied by site specific flood risk assessments. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rate at which climate change will increase the area of land considered at risk of flooding.

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p><u>Option 2</u></p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>In common with Option 1 an approach based on functional geography would continue to omit flood risk as a reflection of the relative sustainability of settlements. However this would continue to be managed through a sequential approach to the allocation of sites, including making this a specific criterion for sites in the rural area.</p> <p>Opportunities identified for urban intensification may potentially increase flood risk as a result of surface water run-off. In addition both Worksop and Retford town centres include areas at risk from fluvial flooding. However this could be mitigated through the redevelopment of urban sites taking the opportunity to de-culvert watercourses.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • Specific criterion for selection of rural sites following a sequential approach. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p><u>Option 3</u></p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>In common with Options 1 and 2 it is expected that flood risk would be addressed through the application of a sequential test in the allocation sites and specific policies to manage additional flood risk generated by new development.</p> <p>This option has the specific benefit of concentrating new development in areas that are identified as being at low risk of fluvial flooding.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1.

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Option 4</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>In common with Options 1, 2 and 3 it is expected that flood risk would be addressed through the application of a sequential test in the allocation sites and specific policies to manage additional flood risk generated by new development.</p> <p>In identifying both settlements with potential for significant expansion and locations for a new village fluvial flood risk, surface water drainage and sewerage capacity would be key criteria for assessing suitability. However the expansion of certain service centres would be constrained by the risk of fluvial flooding. These centres are Misterton, Walkeringham, Mattersey, Beckingham, North and South Wheatley, North Leverton, Sturton-le-Steeple, Rampton and Everton.</p> <p>Additionally some service centres would be excluded from consideration as they are entirely within areas at risk of fluvial flooding. These are Dunham and Misson.</p> <p>Given the number of settlements at risk of flooding and the significant scale of growth proposed in the rural area it is unclear as to whether sufficient development could be accommodated, to meet the overall housing and employment targets, on sites with a low risk of flooding.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1.

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p><u>Option 5</u></p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>In common with Options 1-4 it is expected that flood risk would be addressed through the application of a sequential test in the allocation sites and specific policies to manage additional flood risk generated by new development.</p> <p>Sites around the edge of Worksop are not identified as being at significant risk of flooding, with the exception of land immediately adjacent to the River Ryton. However areas to the north, south and east of Retford are identified as being at risk of fluvial flooding, primarily from the River Idle but also from Retford Beck. This may constrain the ability of this option to deliver the necessary amount of growth required over the plan period without developing sites at significant risk of flooding.</p> <p>In addition there are understood to be surface water drainage issues to the east of Retford, though new development may represent an opportunity to address this through the implementation of SUDs.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p><u>Option 6</u></p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>In line with Options 1-5 it is expected that flood risk would be addressed through the application of a sequential test in the allocation sites and specific policies to manage additional flood risk generated by new development. However, this option has the potential to distribute new development amongst a wider range of settlements, allowing selection from a wider range of sites, which may help to avoid the development of sites at highest risk of flooding.</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>In identifying both settlements with potential for significant expansion and locations for a new village, fluvial flood risk, surface water drainage and sewerage capacity would be key criteria for assessing suitability. As identified under Option 4, this would constrain the expansion of some service centres and rule out others.</p> <p>Urban intensification may increase flood risk as a result of surface water run-off if development results in significantly lower areas of greenspace, which would otherwise allow for surface water infiltration. In addition both Worksop and Retford town centres include areas at risk from fluvial flooding. This could be mitigated through the redevelopment of urban sites taking the opportunity to de-culvert watercourses.</p> <p>The location of any large scale urban extensions would need to account for the constraints identified around Worksop and Retford under Option 5.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All developments are now required by the NPPF to include SUDs. • As per Option 1. • Development Management policies require new development in areas at risk of flooding resulting from surface water drainage capacity problems to demonstrate that they will not exacerbate such problems. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All sites will be accompanied by site specific flood risk assessments. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rate at which climate change will increase the area of land considered at risk of flooding. • As per Option 1. <p>Option 7</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>In line with Options 1-6, it is expected that flood risk would be addressed through the application of a sequential test in the allocation sites and specific policies to manage additional flood risk generated by new development. Given the wider distribution of development that this option would allow for, there is potential to</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>distribute new development amongst a wider range of settlements, allowing selection from a wider range of sites, which may help to avoid the development of sites at high risk of flooding.</p> <p>In identifying settlements with potential for significant expansion, fluvial flood risk, surface water drainage and sewerage capacity would be key criteria for assessing suitability. As identified under Option 4, this would constrain the expansion of some service centres and rule out others.</p> <p>It is expected that urban intensification could result in increases in flood risk due to surface water run-off at such locations if development results in significantly lower areas of greenspace, which would otherwise allow for surface water infiltration. In addition, both Worksop and Retford town centres include areas at risk from fluvial flooding. However, this could be mitigated through the redevelopment of urban sites taking the opportunity to de-culvert watercourses.</p> <p>Providing a high level of growth at the larger settlements of Worksop and Retford would need to account for the constraints identified around Worksop and Retford under Option 5.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Management policies require new development in areas at risk of flooding resulting from surface water drainage capacity problems to demonstrate that they will not exacerbate such problems. • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All sites will be accompanied by site specific flood risk assessments. • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rate at which climate change will increase the area of land considered at risk of flooding. • As per Option 1. <p><u>Option 8</u></p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>In common with Options 1-7 it is expected that flood risk would be addressed through the application of a sequential test in the allocation sites and specific policies to manage additional flood risk generated by new development. Given the wider distribution of development that this option would allow for, there is potential to distribute new development amongst a wider range of settlements, allowing selection from a wider range of sites, in order to avoid the development of sites at risk of flooding.</p> <p>In identifying settlements with potential for significant expansion, fluvial flood risk, surface water drainage and sewerage capacity would be key criteria for assessing suitability. As identified under Option 4, this would constrain the expansion of some service centres and rule out others.</p> <p>This option would allow for a higher level of growth to be focussed at larger settlements. It is expected that urban intensification could result in increases flood risk due to surface water run-off at such locations if development results in significantly lower areas of greenspace, which would otherwise allow for surface water infiltration. In addition, both Worksop and Retford town centres include areas at risk from fluvial flooding. However this could be mitigated through the redevelopment of urban sites taking the opportunity to de-culvert watercourses.</p> <p>Providing a high level of growth at the larger settlements of Worksop and Retford would need to account for the constraints identified around Worksop and Retford under Option 5.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Management policies require new development in areas at risk of flooding resulting from surface water drainage capacity problems to demonstrate that they will not exacerbate such problems. • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All sites will be accompanied by site specific flood risk assessments. • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rate at which climate change will increase the area of land considered at risk of flooding. • As per Option 1.

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
10. Air Quality: To improve air quality	-	-	--	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	<p>Option 1</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>Road traffic emissions are identified as the main source of air pollution in Bassetlaw. However there are currently no identified Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) in the District and only one marginal exceedance of statutory Nitrogen Oxide levels in Worksop.</p> <p>Option 1 concentrates new development in areas of the District that are already more densely populated, with the potential to increase traffic emissions on a cumulative basis, with a detrimental impact on air quality.</p> <p>Conversely concentrating most development in the urban areas of Worksop, Retford and Harworth & Bircotes has the potential to reduce reliance on private vehicles, by giving residents greater choice of differing modes of transport.</p> <p>Equally development in rural areas would continue to be limited to defined service centres, which provide a range of services, helping to minimise travel by private vehicle. However, it is still likely that even limited new development in rural areas will increase the number of trips made by private vehicle.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development Management policies would require development to contribute to the mitigation of highways issues and associated air quality. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of different sites may result in different levels of trip generation, therefore with varying effects on congestion. Where this will exacerbate existing congestion problems there is a greater likelihood of adverse impacts on air quality. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The exact location of future development in each settlement is unknown at this stage. The total amount growth to be delivered over the plan period is not known at this stage. At the site specific scale it is difficult to predict future uses and any emissions that may arise from them. The rate at which emissions from private vehicles will change over the course of the plan period as a result of technological improvements. <p>Option 2</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>When compared to Option 1 this option has the potential to distribute new development amongst a wider range of settlements, particularly leading to a more dispersed pattern of rural development, where residents will be more reliant on private vehicles, and may need to travel further, to access key services and employment. This is likely to generate increased vehicle emissions but may also lead to a more dispersed pattern of road use, having less of an effect on congestion and associated localised air quality concerns. Conversely this option would still see the majority of new development located in the District's towns, with opportunities for urban intensification. While this has potential to reduce trip generation it may exacerbate existing congestion problems should residents choose to use private vehicles.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • Development would not be supported in rural settlements that do not have access to services as measured using a distance threshold. • Site allocation policies with a strong emphasis on integrating pedestrian and cycling infrastructure, including links into the existing urban area and public transport network. • Development Management policies that promote higher density development on sites with access to a defined Commuter Hub. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • It is unclear the extent to which new development will support increased service provision, with a corresponding uncertainty over trip generation. <p>Option 3</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>When compared to Options 1 and 2 this option concentrates new development in a small number of settlements. This would concentrate additional private vehicles movements in a small number of places and on the A1, the road with the most capacity to accommodate additional vehicles.</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>However, this approach would significantly increase the volume of traffic on the A1 itself and surrounding routes, with the potential to generate congestion at peak times. Furthermore the focus on warehousing and distribution employment uses would lead to increased HGV movements. This may lead to localised impacts on air quality along the A1 corridor.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Option 4</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>Compared to Options 1 and 2 this option would divert most new development away from the District's towns, minimising its adverse impact on existing traffic congestion and associated air quality issues.</p> <p>The significant expansion of rural or local service centres may generate new concentrations of road traffic, leading to associated air quality issues.</p> <p>This option would divert large scale, planned development away from Worksop, thereby avoiding exacerbation of known air quality issues in the town.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Option 5</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>This approach concentrates new development solely in large urban extensions to Worksop and Retford. These are areas of the District that are already more densely populated, with the potential to increase traffic emissions on a cumulative basis, with a detrimental impact on air quality.</p> <p>Even with significant enhancements of the highway network around these towns there will be significant increases in airborne pollutants arising from increased congestion.</p> <p>Conversely concentrating most development on the edge of Worksop and Retford has the potential to reduce reliance on private vehicles, by giving residents greater choice of differing modes of transport. Additionally the large scale of development proposed has the potential to increase availability of services and employment, with a corresponding reduction in localised trip generation.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • Site allocation policies with a strong emphasis on integrating pedestrian and cycling infrastructure, including links into the existing urban area and public transport network. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • Sites would be large enough to generate additional contributions towards the promotion of more environmentally sustainable modes of transport. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Option 6</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>This option has the potential to distribute new development amongst a wider range of settlements and sites of differing scales, leading to greater dispersal of road traffic, and reducing the cumulative impact on air quality in any one location.</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>The amount of growth in rural areas is such that it is unlikely to have significant impacts on air quality, though it is acknowledged that residents in rural areas will continue to rely on private vehicle use.</p> <p>Concentrating large scale development on the edges of, and within, Worksop and Retford has the potential to reduce reliance on private vehicles, as these larger, urban areas are likely to have greater choice of sustainable modes of transport. Nonetheless these are also the areas which currently experience greatest levels of road congestion and there are identified air quality problems in Worksop and Retford.</p> <p>A focus on warehousing and distribution employment uses along the A1 corridor would lead to increased HGV movements. This may lead to localised impacts on air quality along the A1 corridor.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Management policies would require development to contribute to the mitigation of highways issues. • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of different sites may result in different levels of trip generation, therefore with varying effects on congestion. Where this will exacerbate existing congestion problems there is a greater likelihood of adverse impacts on air quality. • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The rate at which emissions from private vehicles will drop over the course of the plan period as a result of technological improvements. • As per Option 1. • It is unclear the extent to which new development will support increased service provision, with a corresponding uncertainty over trip generation. <p>Option 7</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>By allowing for a wider and more even distribution of development across the District this option has the potential to distribute new development amongst a wider range of settlements and sites of differing scales, leading to greater dispersal of road traffic, and reducing the cumulative impact on air quality in any one location.</p> <p>This considered, allowing for a higher level of growth at rural settlements, including those which are amongst the smallest and most rural in the District, is likely result in a proportion of new residents relying on private vehicle use on a day to day basis. While the growth in rural areas supported through this option is likely to be of a scale which would provide some services and facilities, this type of growth is still likely to result in increased traffic associated with new housing development, which could create air quality issues.</p> <p>It is expected that larger settlements will accommodate high levels of new growth under this option. Concentrating large scale development on the edges of, and within, Worksop and Retford has the potential to reduce reliance on private vehicles, by as these large, urban areas are likely to have greater choice of sustainable modes of transport. These locations however are also those which currently experience greatest levels of road congestion. There are an identified air quality problems in Worksop and Retford, which could be exacerbated through the provision of a new development of a large scale.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Management policies would require development to contribute to the mitigation of highways issues. • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of different sites may result in different levels of trip generation, therefore with varying effects on congestion. Where this will exacerbate existing congestion problems there is a greater likelihood of adverse impacts on air quality. • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The rate at which emissions from private vehicles will drop over the course of the plan period as a result of technological improvements is unknown.

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • It is unclear the extent to which new development will support increased service provision, with a corresponding uncertainty over trip generation. <p>Option 8</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>By allowing for a wider and more even distribution of development across the District, including potentially at new settlements, this option has the potential to disperse new development amongst a wider range of settlements and sites of differing scales, leading to greater dispersal of road traffic, and reducing the cumulative impact on air quality in any one location.</p> <p>This approach would provide levels of growth in line with the specific roles of larger settlements in Bassetlaw and would not support a high level of development at the smaller and more isolated villages of the District, unless this development was to come forward through the Neighbourhood Plan process. However, allowing for a wider distribution of growth across the District, including at the more established rural settlements, is likely result in a proportion of new residents relying on private vehicle use on a day to day basis. While the growth in rural areas which is supported through this option is likely to be of a scale which would provide some services and facilities at rural locations this type of growth is still likely to result in increased traffic associated with new housing development, which could create air quality issues. The provision of new settlements in line with the principles of Garden Villages is likely to create critical mass to attract services and facilities to make the new development self-sufficient to a degree. However, there may still be a need for residents to travel to larger settlements and any change in travel habits may be depend to a degree on the potential to support transport improvements at new settlements.</p> <p>Providing high levels of development at the larger settlements, including at Worksop and Retford, has the potential to reduce reliance on private vehicles, as these settlements are likely to have greater choice of sustainable modes of transport. These locations, however, are also those which currently experience greatest levels of road congestion. There are an identified air quality problems in Worksop and Retford, which could be exacerbated through the provision of a new development of a large scale.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development Management policies would require development to contribute to the mitigation of highways issues. As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of different sites may result in different levels of trip generation, therefore with varying effects on congestion. Where this will exacerbate existing congestion problems there is a greater likelihood of adverse impacts on air quality. As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rate at which emissions from private vehicles will drop over the course of the plan period as a result of technological improvements is unknown. As per Option 1. It is unclear the extent to which new development will support increased service provision, with a corresponding uncertainty over trip generation.
11. Climate Change: To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of	?	+	?	?	+	+	+	++	<p>Option 1⁷⁷</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>Bassetlaw's CO₂ emissions per capita are significantly above the UK and East Midlands averages. Transport is highlighted as the main source of CO₂ emissions.</p> <p>New development will generate new demands for energy and, consequently, this will lead to increased greenhouse gas emissions. However the extent of this is dependent on the proposed scale of growth and is unlikely to be significantly affected by the overall spatial strategy. This is considered in more detail as part of the appraisal of housing and employment growth options.</p>

⁷⁷ Note that in the previous SA these assessments for all options referred to landscape and townscape impacts. However, these relate to SA objective 14, rather than SA objective 11 and therefore the aspects of these assessments considering landscape and townscape have been moved to the assessment of SA objective 14.

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
climate change									<p>Nonetheless, as appraised under Objective 6, locating development in the most sustainable settlements will affect greenhouse gas emissions, by giving residents access to more sustainable modes of transport and a greater range of services within walking or cycling distance.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Management policies will promote high standards of energy efficient design and, where appropriate, will support renewable energy provision. • Development Management policies will encourage adaptation measures through the detailed design and layout of new development. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Behaviour of future residents cannot be predicted. <p>Option 2</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • Urban intensification schemes that increase density of the built form are well suited to District heating schemes. However this is subject to viability. <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • Development Management policies will encourage the implementation of District heating schemes in the urban areas. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1.

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p><u>Option 3</u></p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p><u>Option 4</u></p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p><u>Option 5</u></p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>As per Option 1. The scale of development proposed through large extensions can be expected to increase the viability of energy efficiency and renewable energy measures as part of the scheme.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1. <p>Option 6</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>Bassetlaw's CO₂ emissions per capita are significantly above the UK and East Midlands averages. Transport is highlighted as the main source of CO₂ emissions.</p> <p>New development will generate new demands for energy and, consequently, this will lead to increased greenhouse gas emissions. However, the extent of this is dependent on the proposed scale of growth and is unlikely to be significantly affected by the overall spatial strategy. This will be considered in more detail as part of the appraisal of housing and employment growth options. Nonetheless, as appraised under Objective 6, locating development in the most sustainable settlements will affect greenhouse gas emissions, by giving residents access to more sustainable modes of transport and a greater range of services within walking or cycling distance.</p> <p>The scale of development will give opportunity to ensure a planned approach to enhance the urban-rural interface and ensure that new development contributes to a high quality townscape.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1. Development Management policies will encourage the implementation of District heating schemes in the urban areas. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1.

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Behaviour of future residents cannot be predicted. • As per Option 1. <p><u>Option 7</u></p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>Bassetlaw's CO₂ emissions per capita are significantly above the UK and East Midlands averages. Transport is highlighted as the main source of CO₂ emissions.</p> <p>As appraised under Objective 6, locating the greatest number of new homes in the most sustainable settlements will affect greenhouse gas emissions, by giving residents access to more sustainable modes of transport and a greater range of services within walking or cycling distance.</p> <p>This option would however result in more even distribution of development throughout the District, including the smaller and more isolated settlements, in addition to the high level of development which would be provided at the larger settlements. Providing new development at these more rural locations would result in new residents being reliant on journeys by private vehicle on a day to day basis.</p> <p>New development will also have an impact on greenhouse gas emissions related to energy generation. However, given the scale of the development required over the plan period it is less likely that the overall spatial strategy would significantly affect greenhouse gas emissions in the District in this manner. This will be considered in more detail as part of the appraisal of housing and employment growth options.</p> <p>This option would allow for a high level of growth at the larger settlements of District, as such promoting a degree of urban intensification, which could support the incorporation of District heating schemes. However this is subject to viability considerations. Furthermore, the provision of a more evenly distributed pattern of growth (with particular regard for development at the smaller and more isolated rural settlements) would not be as suitable to facilitate the incorporation of District heating schemes.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Management policies will encourage adaptation measures through the detailed design and layout of new development. • As per Option 1. • Development Management policies will encourage the implementation of District heating schemes in the urban areas. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Behaviour of future residents cannot be predicted. <p><u>Option 8</u></p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>Bassetlaw's CO₂ emissions per capita are significantly above the UK and East Midlands averages. Transport is highlighted as the main source of CO₂ emissions.</p> <p>As appraised under Objective 6, locating development in the most sustainable settlements will affect greenhouse gas emissions, by giving residents access to more sustainable modes of transport and a greater range of services within walking or cycling distance.</p> <p>This option would result in more even distribution of development throughout much of the District although it would not directly support development at the more rural and isolated settlements unless, allocated through the Neighbourhood Plan process. This is in addition to the high level of development which would be provided at the larger settlements. This option would avoid significant levels of new development being provided at most rural and isolated locations in the District and focus higher levels of development to the more important settlements of the District, which could help to reduce the requirement for new residents to undertake journeys by private vehicle on a day to day basis. The support for new settlements through this option, which are to be guided by Garden Village principles, is expected to result in development which should, to an extent, be self-sufficient. However, there may still be a need for residents to travel to larger</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>settlements and any change in travel habits may be depend to a degree on the potential to support new transport improvements at new settlements.</p> <p>New development will also have an impact on greenhouse gas emissions related to energy generation. However, given the scale of the development required over the plan period it is less likely that the overall spatial strategy would significantly affect greenhouse gas emissions in the District in this manner. This will be considered in more detail as part of the appraisal of housing and employment growth options.</p> <p>This option would allow for a high level of growth at the larger settlements, as such promoting a degree of urban intensification, which could support the incorporation of District heating schemes. However this is subject to viability considerations. It is expected that any growth to be delivered at new settlements in the District would be of a scale which could allow for the incorporation of District heating schemes.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Management policies will encourage adaptation measures through the detailed design and layout of new development. • As per Option 1. • Development Management policies will encourage the implementation of District heating schemes in the urban areas. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Behaviour of future residents cannot be predicted. • As per Option 1.
12. Resource Use and Waste: To encourage sustainabl	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p><u>All options</u></p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>New development as part of all options considered will result in the use raw materials and the generation of waste, both in construction and operation. This has been considered as part of the appraisal of housing and employment growth options and is unlikely to be influenced by the overall spatial strategy.</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
<p>the resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover)</p>									<p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local plan policies should encourage, where possible, use of recycled materials and effective use of resources. The re-use of materials on-site from construction and demolition will be encouraged. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
<p>13. Cultural Heritage: To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	<p>Option 1</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>Bassetlaw has a rich cultural heritage and a wealth of heritage assets across the District, throughout the towns and the rural area. These vary in scale from single buildings and monuments, to extensive areas of historic parks and gardens.</p> <p>All new development will likely have an impact on the historic environment, both directly affecting assets and indirectly affecting their setting. However specific impacts, including the extent to which new development enhances the historic environment, will be dependent on the design and layout of specific proposals.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development Management policies will seek to conserve and enhance built heritage assets. Development Management policies will require new development to take account of the character of built heritage where appropriate. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The exact location of future development in each settlement is unknown at this stage. The total amount growth to be delivered over the plan period is not known at this stage. The scale of impact is proportional to the scale of growth and the exact location of new development in relation to assets of historical value.

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>Option 2</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>Compared to Option 1 this option would likely lead to a more dispersed pattern of development, particularly across the rural area. This would likely lead to impacts on a wider range of historic asset.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • A criteria-based approach to rural development will need to ensure that new development responds to historic patterns of village growth. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • Possible locations for new villages are currently unknown. <p>Option 3</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>Option 3 focuses a significant scale of development on specific locations along the A1 Corridor, affecting a number of settlements that include Conservation Areas. In particular East Markham, Tuxford, Gamston and Blyth have designated Conservation Areas covering large parts of both the built up area and the associated landscape setting. For East Markham and Gamston this covers the entirety of the built-up area. The scale of development proposed has the potential to significantly affect the integrity of the historic environment in each settlement. However, in focusing development on a limited range of settlements, this ensures that the majority of historic assets throughout the District would remain unaffected by any large scale development.</p> <p>Additionally development to the east of Worksop has the potential to affect the setting of the Scofton Estate.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1.

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Option 4</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>Option 4 focuses a significant scale of development on a limited number of currently unspecified rural service centres. This has the potential to affect Conservation Areas in Blyth, Cuckney, East Markham, Everton, Gamston, Gringley-on-the-Hill, Mattersey, Nether Langwith and North and South Wheatley.</p> <p>The scale of development proposed has the potential to significantly affect the integrity of the historic environment in each settlement. However, in focusing development on a limited range of settlements, this ensures that the majority of historic assets throughout the District would remain unaffected by any large scale development.</p> <p>Significantly reducing the burden of delivery on Worksop will reduce the threat to a number of prominent heritage assets and historic landscapes on the periphery of the town</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Option 5</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>The focus of Option 5 on urban extensions around Retford and Worksop ensures that the majority of historic assets throughout the District would remain unaffected by any large scale development.</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>However, development to the north of Worksop would likely begin to encroach upon the setting of Carlton in Lindrick and Gateford Conservation Areas, while development to the east and south west has the potential to affect the setting of the Scofton Estate and Worksop Manor respectively.</p> <p>Development to the south of Retford will likely affect the setting of Retford South Conservation Area, while significant growth to the east of Retford may encroach onto areas of historic ridge and furrow farmland. To the west of Retford is the Babworth Estate, a registered Park and Garden.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p><u>Option 6</u></p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>Bassetlaw has a rich cultural heritage and a wealth of heritage assets across the District, throughout the towns and the rural area. These vary in scale from single buildings and monuments, to extensive areas of historic parks and gardens.</p> <p>All new development will likely have an impact on the historic environment, both directly affecting assets and indirectly affecting their setting. However specific impacts, including the extent to which new development enhances the historic environment, will be dependent on the design and layout of specific proposals.</p> <p>As a hybrid of multiple options this option would likely lead to a more dispersed pattern of development, particularly across the rural area. This would likely lead to impacts on a wider range of historic assets. However, considering the dispersed approach to development, this option also provides scope to select sites that avoid significant impacts on historic assets. It is noted that including new development around Worksop and Retford may have an impact on the historic man-made landscapes associated with the outlying country estates.</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Management policies will require new development to take account of the character of built heritage where appropriate. • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • Possible locations for new villages are currently unknown. <p><u>Option 7</u></p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>Bassetlaw has a rich cultural heritage and a wealth of heritage assets across the District, throughout the towns and the rural area. These vary in scale from single buildings and monuments, to extensive areas of historic parks and gardens.</p> <p>All new development will likely have an impact on the historic environment, both directly affecting assets and indirectly affecting their setting. However, specific impacts, including the extent to which new development enhances the historic environment, will be dependent on the design and layout of specific proposals as well as their location.</p> <p>By distributing development more evenly through the District, this option is likely to lead to impacts on a wider range of historic assets. However, this option also provides scope to select sites that avoid significant impacts on historic assets. The support this option provides for delivering new development at the more isolated and rural settlements in the District is likely to result in adverse impacts in terms of preserving established character and the setting local heritage assets. However, it is noted that opportunities may exist for enhancing character and the setting of heritage assets, particularly if development is to proceed at brownfield sites.</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>This option would also result in a high level of growth occurring at the larger settlements of the District. As identified for Option 5, this approach would help to ensure that the more notable heritage assets would remain unaffected by new development provided over the plan period, as these areas are currently more urban in character. This approach would furthermore help to avoid the provision of a high level of growth in close proximity to the registered parks and gardens of Clumber and Welbeck Abbey which also contain numerous Listed Buildings.</p> <p>However development provided to the north of Worksop would likely begin to encroach upon the setting of Carlton in Lindrick and Gateford Conservation Areas, while development to the east and south west has the potential to affect the setting of the Scofton Estate and Worksop Manor respectively.</p> <p>Development provided to the south of Retford is likely to affect the setting of Retford South Conservation Area, while significant growth to the east of Retford may encroach onto areas of historic ridge and furrow farmland. To the west of Retford is the Babworth Estate, a registered Park and Garden and similarly high levels of growth over the plan period at this location may impact upon its setting.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Management policies will require new development to take account of the character of built heritage where appropriate. • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scale of impact is proportional to the scale of growth and the exact location of new development in relation to assets of historical value. • As per Option 1. <p><u>Option 8</u></p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>Bassetlaw has a rich cultural heritage and a wealth of heritage assets across the District, throughout the towns and the rural area. These vary in scale from single buildings and monuments, to extensive areas of historic parks and gardens.</p> <p>All new development will likely have an impact on the historic environment, both directly affecting assets and indirectly affecting their setting. However specific impacts, including the extent to which new development enhances the historic environment, will be dependent on the design and layout of specific proposals.</p> <p>By distributing development more evenly through the District this option is likely to lead to impacts on a wider range of historic assets. However this option also provides scope to select sites that avoid significant impacts on historic assets. The provision of a new settlement, in line with Garden Village principles, is likely to result in the loss of large amount of greenfield land, which could adversely impact upon the setting of heritage assets in the District. This will be dependent upon the precise location any such settlement and adhering to Garden Village principles is likely to present opportunities to mitigate effects on the setting of heritage assets.</p> <p>This option would also result in a high level of growth occurring at the larger settlements of the District. As identified for Option 5 this approach would help to ensure that the more notable heritage assets would remain unaffected by new development provided over the plan period as these areas are currently more urban in character. This approach would furthermore help to avoid the provision of a high level of growth in close proximity to the registered parks and gardens of Clumber and Welbeck Abbey which also contain numerous Listed Buildings.</p> <p>However development provided to the north of Worksop would likely begin to encroach upon the setting of Carlton in Lindrick and Gateford Conservation Areas, while development to the east and south west has the potential to affect the setting of the Scofton Estate and Worksop Manor respectively.</p> <p>Development provided to the south of Retford is likely to affect the setting of Retford South Conservation Area, while significant growth to the east of Retford may encroach onto areas of historic ridge and furrow farmland. To the west of Retford is the Babworth Estate, a registered Park and Garden and similarly high levels of growth over the plan period at this location may impact upon its setting.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Management policies will require new development to take account of the character of built heritage where appropriate.

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The scale of impact is proportional to the scale of growth and the exact location of new development in relation to assets of historical value. As per Option 1. Possible locations for new villages are currently unknown.
<p>14. Landscape and Townscape: To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes</p>	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	<p>Option 1</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>Bassetlaw's landscape is divided into five character areas, derived from five national character areas. The five Regional Character Areas (RCAs) to which the Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment relates are the Magnesian Limestone Ridge, running down the District's western edge, the Sherwood RCA including the Dukeries and Sherwood Forest, the Mid-Nottinghamshire Farmlands, the Idle Lowlands (the lower part of the Humberhead Levels) and the Trent Washlands running along the District's eastern edge. There are no national landscape designations within Bassetlaw.</p> <p>The emphasis of Option 1 on limiting rural development to the Rural Service Centres and directing the majority of new development to the District's towns will help to limit the erosion of rural character. This approach would see a continuation of the existing landscape relationship between urban and rural areas of Bassetlaw.</p> <p>The condition and sensitivity of the landscape surrounding Harworth & Bircotes bears the clear hallmarks of the former coal-mining activities. As such this presents clear opportunities for landscape enhancement as part of new development. The level of growth proposed in Harworth & Bircotes under this option, including the redevelopment of brownfield sites, would contribute to achieving this.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development Management policies will seek to encourage high quality urban design that responds to its surroundings.

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development Management policies will require new developments to demonstrate regard for the recommended landscape actions identified for each policy zone in the Landscape Character Assessment. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The exact location of future development is unknown at this stage. However the potential impacts on more sensitive areas of landscape will be a key consideration in the process of identifying site allocations. <p>Option 2</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>Compared to Option 1 this option would likely lead to a more dispersed pattern of development, particularly across the rural area. This would likely lead to a wider scale of landscape impacts. However development would generally be expected to be smaller in scale, with a proportionally less significant impact on the landscape.</p> <p>Urban intensification schemes would have a lesser impact than other forms of development on the wider landscape and presents opportunities for enhancing the existing townscape and the overall quality of the built environment.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1. <p>Option 3</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>Option 3 would see the impacts of large scale new development fall particularly on the landscape along the A1 Corridor. In particular the A1 Corridor through much of Bassetlaw is characterised by medium to long</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>distance views across the countryside. Development adjacent to the carriageway and existing settlements along the route has the potential to erode this sense of openness.</p> <p>In addition, expansion of settlements located along the A1 has opportunity to improve views into the townscapes from the countryside, including softening the transition between urban and rural.</p> <p>The focus of this option on warehousing and distribution is likely to result in the construction of buildings which, by virtue of their scale, have potential to be very prominent in the wider landscape.</p> <p>The condition and sensitivity of the landscape surrounding Harworth & Bircotes bears the clear hallmarks of the former coal-mining activities. As such this presents clear opportunities for landscape enhancement as part of new development. The level of growth proposed in Harworth & Bircotes under this option, including the redevelopment of brownfield sites, would contribute to achieving this.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • Possible locations for new villages are currently unknown. <p>Option 4</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>Option 4 focuses a significant scale of development on a limited number of currently unspecified rural service centres. This has the potential to affect Conservation Areas in Blyth, Cuckney, East Markham, Everton, Gamston, Gringley-on-the-Hill, Mattersey, Nether Langwith and North and South Wheatley.</p> <p>The scale of development proposed has the potential to significantly affect the integrity of the historic environment in each settlement. However, in focusing development on a limited range of settlements, this ensures that the majority of historic assets throughout the District would remain unaffected by any large scale development.</p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>Significantly reducing the burden of delivery on Worksop will reduce the threat to a number of prominent heritage assets and historic landscapes on the periphery of the town.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Option 5</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>The focus of Option 5 on urban extensions around Retford and Worksop ensures that the majority of historic assets throughout the District would remain unaffected by any large scale development.</p> <p>However, development to the north of Worksop would likely begin to encroach upon the setting of Carlton in Lindrick and Gateford Conservation Areas, while development to the east and south west has the potential to affect the setting of the Scofton Estate and Worksop Manor respectively.</p> <p>Development to the south of Retford will likely affect the setting of Retford South Conservation Area, while significant growth to the east of Retford may encroach onto areas of historic ridge and furrow farmland. To the west of Retford is the Babworth Estate, a registered Park and Garden.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1.

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>Option 6</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>The urban and village extensions and varying types of development proposed under this option will have widespread landscape impacts, in terms of spatial distribution. However this option also provides scope to select sites that avoid the most sensitive landscapes.</p> <p>As identified for Option 5, any new urban extensions around Worksop and Retford have the potential to enhance the urban-rural interface. The scale of development is likely to help ensure that new development contributes to a high quality townscape. However, as for Option 4, the introduction of a new village/expanded rural settlement is likely to have an adverse impact on the countryside. Additionally, the encouragement of warehousing and distribution uses along the A1 Corridor is likely to result in the construction of buildings which, by virtue of their scale, have potential to be very prominent in the wider landscape.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Management policies will seek new developments to demonstrate regard for the recommended landscape actions identified for each policy zone in the Landscape Character Assessment. • As per Option 1. • Development Management policies and Site Allocations/Masterplans will encourage large new development to provide a clear transition between urban and rural character. • Development Management policies for a new/expanded rural settlement will seek to ensure that this is distinctly rural in its character. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The exact location of future development is unknown at this stage. However the potential impacts on more sensitive areas of landscape will be a key consideration in the process of identifying site allocations. • As per Option 1.

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p><u>Option 7</u></p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>By distributing development more evenly throughout the District this option provides scope to select sites that avoid the most sensitive landscapes. It may however result in the loss of a large amount of greenfield land which is likely to have a negative effect on landscape setting in the District given that a large amount of the development would take place at rural locations. While this approach would include development locations at the smallest and most isolated settlements in the District it is likely that the greatest impacts on existing landscape character might be avoided given that the development to be delivered would be commensurate to settlement size.</p> <p>As identified for Option 5, new urban growth around Worksop and Retford has the potential to enhance the urban-rural interface.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Management policies will seek new developments to demonstrate regard for the recommended landscape actions identified for each policy zone in the Landscape Character Assessment. • As per Option 1. • Development Management policies and Site Allocations/Masterplans will encourage large new development to provide a clear transition between urban and rural character. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The exact location of future development is unknown at this stage. However the potential impacts. • As per Option 1. <p><u>Option 8</u></p>

SA Objective	Spatial Option/Score								Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Option 1: Maintain current strategy	Option 2: New hierarchy based on functional	Option 3: Focus development along the A1	Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements	Option 5: Large scale urban extensions	Option 6: Hybrid option	Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth	Option 8: Parallel Strategies	
									<p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>By distributing development more evenly throughout the District this option provides the scope to select sites that avoid the most sensitive landscapes. It may however result in the loss of a large amount of greenfield land which is likely to have a negative effect on landscape character in the District, given that a large amount of the development would take place at rural locations. It is noted that this option would not support high levels of development at the smallest and most isolated settlements in the District unless it was to be allocated through the Neighbourhood Plan process.</p> <p>As identified for Option 5, new urban growth around Worksop and Retford has the potential to enhance the urban-rural interface. However, as per Option 4, the introduction of a new settlement is likely to have an adverse impact on the countryside. While the provision of a new settlement would be required to adhere to the principles of Garden Villages which is likely to help mitigate impacts on landscape setting (for example through the incorporation of green infrastructure) the development of greenfield land at this scale is still expected to have a negative effect on the existing landscape character in the surrounding area.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Management policies will seek new developments to demonstrate regard for the recommended landscape actions identified for each policy zone in the Landscape Character Assessment. • As per Option 1. • Development Management policies and Site Allocations/Masterplans will encourage large new development to provide a clear transition between urban and rural character. • Development Management policies for a new rural settlement will seek to ensure that this is distinctly rural in its character. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The exact location of future development is unknown at this stage. However the potential impacts on more sensitive areas of landscape will be a key consideration in the process of identifying site allocations. • As per Option 1.

Table A4.2 Housing Target options

SA Objective	Housing Target Options/Effect					Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Government's standardised OAN figure (288dpa)	Option A: 591 dpa	Option B: 646 dpa	Option C: 530 dpa	Option D: 562 dpa	
<p>1. Biodiversity: To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	-?	--?	--?	--?	--?	<p>There are no internationally designated sites within Bassetlaw. However, development could result in adverse effects on the prospective potential SPA at Sherwood Forest, located to the south of Worksop. Additionally, there are 20 SSSIs located mostly in the Sherwood area, to the south of Worksop (around the Clumber and Welbeck estates) as well as the north of Retford, along the Idle Valley. There are over 300 Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) covering approximately 4,000ha, which are widely distributed across Bassetlaw. The areas identified as the focal points for many of these environmental assets are, however, not regarded as sustainable locations for new development (from information in the current Core Strategy).</p> <p>Worksop is notably constrained to the south due to the concentration of environmental assets located here, including nationally important sites. Development in Worksop and nearby villages may increase pressure on these areas as recreational destinations. However, there is a significant network of locally important sites stretching to the north of the town, up towards Carlton-in-Lindrick. The flooded former mineral extraction sites to the north of Retford are particularly significant as habitat for breeding birds, therefore is sensitive to development occurring along the River Idle. Coal mining around Harworth and Bircotes has, until recently, led to significant ongoing change in the environment, resulting in a lack of designated sites. This area is therefore, in ecological terms, less sensitive to the potential effects of development.</p> <p>The shortage of available previously developed land in the District that could make significant contributions to housing growth targets means that housing growth will inevitably involve loss of greenfield land. In this regard it is the general biodiversity value of greenfield sites that is under threat. However, the exact locations of future residential development are not yet known, meaning that the specific effects are unclear.</p> <p>The standardised OAN option proposes a notably lower annual housing delivery target compared to Options A-D, and so over the plan period would involve the least amount of land take. Of all the options considered this has potential to have a less extensive impact on features of biodiversity importance. Options A-D would deliver between 530 and 646 new homes over the plan period, compared to 288 under the OAN option, which increases the likelihood of negative effects on biodiversity. Overall, a minor negative effect with uncertainty is likely for the OAN option and a significant negative effect (also with uncertainty) is likely for Options A-D. The uncertainty exists in all cases as the actual effect depends on where housing growth is eventually located within the District.</p>

SA Objective	Housing Target Options/Effect					Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Government's standardised OAN figure (288dpa)	Option A: 591 dpa	Option B: 646 dpa	Option 3C 530 dpa	Option D: 562 dpa	
						<p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Careful consideration to be given to selection of sites and general directions of growth taking account of the sensitivity of particular areas, such as land to the south of Worksop and to the north of Retford. Local Plans should plan positively for green infrastructure and Development Management (DM) policies will avoid/mitigate any adverse impacts of development schemes. Larger scale developments give rise to opportunities for Green Infrastructure development which may offset any potential impacts and contribute biodiversity gains over the longer term. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In a land-rich District there are many options for development in areas that are less sensitive or significant in biodiversity terms. All development will to some extent result in loss or fragmentation of habitat and migration routes. Limited brownfield land availability means that new development will predominantly occur on greenfield sites. It is assumed that greenfield sites typically support greater biodiversity. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear how strongly the market will support a brownfield first approach, given the additional remediation costs involved. The exact location of future development in each settlement is unknown at this stage.
<p>2. Housing: To ensure that the District's housing needs are met.</p>	-	++	++	+	+	<p>Housing completions in Bassetlaw have varied considerably in recent years, although with a persistent under delivery in relation to both the Core Strategy housing target and the later SHMA target. Between 2006 and 2018, a total of 4,025 dwellings were completed, equating to an average of 335 dwellings per annum. In 2017/2018, there were 551 total completions, which represents an increase over the previous year when 462 dwellings were completed.</p> <p>The first option is based on the Government's proposed standardised methodology that was consulted on at the end of 2017, in the 'Planning for the right homes in the right places' document. Concern was expressed over various aspects of the standard methodology for assessing local housing need within the document, such as the use of ONS data, the simplicity of the proposed adjustment method and the use of the cap. The most up to date calculation of OAN means that this option would deliver 288 dwellings per annum, which represents a realistic aspiration in light of what has been achieved in previous years. Overall, this option would contribute significantly to</p>

SA Objective	Housing Target Options/Effect					Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Governments standardised OAN figure (288dpa)	Option A: 591 dpa	Option B: 646 dpa	Option 3C 530 dpa	Option D: 562 dpa	
						<p>the range of housing needs in the District, including affordable housing. However, the OAN calculation does not take into account the need to balance housing delivery with economic growth aspirations and this figure would therefore result in an imbalance between housing and jobs growth. With the proposed strategic employment site at Apleyhead Junction, the delivery of 288 dwellings per annum would not support the Council's aspirations for economic growth and a minor negative effect is identified overall.</p> <p>Options A-D would all deliver significantly more homes, between 530 and 646 per annum, with the growth being balanced with the economic growth proposed in Bassetlaw. The higher level of housing growth under any of these options should provide good opportunities for delivering a range of housing types and tenures. Options A and B would deliver all of the housing required to balance the planned economic growth within Bassetlaw District; therefore those options would have a significant positive effect. The effects of Options C and D would be minor positive as they would provide most, but not all, of the housing within Bassetlaw that is needed to support economic growth. These options rely on some provision being made in neighbouring authorities, over which there is less certainty.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most affordable housing is expected to be delivered on allocated sites as part of s106 agreements, therefore a lower housing target will equate to lower affordable housing delivery. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The extent to which housing development meets local needs depends on the developer's discretion to provide a mix of housing.
3. Economy and Skills: To promote a strong economy which offers high quality	-?	++	++	+++?	+++?	<p>Housing development and economic growth may not appear to have a particularly clear relationship, but the two are not mutually exclusive. Housing growth can make a significant contribution to jobs, during the construction phase of development, while an increase in population arising from inward migration contributes to the spending power within the local economy. It is also important that housing and jobs are delivered in a balanced manner in order to meet local needs and avoid high levels of commuting.</p> <p>The housing target Options A-D are all based on an aim of balancing the housing target with economic growth aspirations, taking into account committed and proposed economic development including the strategic site at</p>

SA Objective	Housing Target Options/Effect					Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Governments standardised OAN figure (288dpa)	Option A: 591 dpa	Option B: 646 dpa	Option 3C 530 dpa	Option D: 562 dpa	
local employment opportunities.						<p>Apleyhead Junction. Options A and B would involve all homes to support that growth being delivered within Bassetlaw District, while Options C and D would involve the majority of homes to support the proposed level of economic growth being delivered within Bassetlaw, but some being provided in neighbouring authorities. Option B would deliver more housing than Option A and Option D would deliver more than Option C, as options B and D assume a higher employment figure at Apleyhead compared to Options A and C.</p> <p>All four options are considered likely to have significant positive effects on this objective, due to the aspiration of balancing housing with ambitious economic growth aspirations. Housing delivery at an appropriate level will support economic growth by securing the local workforce. There is some uncertainty attached to Options C and D as assuming that some of the housing would be provided outside of Bassetlaw means there is less certainty about its delivery and the housing would be located further from the associated employment opportunities, with more commuting required.</p> <p>The option of delivering the OAN of 288 dwellings per annum would have a minor negative effect on this SA objective as the level of housing growth would not be sufficient to support the planned economic growth in the District and there is a risk of an imbalance between housing provision and job creation which could result in particularly high levels of commuting.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified.
4. Regeneration and Social Inclusion: To promote regeneration,	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	Options A-D all involve a significantly higher level of housing provision than has historically occurred within Bassetlaw in recent years. The development of between 530 and 646 dwellings per annum over the plan period under those options will help sustain existing facilities but could significantly increase pressures on existing services, with greater likelihood of adverse impacts on service quality, if appropriate provision is not made to support the growing population. However, increased levels of growth may increase investment to support

SA Objective	Housing Target Options/Effect					Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Governments standardised OAN figure (288dpa)	Option A: 591 dpa	Option B: 646 dpa	Option 3C 530 dpa	Option D: 562 dpa	
tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all						<p>regeneration initiatives and enhancement or provision of new services in response to demand. Overall, a mixed (minor positive and minor negative effect) with uncertainty is likely for all four options.</p> <p>The option of meeting the OAN of 288 dwellings per annum means that the potential negative effects of growth in terms of pressures on services may be less likely to occur; however there is also less potential for the positive effects of investment and regeneration to be achieved. Therefore, the effects of this option are also potentially a mix of minor positive and minor negative effects, but currently uncertain.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developer contributions should be secured towards enhancement of key services and facilities where evidence exists to demonstrate need. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All housing growth will, to varying effect, depending upon scale, make a contribution to sustaining service provision and secure investment through developer contributions. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development viability may vary according to the specific needs of individual sites, therefore it is not possible to consistently predict what contributions may be secured.
5. Health and Wellbeing: To improve health and reduce health inequalities.	-	+/-	+/-	+/-?	+/-?	<p>The development of between 530 and 646 dwellings per annum over the plan period under Options A-D is expected to help sustain healthcare, recreation and leisure services and facilities, but also potentially incur adverse effects on the quality of provision, due to increased pressure on these services and facilities. However, it is possible that increased levels of growth may provide investment to support regeneration initiatives and enhancement or provision of new infrastructure in response to demand. Furthermore, going significantly beyond the OAN under all four of these options increases opportunities to further address specific needs in the area, such as the needs of the elderly and disabled.</p> <p>Under Options A and B, all of the housing to balance the planned economic growth would be within Bassetlaw, while under Options C and D some would be delivered in neighbouring areas. Options C and D could therefore result in higher levels of commuting over longer distances, and lower levels of commuting over shorter distances via walking and cycling which would otherwise benefit health, although the differences between the options in this</p>

SA Objective	Housing Target Options/Effect					Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Governments standardised OAN figure (288dpa)	Option A: 591 dpa	Option B: 646 dpa	Option 3C 530 dpa	Option D: 562 dpa	
						<p>sense are not likely to be significant. Overall, mixed effects (minor positive and minor negative) are likely for Options A-D, with some uncertainty attached for Options C and D.</p> <p>Delivering the OAN figure of 288 dwellings per annum may be less likely to result in pressure on existing healthcare facilities; however it would also be less likely to stimulate the provision of new services including healthcare-related services. It would also result in an imbalance between housing and employment provision within Bassetlaw and so would be likely to lead to high levels of commuting over longer distances, reducing the likelihood of people travelling shorter distances via active modes. A minor negative effect is therefore likely overall for that option.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developer contributions should be secured towards enhancement of open space, recreation provision and healthcare facilities where evidence exists to demonstrate need. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All housing growth will, to varying effect, depending upon scale, make a contribution to sustaining service provision and secure investment through developer contributions. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development viability may vary according to the scale and specific needs of individual sites, therefore it is not possible to consistently predict what contributions may be secured.
<p>6. Transport: To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	--	-	-	--	--	<p>The delivery of between 530 and 646 new dwellings per annum over the plan period under any of Options A-D will have a considerable impact on the highway network. However, it is expected that new housing delivery will result in an increase of investment to help offset some of these impacts. As Options C and D rely on some of the housing to balance planned economic growth being provided in neighbouring districts, these options could result in higher levels of commuting over longer distances compared to Options A and B, which may be more likely to be via car. Options C and D are therefore likely to have significant negative effects, while Options A and B could have minor negative effects.</p> <p>The option of providing the OAN (288 dwellings per annum) is also likely to result in significant negative effects as there would be an imbalance between the number of homes and jobs to be provided in Bassetlaw, which would result in particularly high levels of commuting into the District over longer distances via car.</p>

SA Objective	Housing Target Options/Effect					Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Governments standardised OAN figure (288dpa)	Option A: 591 dpa	Option B: 646 dpa	Option 3C 530 dpa	Option D: 562 dpa	
						<p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developer contributions should be secured where capacity issues are identified on roads, junctions and other transport networks. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All housing growth will, to varying effect, depending upon scale, make a contribution to improved transport infrastructure via CIL and developer contributions. All housing growth, however limited/extensive, will increase pressure on existing transport networks. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development viability may vary according to the scale and specific needs of individual sites, therefore it is not possible to consistently predict what contributions may be secured. The location of development is not yet known, therefore it is not possible to precisely determine implications for existing transport infrastructure.
<p>7. Land Use and Soils: To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	-?	--?	--?	--?	--?	<p>Soil quality across Bassetlaw is variable, with large areas of high (or potentially high) quality soils being present, including in the east of the District. Levels of housing development on brownfield sites in recent years have been slightly below the national average but have increased from levels prior to that.</p> <p>Options A and D all involve high levels of housing development, of between 530 and 646 dwellings per annum. All four options are therefore likely to result in the loss of greenfield land to new development, which may be high quality agricultural land depending on the specific location of housing developments that come forward. All four options could therefore have significant negative effects; however there is uncertainty attached depending on the location of sites.</p> <p>Providing for the OAN figure of 288 dwellings per annum would involve a much lower level of housing development; therefore a larger proportion of the overall housing figure may be able to be delivered on brownfield land and it may be easier to avoid the loss of high quality soils. A minor negative effect is therefore identified for that option, although it is again uncertain depending on the location of sites.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage redevelopment of brownfield land as a priority within the plan. When identifying potential site allocations seek to avoid loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land.

SA Objective	Housing Target Options/Effect					Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Governments standardised OAN figure (288dpa)	Option A: 591 dpa	Option B: 646 dpa	Option 3C 530 dpa	Option D: 562 dpa	
						<p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A general assumption associated with this objective is that increases in levels of housing will incur greater need to develop on greenfield sites due to a limited supply of previously developed land. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deliverability of brownfield sites is unclear without detailed investigation into contamination and market demand for development in the locations where such sites are available.
<p>8. Water: To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	-?	--?	--?	--?	--?	<p>Water quality in Bassetlaw is generally good, although phosphorus levels in most watercourses are high. The west of the District is within the Anglian Water West Lincolnshire Water Resource Zone (WRZ) and the Anglian Water area has been identified by the Environment Agency as being in 'serious water stress'.</p> <p>The provision of between 520 and 646 dwellings per annum under any of Options A-D will result in an increase in demand for water, which will give rise to greater pressure on existing water and sewage treatment infrastructure. Furthermore, a loss of greenfield land to accommodate this growth will result in an increased likelihood of surface water run-off with varying consequences, depending on location. All of Options A-D could therefore have significant negative effects on this objective although there is some uncertainty attached depending on the location of development, particularly whether it comes forward in the areas of the District under greater water stress.</p> <p>Providing the OAN figure of 288 dwellings per annum would result in a significant lower level of development compared to Options A-D and therefore a potential but uncertain minor negative effect is identified.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage redevelopment of brownfield land as a priority within the plan. Promotion of on-site SuDS for all developments to manage surface water flows. Sustainable design to promote greater standards of water efficiency within development schemes. Secure developer contributions towards provision of new infrastructure where need is demonstrated. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dialogue with infrastructure providers will be maintained to ensure that issues are identified early in plan/development processes.

SA Objective	Housing Target Options/Effect					Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Governments standardised OAN figure (288dpa)	Option A: 591 dpa	Option B: 646 dpa	Option 3C 530 dpa	Option D: 562 dpa	
						<p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The locations of development are not yet known therefore it is not possible to determine which water resources will be affected by proposals.
<p>9. Flood Risk: To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	-?	--?	--?	--?	--?	<p>There are fairly extensive areas of Flood Zones 2 and 3 across the northern and eastern edges of Bassetlaw District, as well as around the main watercourses in the District. The Rivers Ryton and Idle flow through Worksop and Retford respectively, with some associated flooding issues particularly where culverts are unable to cope with floodwater.</p> <p>The overall extent of new development under any of Options A-D is likely to lead to a large increase in impermeable surfaces, and therefore a reduction in the drainage ability of the ground. Overall, a significant negative effect with uncertainty is identified for all four options, as the actual effect depends on where development is located within the District.</p> <p>Providing the OAN figure of 288 dwellings per annum would result in a far lower level of development compared to Options A-D and therefore a lower level of greenfield land is likely to be lost and it may be easier to locate development away from the areas of highest flood risk. However, a potential but uncertain minor negative effect is still identified as there would be some greenfield land loss with the potential impacts on flood risk.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promotion of on-site SuDS for all developments to manage surface water flows and minimise the risk of flooding that might be posed to nearby existing properties. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Surface water run-off that is generated from new developments can be managed on-site through the use of SuDS without increasing the risk of flooding elsewhere. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rate at which climate change will increase the area of land considered at risk of flooding is uncertain.
<p>10. Air Quality: To improve air quality</p>	--	-	-	--	--	<p>The main source of air pollution in Bassetlaw is road traffic emissions although other pollution sources, including commercial, industrial and domestic sources, also make a contribution to background pollution concentrations. There are currently no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) declared in Bassetlaw; however there are several streets within the District that have been highlighted as having elevated levels of nitrogen dioxide.</p>

SA Objective	Housing Target Options/Effect					Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Governments standardised OAN figure (288dpa)	Option A: 591 dpa	Option B: 646 dpa	Option 3C 530 dpa	Option D: 562 dpa	
						<p>The delivery of between 530 and 646 new dwellings per annum over the plan period under any of Options A-D will result in an increase in car numbers and the associated emissions. However, new housing development may result in an increase of investment to help improve the highways network and encourage use of more sustainable transport modes, reducing emissions and improving air quality. As Options C and D rely on some of the housing to balance planned economic growth being provided in neighbouring districts, these options could result in higher levels of commuting over longer distances compared to Options A and B, meaning likely higher levels of emissions from car use. Options C and D are therefore likely to have significant negative effects, while Options A and B could have minor negative effects. .</p> <p>The option of providing the OAN (288 dwellings per annum) is also likely to result in significant negative effects as there would be an imbalance between the number of homes and jobs to be provided in Bassetlaw, which would result in particularly high levels of commuting into the District over longer distances. Such journeys are more likely to be undertaken by car, with the associated impacts on air quality.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developer contributions may present opportunities to enhance public transport provision, along with walking and cycling infrastructure. • The location of development proposals should include consideration of accessibility of key services and facilities. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An inevitable consequence of development is an increase in road traffic. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The locations of residential development are not yet known. This will have a significant impact on the modes of transport that future residents can use and, depending upon location, may contribute to existing air quality problems. • Current trends suggest that advancements in technology may mean that vehicles of the future will be less polluting and therefore air quality impacts could be reduced, even with more cars on the road.

SA Objective	Housing Target Options/Effect					Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Governments standardised OAN figure (288dpa)	Option A: 591 dpa	Option B: 646 dpa	Option 3C 530 dpa	Option D: 562 dpa	
<p>11. Climate Change: To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change</p>	--	-	-	--	--	<p>The growth proposed under all options will result in an increase in greenhouse gas emissions from new development although this will depend in part on the design of the development and the incorporation of mitigation such as renewable energy generating infrastructure. Such measures may be more viable where growth is larger-scale, although emissions will also be higher.</p> <p>Options A-D would all result in high levels of growth, well above the OAN, in order to balance with the planned economic growth for Bassetlaw. As Options C and D rely on some of the housing to balance planned economic growth being provided in neighbouring districts, these options could result in higher levels of commuting over longer distances compared to Options A and B, meaning likely higher levels of greenhouse gas emissions from car use. Options C and D are therefore likely to have significant negative effects, while Options A and B could have minor negative effects.</p> <p>The option of providing the OAN (288 dwellings per annum) is also likely to result in significant negative effects as there would be an imbalance between the number of homes and jobs to be provided in Bassetlaw, which would result in particularly high levels of commuting into the District over longer distances. Such journeys are more likely to be undertaken by car, with the associated greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Management policies should promote high standards of energy efficient design and, where appropriate, support renewable energy provision. • Development Management policies will encourage adaptation measures through the detailed design and layout of new development. • The location of development proposals should include consideration of accessibility of key services and facilities as this has potential to give residents access to more sustainable modes of transport and a greater range of services within walking or cycling distance. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New development will generate new demands for energy and, consequently, this will lead to increased greenhouse gas emissions. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Behaviour of future residents cannot be predicted.

SA Objective	Housing Target Options/Effect					Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Governments standardised OAN figure (288dpa)	Option A: 591 dpa	Option B: 646 dpa	Option 3C 530 dpa	Option D: 562 dpa	
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The locations of residential developments are not yet known. This will have a significant impact on the modes of transport that future residents can use and, depending upon location, may contribute to existing air quality problems. The rate at which the effects of climate change manifest themselves is uncertain – e.g. increases in areas of land considered at risk of flooding.
12. Resource Use and Waste: To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover)	-	--	--	--	--	<p>The most likely impacts identified in relation to resource use and waste are the waste generation of each new household and the effects of the construction stage of development. The magnitude of the effects of each of these is likely to be proportionate, relative to the level of growth. Options A-D all involve high levels of growth, well above the OAN, of between 530 and 646 dwellings per annum; therefore all are expected to have significant negative effects on this objective.</p> <p>The option of delivering growth based on the OAN of 288 dwellings per annum would have a minor negative effect as the overall extent of development would be far lower.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local plan policies should encourage, where possible, use of recycled materials and effective use of resources. The re-use of materials on-site from construction and demolition will be encouraged. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nottinghamshire County Council is the waste management authority for the Bassetlaw area. It is expected that any additional capacity requirements will be addressed through the Waste Local Plan/Core Strategy. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
13. Cultural Heritage: To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment,	-?	--?	--?	--?	--?	<p>Bassetlaw has a wealth of heritage features including 1,067 listed buildings (comprising 33 Grade I, 48 Grade II*, 962 Grade II listed buildings and 24 Scheduled Monuments), which is the second highest number of listed buildings in Nottinghamshire. There are also many buildings within the District which are not listed, but which contribute to the character of the area. There are currently 10 building or structure entries, eight place of worship entries, one archaeological entry, one park and garden entry, and two conservation area entries on the Historic England Heritage At Risk Register.</p>

SA Objective	Housing Target Options/Effect					Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Governments standardised OAN figure (288dpa)	Option A: 591 dpa	Option B: 646 dpa	Option 3C 530 dpa	Option D: 562 dpa	
cultural heritage, character and setting.						<p>The higher amount of development proposed under any of Options A-D could affect the setting of nearby heritage features, and the scale of development that would result from any of those options means that effects could be significant, although effects will be uncertain depending on where development is located within the District.</p> <p>Delivering a lower housing target in line with the OAN (288 dwellings per annum) could mean it is easier to avoid negative effects on heritage features as the Council would be able to be more selective about development sites. A potential but uncertain minor negative effect is therefore identified for that option.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote high standards of architecture and design through plan policies. Conservation of heritage and other assets of recognised importance through plan policies. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bringing back in to use buildings which are currently identified on the 'Buildings at Risk Register' can have significant positive effects on heritage assets. Targeted redevelopment of derelict land and/or buildings can facilitate enhancement of the setting of identified assets. Development has potential to support improved access to cultural heritage assets. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The location of development is not yet known, therefore it is not possible to determine potential impacts on cultural heritage. The nature of impacts arising from new development can only be assessed properly subject to heritage/landscape/visual impact assessments identifying the potential significance of sites/assets in relation to potential development sites, along with planning applications providing details of design and layout.
<p>14. Landscape and Townscape: To conserve and enhance the District's landscape</p>	-?	--?	--?	--?	--?	<p>There are no national landscape designations (i.e. National Parks or AONBs) in Bassetlaw. The landscape of the District is varied in character and incorporates parts of five different National Character Areas, which are heavily influenced by their underlying geology.</p> <p>The higher amount of development proposed under any of Options A-D could affect the quality and character of the District's landscapes and townscapes, and the scale of development that would result from any of those options</p>

SA Objective	Housing Target Options/Effect					Commentary on Likely Sustainability Effects
	Government's standardised OAN figure (288dpa)	Option A: 591 dpa	Option B: 646 dpa	Option 3C 530 dpa	Option D: 562 dpa	
character and townscapes						<p>means that effects could be significant, although effects will be uncertain depending on where development is located within the District.</p> <p>Delivering a lower housing target in line with the OAN (288 dwellings per annum) could mean it is easier to avoid negative effects on the landscape as the Council would be able to be more selective about development sites. A potential but uncertain minor negative effect is therefore identified for that option.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote high standards of design and layout through plan policies. Ensure protection of the most sensitive landscapes and the intrinsic beauty and character of the countryside through plan policies. Prioritise development of brownfield sites wherever possible, recognising that this can have significant positive effects on townscapes. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Targeted development has potential to enhance the urban rural interface where the existing built form ends abruptly in a manner that is insensitive to the character of the surrounding countryside. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The location of development if not yet known, therefore it is not possible to determine potential impacts on landscape character and townscape. The nature of impacts arising from large scale new development can only be assessed properly subject to landscape and visual impact assessments identifying the potential magnitude of impacts in relation to potential development sites and sensitive receptors, along with planning applications providing details of design and layout.

Table A4.3 Employment Target

SA Objective	Employment Target/Score			Commentary on Likely sustainability effects
	Option 1: No allocations – demand led growth	Option 2: Allocations to reflect past delivery trends (11.8 ha per annum) with flexibility across the spatial hierarchy	Option 3: Large scale aspirational growth to reflect Sheffield City Region 10 year growth target	
<p>1. Biodiversity: To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	-?	-?	-?	<p>Option 1</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>There are no internationally designated sites within Bassetlaw. However, development could result in adverse effects on a prospective potential SPA at Sherwood Forest, located to the south of Worksop. Additionally, there are 20 SSSIs located mostly in the Sherwood area to the south of Worksop (around the Clumber and Welbeck estates) and north of Retford, along the Idle Valley. There are over 300 Local Wildlife Sites (LWS), covering approximately 4000ha, widely distributed across Bassetlaw. The areas identified as the focal points for many of these environmental assets are, however, not regarded as sustainable locations for new development in the current Core Strategy and include large areas that are at significant risk of flooding.</p> <p>With no sites yet identified or proposed for allocation under this option there is significant uncertainty about the extent of likely effects. While re-use of existing vacant employment sites may be preferable, in terms of potential biodiversity impacts, the deliverability of these and their suitability for modern economic development needs is unclear.</p> <p>In Worksop, Retford and Harworth & Bircotes there is a possibility of negative effects occurring on protected sites on the edges of the built up areas, as a result of outward growth, which may also affect accessibility of the countryside for existing residents.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Careful consideration to be given to selection of sites and general directions of growth taking account of the sensitivity of particular areas, such as land to the south of Worksop and to the north of Retford. • Local Plans should plan positively for green infrastructure and Development Management (DM) policies will avoid/mitigate any adverse impacts of development schemes. • Employment developments may support development of new walking and cycling routes, with opportunity to secure other Green Infrastructure benefits. <p>Assumptions:</p>

SA Objective	Employment Target/Score			Commentary on Likely sustainability effects
	Option 1: No allocations – demand led growth	Option 2: Allocations to reflect past delivery trends (11.8 ha per annum) with flexibility across the spatial hierarchy	Option 3: Large scale aspirational growth to reflect Sheffield City Region 10 year growth target	
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In a land rich District there are a great many options for development in areas that are less sensitive or significant in biodiversity terms. • All development can to some extent result in loss or fragmentation of habitat and migration routes. • Limited brownfield land availability means that new development will predominantly occur on greenfield sites. It is assumed that greenfield sites typically support greater biodiversity. • Impacts on biodiversity are expected to be duly considered in the planning application process. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The exact location of future development in each settlement is unknown at this stage. <p>Option 2</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>Likely effects are largely similar to Option 1 with no sites having been identified yet. However, allocating sites will give greater certainty of which sites will be developed allowing for more tailored approaches to mitigation and enhancement.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1 <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1 <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1 <p>Option 3</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>The effects of Option 3 are likely to be similar to Options 1 & 2, although a higher, yet undefined, target is considered more likely to need more land and incur more greenfield site development as a 'job target' rather than a land requirement target may have a low job density per hectare developed. Higher demand for employment land may create competition with housing sites.</p>

SA Objective	Employment Target/Score			Commentary on Likely sustainability effects
	Option 1: No allocations – demand led growth	Option 2: Allocations to reflect past delivery trends (11.8 ha per annum) with flexibility across the spatial hierarchy	Option 3: Large scale aspirational growth to reflect Sheffield City Region 10 year growth target	
				<p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1 <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1 <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1 • Unknown quantity of land required to contribute to significant increase in job creation. • Based on past delivery trends, deliverability of significant increases may be questionable.
<p>2. Housing: To ensure that the District's housing needs are met.</p>	0	0	0?	<p>Option 1</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>Whilst housing growth will support economic growth, additional economic growth is not considered necessary to ensure the District's housing needs are met.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified <p>Option 2</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>The effects of this approach are considered likely to be similar to Option 1.</p>

SA Objective	Employment Target/Score			Commentary on Likely sustainability effects
	Option 1: No allocations – demand led growth	Option 2: Allocations to reflect past delivery trends (11.8 ha per annum) with flexibility across the spatial hierarchy	Option 3: Large scale aspirational growth to reflect Sheffield City Region 10 year growth target	
				<p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1 <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1 <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1 <p>Option 3</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>The effects of Option 3 are likely to be similar to Options 1 & 2. However, a significant level of growth that attracts higher value-added employment opportunities may support increased in-migration or demand for higher end properties.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1 <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1 <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1 Increased demand for employment land may create competition for housing sites.
3. Economy and Skills: To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local	+?/-?	++?	++/?	<p>Option 1</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>Bassetlaw's economy includes recognised brands in food production, world class precision engineering and manufacturing. Following the decline of its traditional industries over the last 30 years, particularly in the west, there is now a dominance of lower-value added employment in the District's labour market, characterised by jobs with low</p>

SA Objective	Employment Target/Score			Commentary on Likely sustainability effects
	Option 1: No allocations – demand led growth	Option 2: Allocations to reflect past delivery trends (11.8 ha per annum) with flexibility across the spatial hierarchy	Option 3: Large scale aspirational growth to reflect Sheffield City Region 10 year growth target	
employment opportunities.				<p>earnings and low skills requirements and high levels of part-time employment. Of the 51,000 jobs within the District (as at 2013), a large proportion are located in Worksop (22,600 jobs) and Retford (11,200 jobs). The majority of jobs in the District are within the service sector (75.8%), reflecting regional and national trends. However, despite a decline in traditional manufacturing, the District has a relatively high proportion of manufacturing jobs (17.1%), particularly when compared to the national average (8.5%). The number of jobs in this sector has grown over the period 2009-2014. While this Option will provide flexibility for supporting economic growth it does not provide any certainty for prospective investors, nor does it proactively make contributions to sub-regional growth aspirations. While opportunities for economic growth may be limited the flexibility of this approach would ensure the plan has potential to be responsive to market needs, yet not directly stimulating economic growth with no demonstrable supply of sites.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With potential locations for employment development unknown at this stage there is significant uncertainty about the accessibility of jobs in relation to existing population. <p>Option 2</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>Compared to Option 1, allocating development sites in line with trends of the past 10 years reflects times of buoyancy and depression in the local market, and will facilitate opportunity to help support and sustain existing centres and promote new areas of growth. In addition to a ready supply of sites this option includes added strength of a flexible approach, where it is needed, to allow for a more responsive strategy. Particular support for rural diversification will support the sustainability of rural areas.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1 <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1

SA Objective	Employment Target/Score			Commentary on Likely sustainability effects
	Option 1: No allocations – demand led growth	Option 2: Allocations to reflect past delivery trends (11.8 ha per annum) with flexibility across the spatial hierarchy	Option 3: Large scale aspirational growth to reflect Sheffield City Region 10 year growth target	
				<p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1 <p>Option 3</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>With no focus on specific sectors and no defined amount of floorspace required to deliver the [circa] 3,700 jobs envisaged as Bassetlaw's contribution to the Sheffield City Region Local Enterprise Partnership (SCR LEP) 10 year/70,000 job target, it is unclear as to how much land may be needed under this option. With the density of jobs per hectare varying significantly within different employment sectors this target could vary wildly – i.e. with warehousing and distribution requiring significantly more land per job than office space.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1 <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1 Higher jobs/land aspirations have greater flexibility and potential to support a broader range of development. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1
4. Regeneration and Social Inclusion: To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure	?	+	+	<p>Option 1</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>While Bassetlaw ranks only 115th out of 326 local authorities on the 2015 Index of Multiple Deprivation, there are five Lower Layer Super Output Areas within the District that fall within the top 10% most deprived and a further six in the top 20%. This serves as an indicator of the diversity of the challenges faced in the District.</p>

SA Objective	Employment Target/Score			Commentary on Likely sustainability effects
	Option 1: No allocations – demand led growth	Option 2: Allocations to reflect past delivery trends (11.8 ha per annum) with flexibility across the spatial hierarchy	Option 3: Large scale aspirational growth to reflect Sheffield City Region 10 year growth target	
accessibility for all.				<p>A limited distribution of services across the rural parts of Bassetlaw highlights the reliance on larger centres for service provision.</p> <p>New economic development on its own is unlikely to have direct impacts on this objective, although new enterprises locating in Bassetlaw may give rise to opportunities for training and raising skills levels that have remained low since the decline of traditional industries. Depending on the location of development and the size of workforce at a given site, employment developments have the potential to support the vitality and viability of local services and facilitate new infrastructure development. However, under this scenario, an unspecified amount of growth leaves significant uncertainty about the potential effects.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The exact location of future development in each settlement is unknown at this stage. <p><u>Option 2</u></p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>Effect are considered likely to be as per Option 1, although the commitment to delivering a specific amount of land per year is likely to stimulate regeneration benefits and further job creation in particular areas once site allocations are identified.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1 <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1 <p>Uncertainties:</p>

SA Objective	Employment Target/Score			Commentary on Likely sustainability effects
	Option 1: No allocations – demand led growth	Option 2: Allocations to reflect past delivery trends (11.8 ha per annum) with flexibility across the spatial hierarchy	Option 3: Large scale aspirational growth to reflect Sheffield City Region 10 year growth target	
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1 <p>Option 3 Likely sustainability effects: Likely effects as per Option 1 and Option 2</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1 <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1 Higher jobs targets/land aspirations offer potential to support a broader range of development and regeneration opportunities. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1
5. Health and Wellbeing: To improve health and reduce health inequalities.	0?	0?	0?	<p>Option 1 Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>As with many types of new development, employment-creating uses have potential to result in negative effects on people's health and wellbeing during the construction stages of development, with increased traffic congestion causing inconvenience and increased air pollution, as well as construction dust, noise and odour. Some employment uses may also generate noise and odour problems for neighbouring residents/land uses.</p> <p>Conversely, where new employment developments of a certain scale are located within range of an existing population that may provide a significant proportion of the workforce it is feasible that Green Infrastructure could be enhanced through provision of walking/cycling routes. Redevelopment of existing derelict buildings and brownfield sites can also have positive effects on the health and wellbeing of nearby residents.</p>

SA Objective	Employment Target/Score			Commentary on Likely sustainability effects
	Option 1: No allocations – demand led growth	Option 2: Allocations to reflect past delivery trends (11.8 ha per annum) with flexibility across the spatial hierarchy	Option 3: Large scale aspirational growth to reflect Sheffield City Region 10 year growth target	
				<p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is assumed that potential impacts on health and wellbeing of nearby residents/neighbouring users will be considered in detail at the planning application determination stage • New developments to support pedestrian/cycle access as part of green travel plans <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The exact location of future development in each settlement is unknown at this stage. <p><u>Option 2</u></p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>As per Option 1</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Plan policies will be developed to secure alternative means of access to sites, other than by private vehicle. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1 <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1 <p><u>Option 3</u></p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>As per Option 1 and Option 2.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1

SA Objective	Employment Target/Score			Commentary on Likely sustainability effects
	Option 1: No allocations – demand led growth	Option 2: Allocations to reflect past delivery trends (11.8 ha per annum) with flexibility across the spatial hierarchy	Option 3: Large scale aspirational growth to reflect Sheffield City Region 10 year growth target	
				<p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1 <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1
<p>6. Transport: To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+?/-	+?/-?	+?/-?	<p>Option 1</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>Bassetlaw benefits from good access to strategic transport connections, with the A1 running through the District, along with links to the M1 via the A57 and the East Coast Mainline and Sheffield-Lincoln railway lines serving north-south and east-west needs.</p> <p>There is potential for construction and operation of new employment uses to disrupt transport services and increase road congestion as a result of increased vehicle movements and exacerbating capacity issues affecting key junctions. Also, depending on the scale of development and the type of employment, there could be increases in in-commuting, also generating a greater number of vehicle movements.</p> <p>Under this option, while not allocating specific sites allows flexibility for companies to locate where is appropriate for them in relation to the strategic road network, allocating particular sites allows greater certainty/clarity of specific enhance requirements. Where new infrastructure is not planned in relation to new sites this option may increase reliance on existing infrastructure.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developer contributions will be secured where capacity issues are identified on roads, junctions and other transport networks <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is assumed that potential impacts on transport and road capacity will be considered in detail at the planning application determination stage

SA Objective	Employment Target/Score			Commentary on Likely sustainability effects
	Option 1: No allocations – demand led growth	Option 2: Allocations to reflect past delivery trends (11.8 ha per annum) with flexibility across the spatial hierarchy	Option 3: Large scale aspirational growth to reflect Sheffield City Region 10 year growth target	
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All employment growth will, to varying effect, depending upon scale, make a contribution to improved transport infrastructure via CIL and developer contributions All employment growth, however limited/extensive, will increase pressure on existing transport networks <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The exact location of future development in each settlement is unknown at this stage. <p>Option 2</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>The effects of this option are broadly similar to Option 1, although allocating a specific amount of land in particular locations allows for focused improvements in relation to potential development sites/clusters of sites.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1 <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1 <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1 <p>Option 3</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>As per Option 1, although with impacts increasing relative to the scale of development.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1 <p>Assumptions:</p>

SA Objective	Employment Target/Score			Commentary on Likely sustainability effects
	Option 1: No allocations – demand led growth	Option 2: Allocations to reflect past delivery trends (11.8 ha per annum) with flexibility across the spatial hierarchy	Option 3: Large scale aspirational growth to reflect Sheffield City Region 10 year growth target	
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1 <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1
<p>7. Land Use and Soils: To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	?	+?/-?	-?	<p>Option 1</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>With no allocations made under this option there is no certainty about which sites will be developed, which, in turn, means that it is unclear whether or not this option will maximise re-use of brownfield land. Lack of take-up of vacant former employment sites may be symptomatic of current market conditions, although it may also be a useful indicator that these sites are not necessarily fit for purpose and result in greater greenfield site loss.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The exact location of future development in each settlement is unknown at this stage. <p>Option 2</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>The effects of this option are considered likely to be similar to Option 1, although demand for newly allocated sites that suit more modern employment needs and are favourable in the current market may result in greater pressure on greenfield sites. In contrast, allocating sites can encourage or even prioritise redevelopment of brownfield sites.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1

SA Objective	Employment Target/Score			Commentary on Likely sustainability effects
	Option 1: No allocations – demand led growth	Option 2: Allocations to reflect past delivery trends (11.8 ha per annum) with flexibility across the spatial hierarchy	Option 3: Large scale aspirational growth to reflect Sheffield City Region 10 year growth target	
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider the possibility of prioritising brownfield redevelopment in some locations <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1 <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1 <p>Option 3</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>This option is likely to have a similar degree of uncertainty to Option 1, with no sites identified or allocated. Significant increases in employment development, with no clear quantity of land, could result in greater loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1 <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1 <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1
8. Water: To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.	-	-	-	<p>Option 1</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>Anglian Water highlights Bassetlaw as an area of water stress. The construction and operation of new businesses and industrial operations will increase demand for water.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p>

SA Objective	Employment Target/Score			Commentary on Likely sustainability effects
	Option 1: No allocations – demand led growth	Option 2: Allocations to reflect past delivery trends (11.8 ha per annum) with flexibility across the spatial hierarchy	Option 3: Large scale aspirational growth to reflect Sheffield City Region 10 year growth target	
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Severn Trent and Anglian Water ‘Water Resource Management Plans’ to identify resource supply issues and advise the Council accordingly. • Promotion of on-site SuDS for all developments to manage surface water flows. • Sustainable design to promote greater standards of water efficiency within development schemes. • Secure developer contributions towards provision of new infrastructure where need is demonstrated. • Consider location of development proposals in relation Source Protection Zones. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is expected that at the planning application stage of development the potential impacts of surface water runoff and any related issues will be duly considered. • The Council will maintain dialogue with water companies throughout plan preparation. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The exact location of future development in each settlement is unknown at this stage. <p><u>Option 2</u></p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>As per Option 1, although increased demand is expected to increase water use proportionately.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1 <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1 <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1 <p><u>Option 3</u></p>

SA Objective	Employment Target/Score			Commentary on Likely sustainability effects
	Option 1: No allocations – demand led growth	Option 2: Allocations to reflect past delivery trends (11.8 ha per annum) with flexibility across the spatial hierarchy	Option 3: Large scale aspirational growth to reflect Sheffield City Region 10 year growth target	
				<p>Likely sustainability effects: As per Option 1 & 2, although increased demand is expected to increase water use proportionately.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1 <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1 <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1
<p>9. Flood Risk: To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	?	+?	-?	<p>Option 1</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects: The overall quantity of land needed to accommodate employment development over the plan period is largely expected to have no direct impact on the likelihood of people and property being at risk of flooding. However, with no allocations proposed (therefore locations for growth being demand driven) it is not possible to fully predict the effects of this option on this SA Objective.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is expected that the planning application stage of development will duly consider the flood risk associated with each site. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The exact location of future development in each settlement is unknown at this stage. <p>Option 2</p>

SA Objective	Employment Target/Score			Commentary on Likely sustainability effects
	Option 1: No allocations – demand led growth	Option 2: Allocations to reflect past delivery trends (11.8 ha per annum) with flexibility across the spatial hierarchy	Option 3: Large scale aspirational growth to reflect Sheffield City Region 10 year growth target	
				<p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>In contrast to Option 1, this option has the ability to ensure sites are allocated in sequentially preferable areas that are at low(er) risk of flooding. However, it is important to acknowledge that there are some areas of flood risk associated with the more traditional areas of employment and industry, and along key transport routes.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1. • Mitigation measures to be identified if there is demand in areas of existing flood risk for existing businesses wanting to expand in their current location. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1 <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1 <p><u>Option 3</u></p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>Greater demand for land means an increased likelihood of pressure to develop in areas at risk of flooding.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1 & 2. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1 <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1

SA Objective	Employment Target/Score			Commentary on Likely sustainability effects
	Option 1: No allocations – demand led growth	Option 2: Allocations to reflect past delivery trends (11.8 ha per annum) with flexibility across the spatial hierarchy	Option 3: Large scale aspirational growth to reflect Sheffield City Region 10 year growth target	
10. Air Quality: To improve air quality	-?	-?	-?	<p><u>Option 1</u></p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>There is potential for the construction and operation of employment uses (depending on the type of use) to impact negatively on air quality. Uses that generate a significant number of trips by both cars and HGVs, or through in-commuting, will result in localised air quality impacts.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developer contributions may present opportunities to enhance public transport provision, along with walking and cycling infrastructure. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is expected that the planning application stage of development will duly consider the air quality impacts of different types of uses on each site. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The exact location of future development in each settlement is unknown at this stage. <p><u>Option 2</u></p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>With allocation of specific, albeit undefined sites, the effects of this option are likely to result in a proportionate increase relative to those effects identified under Option 1.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1 <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1 <p>Uncertainties:</p>

SA Objective	Employment Target/Score			Commentary on Likely sustainability effects
	Option 1: No allocations – demand led growth	Option 2: Allocations to reflect past delivery trends (11.8 ha per annum) with flexibility across the spatial hierarchy	Option 3: Large scale aspirational growth to reflect Sheffield City Region 10 year growth target	
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1 <p>Option 3 Likely sustainability effects: With the potential level of growth that could occur under this option the effects are likely to result in proportionately increased adverse impacts on air quality relative to those effects identified under Options 1 and 2.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1 <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1 <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1
11. Climate Change: To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change	+/-	+/-	+/-	<p>Option 1 Likely sustainability effects: Industrial uses have in recent years been amongst the most significant contributors to CO2 emissions in Bassetlaw. Although advances in technology (often pioneered by businesses) will contribute to more efficient construction and operation over the plan period, economic growth beyond the baseline levels at the adoption of the plan will result in increased energy demand, trip generation and CO2 emissions.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development Management policies should promote high standards of energy efficient design and, where appropriate, should support renewable energy provision. Development Management policies should encourage adaptation measures through the detailed design and layout of new development.

SA Objective	Employment Target/Score			Commentary on Likely sustainability effects
	Option 1: No allocations – demand led growth	Option 2: Allocations to reflect past delivery trends (11.8 ha per annum) with flexibility across the spatial hierarchy	Option 3: Large scale aspirational growth to reflect Sheffield City Region 10 year growth target	
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development proposals should be required to give consideration to accessibility of for potential employees to access work by sustainable modes of transport. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is expected that the planning application stage of development will duly consider the potential to integrate renewable and low carbon energy and other measures to reduce CO2 emissions and maximise energy efficiency. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The exact location of future development in each settlement is unknown at this stage. The scale of greenhouse gas emissions will depend on factors such as the design of new development, travel patterns and the energy consumption behaviour of individual companies. Also, the extent to which energy supplied through the national grid has been ‘decarbonised’ is unknown. <p>Option 2</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>The effects of this option on climate change are likely to show a proportionate increase on those identified in Option 1.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1 <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1 <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1 <p>Option 3</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p>

SA Objective	Employment Target/Score			Commentary on Likely sustainability effects
	Option 1: No allocations – demand led growth	Option 2: Allocations to reflect past delivery trends (11.8 ha per annum) with flexibility across the spatial hierarchy	Option 3: Large scale aspirational growth to reflect Sheffield City Region 10 year growth target	
				<p>The effects of this option on climate change are likely to show a proportionate increase on those identified in Options 1 & 2.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1 <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1 <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1
<p>12. Resource Use and Waste: To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	-	-	-	<p><u>Option 1</u></p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>The construction of new business and industrial premises will require raw materials, although this is not expected to be significant in the wider context.</p> <p>Commercial uses can generate significant levels of waste, depending on the nature of operations.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local plan policies should encourage, where possible, use of recycled materials and effective use of resources. • The re-use of materials on-site from construction and demolition should be encouraged. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commercial operations are likely to increase both resource use and waste generation, although a proportion of this will be likely to include materials for recycling. • Nottinghamshire County Council is the waste management authority for the Bassetlaw area. It is expected that any additional capacity requirements will be addressed through the Waste Local Plan/Core Strategy. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The exact location of future development in each settlement is unknown at this stage.

SA Objective	Employment Target/Score			Commentary on Likely sustainability effects
	Option 1: No allocations – demand led growth	Option 2: Allocations to reflect past delivery trends (11.8 ha per annum) with flexibility across the spatial hierarchy	Option 3: Large scale aspirational growth to reflect Sheffield City Region 10 year growth target	
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The scale of development likely to come forward and the subsequent waste generated is unclear at this stage. <p>Option 2 Likely sustainability effects: Despite allocating a specific amount of land under this option, there is no basis for assessing how much waste is generated per site. This largely depends on end users and the nature of the construction methods used in development and the operation/number of people using the premises.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1 <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1 <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The exact location of future development in each settlement is unknown at this stage. <p>Option 3 Likely sustainability effects: As per Option 1, although with a proportionate increase relative to the levels of growth.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1 <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1 <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Option 1

SA Objective	Employment Target/Score			Commentary on Likely sustainability effects
	Option 1: No allocations – demand led growth	Option 2: Allocations to reflect past delivery trends (11.8 ha per annum) with flexibility across the spatial hierarchy	Option 3: Large scale aspirational growth to reflect Sheffield City Region 10 year growth target	
13. Cultural Heritage: To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.	-?	+/-	-?	<p>Option 1</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>Bassetlaw has a rich cultural heritage that has shaped the built environment. The National Heritage List for England includes 1,067 listed building entries in Bassetlaw (comprising 33 Grade I, 48 Grade II*, 962 Grade II listed buildings and 24 scheduled monuments). As such, adverse impacts on heritage assets may be felt during both the construction and operation of new commercial premises which, depending on their scale and location, will have varying impacts.</p> <p>An undefined amount of employment growth, coming forward on an ad-hoc basis may be potentially detrimental to cultural heritage assets and the historic character of an area. Depending on the scale of development effects could be relatively localised or much farther reaching, depending on the location and characteristics of employment developments.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote high standards of architecture and design through plan policies. • Conservation of heritage and other assets of recognised importance through plan policies. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bringing back in to use buildings which are currently identified on the 'Buildings at Risk Register' can have significant positive effects on heritage assets. • Targeted redevelopment of derelict land and/or buildings can facilitate enhancement of the setting of identified assets. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The location of development is not yet known, therefore it is not possible to determine potential impacts on cultural heritage. • The nature of impacts arising from new development can only be assessed properly subject to heritage/landscape/visual impact assessments identifying the potential significance of sites/assets in relation to potential development sites, along with planning applications providing details of design and layout. <p>Option 2</p>

SA Objective	Employment Target/Score			Commentary on Likely sustainability effects
	Option 1: No allocations – demand led growth	Option 2: Allocations to reflect past delivery trends (11.8 ha per annum) with flexibility across the spatial hierarchy	Option 3: Large scale aspirational growth to reflect Sheffield City Region 10 year growth target	
				<p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>In comparison to Option 1, allocating specific sites for development allows the Council to avoid or mitigate significant adverse impacts on sensitive cultural heritage assets.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1 • Site allocation policies to include landscaping and design requirements <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1 <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The exact location of future development in each settlement is unknown at this stage <p><u>Option 3</u></p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>As per Option 1, although with a proportionate increase relative to the levels of growth.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1 <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1 <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1
14. Landscape and Townscape: To conserve and	-?	+/-	-?	<p><u>Option 1</u></p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p>

SA Objective	Employment Target/Score			Commentary on Likely sustainability effects
	Option 1: No allocations – demand led growth	Option 2: Allocations to reflect past delivery trends (11.8 ha per annum) with flexibility across the spatial hierarchy	Option 3: Large scale aspirational growth to reflect Sheffield City Region 10 year growth target	
enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.				<p>There are no formal landscape designations affecting Bassetlaw, although it still has a varied and valued landscape – as defined in the Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment.</p> <p>Development of commercial premises on a demand-led basis has potential to adversely impact landscapes and townscapes and would also potentially fail to maximise re-use of brownfield land where landscape and townscape impacts may be less significant.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote high standards of design and layout through plan policies. • Ensure protection of the most sensitive landscapes and the intrinsic beauty and character of the countryside through plan policies. • Prioritise development of brownfield sites wherever possible, recognising that this can have significant positive effects on townscapes. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The location of development is not yet known, therefore it is not possible to determine potential impacts on landscape character and townscape. • The nature of impacts arising from large scale new development can only be assessed properly subject to landscape and visual impact assessments identifying the potential magnitude of impacts in relation to potential development sites and sensitive receptors, along with planning applications providing details of design and layout. <p>Option 2</p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>In comparison to Option 1, allocating specific sites for development allows the Council to avoid or mitigate significant adverse impacts on sensitive landscapes.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p>

SA Objective	Employment Target/Score			Commentary on Likely sustainability effects
	Option 1: No allocations – demand led growth	Option 2: Allocations to reflect past delivery trends (11.8 ha per annum) with flexibility across the spatial hierarchy	Option 3: Large scale aspirational growth to reflect Sheffield City Region 10 year growth target	
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1 • Site allocation policies to include landscaping and design requirements. <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targeted development has potential to enhance the urban rural interface where the existing built form ends abruptly or in a manner that is insensitive to the character of the surrounding countryside. <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1 <p><u>Option 3</u></p> <p>Likely sustainability effects:</p> <p>This Option is likely to have similar effects to Option 1, although higher annual growth aspirations would require significant amounts of land to be developed over the plan period and increase the likelihood that some impacts to sensitive receptors will be unavoidable.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1 <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1 <p>Uncertainties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Option 1

Appendix 5

Significance Criteria Applied in the SA of Options and Policies and Appraisal Criteria Applied in the SA of Site Options

Table A5.1: Significance criteria to be applied in the SA of options and policies

SA Objective	Guide Questions	Effect	Description	Illustrative Guidance
<p>1. Biodiversity, Green and Blue Infrastructure: To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it conserve and enhance international designated nature conservation sites (Special Areas of Conservation, Special Protection Areas and Ramsar Sites)? • Will it conserve and enhance nationally designated nature conservation sites such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest? • Will it conserve and enhance Local Nature Reserves and Local Wildlife Sites? • Will it consider local BAP requirements and UK protected species? • Will it conserve and enhance species diversity, and in particular avoid harm to indigenous species of principal importance, or priority species and habitats? • Will it offer protection to existing corridors and opportunities to create and enhance/connect habitats to offer a wider network? • Will it provide opportunities for new habitat creation or restoration and link existing habitats as part of the development process? • Will it enhance ecological connectivity and maintain and improve the green and blue infrastructure network, addressing deficiencies and 	<p>++</p>	<p>Significant Positive</p>	<p>The policy/proposal would have a positive effect on European or national designated sites, habitats or species (e.g. enhancing habitats, creating additional habitat or increasing protected species populations).</p> <p>The policy/proposal would create new habitat and link it with existing habitats or significantly improve existing habitats to support local biodiversity.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would have significant positive effects on protected geologically important sites.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would significantly enhance the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>

SA Objective	Guide Questions	Effect	Description	Illustrative Guidance
	<p>providing green spaces that are well connected and biodiversity rich?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it maintain and enhance woodland cover and management? • Will it avoid damage to, and protect, Regionally Important Geological Sites? • Will it provide opportunities for people to access the natural environment including green and blue infrastructure? • Will it enhance the resilience of the natural environment to the impacts of climate change? 			
		+	Positive	<p>The policy/proposal would have a positive effect on sub-regional/local designated sites, habitats or species.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would improve existing habitats to support local biodiversity.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would have positive effects on protected geologically important sites.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would enhance the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>
		0	Neutral/No effect	<p>The policy/proposal would not have any effect on the achievement of the objective.</p>

SA Objective	Guide Questions	Effect	Description	Illustrative Guidance
		-	Negative	<p>The policy/proposal would have negative effects on sub-regional or local designated sites, habitats or species (e.g. short term loss of habitats, loss of species and temporary effects on the functioning of ecosystems).</p> <p>The policy/proposal would lead to short-term disturbance of existing habitat but would not have long-term effects on local biodiversity.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would have minor negative effects on protected geologically important sites.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would adversely affect the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>

SA Objective	Guide Questions	Effect	Description	Illustrative Guidance
		--	Significant Negative	<p>The policy/proposal would have negative effects on European or national designated sites, habitats and/or protected species (i.e. on the interest features and integrity of the site, by preventing any of the conservation objectives from being achieved or resulting in a long term decrease in the population of a priority species). These effects could not be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would result in significant, long term negative effects on non-designated sites (e.g. through significant loss of habitat leading to a long term loss of ecosystem structure and function).</p> <p>The policy/proposal would have significant negative effects on protected geologically important sites.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would have a significant adverse effect on the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>
		?	Uncertain	The policy/proposal has an uncertain relationship to the objective or the relationship is dependent on the way in which the aspect is managed. In addition, insufficient information may be available to enable an assessment to be made.
2. Housing: To ensure that the District's housing needs are met.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it meet the District's objectively assessed housing need, providing a range of housing types to meet current and emerging need for market and affordable housing? Will it reduce homelessness? Will it reduce the number of unfit homes? Will it make best use of the District's existing housing stock? Will it help to ensure the provision of good quality, well designed homes? Will it deliver housing to meet the needs of the elderly and those with special needs? Will it deliver pitches required for Gypsies and Travellers and Showpeople? 	++	Significant Positive	The policy/proposal would provide a significant increase to housing supply and would provide access to decent, affordable housing for residents with different needs (e.g. housing sites with capacity for 100 or more units).
		+	Positive	<p>The policy/proposal would provide an increase to housing supply and would provide access to decent, affordable housing for residents with different needs (e.g. housing sites of between 1 and 99 units).</p> <p>The policy/proposal would make use of/improve existing buildings or unfit, empty homes.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would promote high quality design.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would deliver sufficient pitches to meet requirements for Gypsies and Travellers and Showpeople.</p>
		0	Neutral/No effect	The policy/proposal would not have any effect on the achievement of the objective.
		-	Negative	The policy/proposal would reduce the amount of affordable, decent housing available (e.g. a net loss of between 1 and 99 dwellings).
		--	Significant Negative	The policy/proposal would significantly reduce the amount of affordable, decent housing available (e.g. a net loss of 100+ dwellings).
		?	Uncertain	The policy/proposal has an uncertain relationship to the objective or the relationship is dependent on the way in which the aspect is managed. In addition, insufficient information may be available to enable an assessment to be made.
3. Economy and Skills: To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it deliver local economic growth? Will it provide a supply of flexible, good quality 	++	Significant Positive	<p>The policy/proposal would significantly encourage investment in businesses, people and infrastructure which would lead to a more diversified economy, maximising viability of the local economy and reducing out-commuting (e.g. it would deliver over 5 ha of employment land).</p> <p>The policy/proposal would result in the creation of new educational institutions.</p>

SA Objective	Guide Questions	Effect	Description	Illustrative Guidance
employment opportunities.	<p>employment land to meet the needs of the District's existing businesses and attract inward investment?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it help to diversify the local economy and support the delivery of the District's Regeneration and Growth Strategy, Nottinghamshire Growth Plan, Sheffield City Region and the D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership Strategic Economic Plan? Will it provide good quality, well paid employment opportunities that meet the needs of local people? Will it increase average income levels? Will it improve the physical accessibility of jobs? Will it support rural diversification? Will it promote a low carbon economy? Will it improve access to training to raise employment potential? Will it increase levels of qualification? Will it create jobs in high knowledge sectors? Will it promote investment in educational establishments? 	+	Positive	<p>The policy/proposal would encourage investment in businesses, people and infrastructure (e.g. delivering between 0.1 and 4.99 ha of employment land). The policy/proposal would provide accessible employment opportunities. The policy/proposal would support diversification of the rural economy. The policy/proposal would support existing educational institutions. The policy/proposal would support economic growth in the low carbon sector.</p>
		0	Neutral/No effect	The policy/proposal would not have any effect on the achievement of the objective.
		-	Negative	The policy/proposal would have negative effects on businesses, the local economy and local employment (e.g. it would result in the loss of between 0.1 and 4.99 ha of employment land).
		--	Significant Negative	<p>The policy/proposal would have significant negative effects on business, the local economy and local employment (e.g. policy/proposal would lead to the closure or relocation of existing significant local businesses, loss of employment land of 5 ha or more, or would affect key sectors).</p> <p>The policy/proposal would result in the loss of existing educational establishments without replacement provision elsewhere within the District.</p>
		?	Uncertain	The policy/proposal has an uncertain relationship to the objective or the relationship is dependent on the way in which the aspect is managed. In addition, insufficient information may be available to enable an assessment to be made.

SA Objective	Guide Questions	Effect	Description	Illustrative Guidance
4. Regeneration and Social Inclusion: To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it maintain and enhance community facilities and services? Will it enhance accessibility to key community facilities and services including schools and public transport? Will it help to promote shared community use and the co-location of services and facilities? Will it protect and enhance the vitality and viability of the District's towns and villages? Will it tackle deprivation in the District's most deprived areas and reduce inequalities? Will it contribute to regeneration initiatives including in those areas which have been affected by the decline of the coal industry and the closure of collieries? Will it encourage engagement in community activities? Will it promote participation in cultural activities? Will it enhance the public realm? Will it align investment in services, facilities and infrastructure with growth? 	++	Significant Positive	<p>The policy/proposal would create new, or significantly enhance existing, community facilities and services.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would significantly improve social and environmental conditions within deprived areas and support regeneration.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would significantly enhance the vitality and viability of the District's town centres and/or villages.</p>
		+	Positive	<p>The policy/proposal would enhance existing community facilities and services.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would improve social and environmental conditions within deprived areas.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would enhance the vitality and viability of the District's town centres and/or villages.</p>
		0	Neutral/No effect	The policy/proposal would not have any effect on the achievement of the objective.
		-	Negative	<p>The policy/proposal would reduce the accessibility, availability and quality of existing community facilities and services.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would have an adverse effect on the vitality and viability of the District's town centres and/or villages.</p>
		--	Significant Negative	<p>The policy/proposal would result in the loss of existing community facilities and services without their replacement elsewhere within the District.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would have a significantly adverse effect on the vitality and viability of the District's town centres and/or villages.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would result in new residential development being inaccessible to existing services and facilities.</p>
		?	Uncertain	The policy/proposal has an uncertain relationship to the objective or the relationship is dependent on the way in which the aspect is managed. In addition, insufficient information may be available to enable an assessment to be made.
5. Health and Wellbeing: To improve health and reduce health inequalities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it avoid locating development in locations that could adversely affect people's health? Will it maintain and improve access to green and blue 	++	Significant Positive	<p>The policy/proposal would have strong and sustained impacts on healthy lifestyles and improve well-being through physical activity, recreational activity, improved environmental quality, etc. Different groups within the society are taken into consideration.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would deliver new healthcare facilities and/or open space.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would significantly reduce the level of crime through design and other safety measures.</p>

SA Objective	Guide Questions	Effect	Description	Illustrative Guidance
	<p>infrastructure, open space, leisure and recreational facilities for all?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it maintain and improve access to children's play areas? Will it increase the opportunities for physical activity and accessibility of recreational services and facilities? Will it improve access to health and social care facilities and services? Will it reduce health inequalities? Will it meet the needs of the District's ageing population? Will it support those with disabilities and promote accessible buildings and public spaces? Will it promote community safety? Will it reduce actual levels of crime and anti-social behaviour? Will it reduce the fear of crime? Will it promote design that discourages crime? Will it align healthcare facilities and services with growth? Will it minimise noise levels associated with new development and avoid locating sensitive development in areas affected by noise? 	+	Positive	The policy/proposal would promote healthy lifestyles and improve well-being through physical activity, recreational activity, improved environmental quality, etc. Different groups within the society are taken into consideration. The policy/proposal would reduce crime through design and other safety measures.
		0	Neutral/No effect	The policy/proposal would not have any effect on the achievement of the objective.
		-	Negative	The policy/proposal would reduce access to healthcare facilities and open space. The policy/proposal would lead to an increase in reported crime and the fear of crime in the District. The policy/proposal would have effects which could cause deterioration of health.
		--	Significant Negative	The policy/proposal would result in the loss of healthcare facilities and open space without their replacement elsewhere within the District. The policy/proposal would lead to a significant increase in reported crime and the fear of crime. The policy/proposal would have significant effects which would cause deterioration of health within the community (i.e. increase in pollution)
		?	Uncertain	The policy/proposal has an uncertain relationship to the objective or the relationship is dependent on the way in which the aspect is managed. In addition, insufficient information may be available to enable an assessment to be made.
6. Transport: To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it reduce travel demand and the distance people travel for jobs, employment, leisure and services and facilities? 	++	Significant Positive	The policy/proposal would significantly reduce need for travel, road traffic and congestion. The policy/proposal would create opportunities/incentives for the use of sustainable travel/transport of people/goods. The policy/proposal would significantly reduce out-commuting.

SA Objective	Guide Questions	Effect	Description	Illustrative Guidance
transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it encourage a shift to more sustainable modes of transport? Will it encourage walking, cycling and the use of public transport? Will it help to address highways capacity issues and reduce traffic congestion? Will it deliver investment in the District's transportation infrastructure and support proposals identified in the Local Transport Plan? Will it capitalise on the District's good transport accessibility, links to Robin Hood Airport and the new Worksop Bus Station? Will it help to develop a transport network that minimises the impact on the environment and public health? Will it help deliver traffic management and calming measures to reduce road injuries? Will it reduce the level of freight movement by road? Will it help to enhance the connectivity of more remote, rural settlements? 			The policy/proposal would support investment in transportation infrastructure and/or services.
		+	Positive	The policy/proposal would reduce need for travel. The policy/proposal would encourage the use of sustainable travel/transport of people/goods.
		0	Neutral/No effect	The policy/proposal would not have any effect on the achievement of the objective.
		-	Negative	The policy/proposal would increase the need for travel by less sustainable forms of transport, increasing road traffic and congestion.
		--	Significant Negative	The policy/proposal would significantly increase the need for travel by less sustainable forms of transport, substantially increasing road traffic and congestion. The policy/proposal would result in the loss of transportation infrastructure and/or services.
		?	Uncertain	The policy/proposal has an uncertain relationship to the objective or the relationship is dependent on the way in which the aspect is managed. In addition, insufficient information may be available to enable an assessment to be made.
7. Land Use and Soils: To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it promote the use of previously developed (brownfield) land and minimise the loss of greenfield land? Will it avoid the loss of agricultural land including best and most versatile land? Will it make best use of and reduce the amount of derelict, 	++	Significant Positive	The policy/proposal would encourage significant development on brownfield land. The policy/proposal would result in existing land / soil contamination being removed. The policy/proposal would protect best and most versatile agricultural land.
		+	Positive	The policy/proposal would encourage development on brownfield.
		0	Neutral/No effect	The policy/proposal would not have any effect on the achievement of the objective.
		-	Negative	The policy/proposal would result in development on greenfield or would create conflicts in land-use. The policy/proposal would result in the loss of agricultural land.

SA Objective	Guide Questions	Effect	Description	Illustrative Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> degraded and underused land in the District? Will it encourage the reuse of existing buildings and infrastructure? Will it prevent land contamination and facilitate remediation of contaminated sites? Will it maintain and enhance soil quality? 	--	Significant Negative	The policy/proposal would result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The policy/proposal would result in land contamination.
		?	Uncertain	The policy/proposal has an uncertain relationship to the objective or the relationship is dependent on the way in which the aspect is managed. In addition, insufficient information may be available to enable an assessment to be made.
8. Water: To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it result in a reduction of run-off of pollutants to nearby water courses that lead to a deterioration in existing status and/or failure to achieve the objective of good status under the Water Framework Directive? Will it improve ground and surface water quality? Will it reduce water consumption and encourage water efficiency? Will it ensure that new water/wastewater management infrastructure is delivered in a timely manner to support new development? 	++	Significant Positive	The policy/proposal would lead to a significant reduction of wastewater, surface water runoff and pollutant discharge so that the quality of groundwater and/or surface water would be significantly improved and all water targets (including those relevant to biological and chemical quality) would be met/exceeded. The policy/proposal would lead to a significant reduction in the demand for water. The policy/proposal would support investment in water resources infrastructure.
		+	Positive	The policy/proposal would lead to a reduction of wastewater, surface water runoff and/or pollutant discharge so that the quality of groundwater or surface water would be improved and some water targets (including those relevant to biological and chemical quality) would be met/exceeded. The policy/proposal would lead to a reduction in the demand for water.
		0	Neutral/No effect	The policy/proposal would not have any effect on the achievement of the objective.
		-	Negative	The policy/proposal would lead to an increase in the amount of waste water, surface water runoff and pollutant discharge so that the quality of groundwater or surface water would be reduced. The policy/proposal would lead to an increase in the demand for water.
		--	Significant Negative	The policy/proposal would lead to a significant increase in the amount of wastewater, surface water runoff and pollutant discharge so that the quality of groundwater or surface water would be decreased and water targets would not be met. The policy/proposal would lead to deterioration of the current WFD classification. The policy/proposal would lead to a significant increase in the demand for water placing water resource zones in deficit over the lifetime of the Severn Trent Water and/or Anglian Water Water Resources Management Plans. The policy/proposal would result in the capacity of existing wastewater management infrastructure being exceeded without appropriate mitigation.
		?	Uncertain	The policy/proposal has an uncertain relationship to the objective or the relationship is dependent on the way in which the aspect is managed. In addition, insufficient information may be available to enable an assessment to be made.

SA Objective	Guide Questions	Effect	Description	Illustrative Guidance
9. Flood Risk: To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it help to avoid or reduce the risk of flooding to existing and new developments/infrastructure? Will it ensure that new development does not give rise to flood risk elsewhere? Will it manage effectively, and reduce the likelihood of, flash flooding, taking into account the capacity of sewerage systems? Will it discourage inappropriate development in areas at risk from flooding? Will it deliver sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDs) and promote investment in flood defences that reduce vulnerability to flooding? 	++	Significant Positive	The policy/proposal would significantly reduce flood risk to new or existing infrastructure or communities (currently located within the 1 in 100 year floodplain).
		+	Positive	The policy/proposal would reduce flood risk to new or existing infrastructure or communities (currently located 1 in 1000 year floodplain).
		0	Neutral/No effect	The policy/proposal would not have any effect on the achievement of the objective. It is anticipated that the policy will neither cause nor exacerbate flooding in the catchment.
		-	Negative	The policy/proposal would result in an increased flood risk within the 1 to 1000 year floodplain. The policy/proposal would result in development classed as 'highly vulnerable' being located within Flood Zone 2 or development classed as 'more vulnerable' being located within Flood Zone 3a. or 'essential infrastructure' being located within Flood Zones 3a or 3b.
		--	Significant Negative	The policy/proposal would result in an increased flood risk within the 1 to 100 year floodplain. The policy/proposal would result in development classed as 'highly vulnerable' being located within Flood Zone 3a or development classed as 'more vulnerable' being located within Flood Zone 3b.
		?	Uncertain	The policy/proposal has an uncertain relationship to the objective or the relationship is dependent on the way in which the aspect is managed. In addition, insufficient information may be available to enable an assessment to be made.
10. Air Quality: To improve air quality.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it maintain and improve air quality? Will it avoid locating development in areas of existing poor air quality/odour? Will it minimise emissions to air including odour from new development? 	++	Significant Positive	The policy/proposal would significantly improve air quality.
		+	Positive	The policy/proposal would improve air quality.
		0	Neutral	The policy/proposal would not have any effect on the achievement of the objective.
		-	Negative	The policy/proposal would lead to a decrease in air quality.
		--	Significant Negative	The policy/proposal would lead to a decrease in air quality and would result in new AQMAs being declared.
		?	Uncertain	The policy/proposal has an uncertain relationship to the objective or the relationship is dependent on the way in which the aspect is managed. In addition, insufficient information may be available to enable an assessment to be made.
11. Climate Change: To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it minimise energy use and reduce or mitigate greenhouse gas emissions? Will it plan or implement adaptation measures for the likely effects of climate change? 	++	Significant Positive	The policy/proposal would significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the District. The policy/proposal would significantly reduce energy consumption or increase the amount of renewable energy being used/generated.
		+	Positive	The policy/proposal would reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the District. The policy/proposal would increase resilience/decrease vulnerability to climate change effects.

SA Objective	Guide Questions	Effect	Description	Illustrative Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it support the delivery of renewable and low carbon energy in the District and reduce dependency on non-renewable sources? Will it promote sustainable design and layout that is energy efficient, minimises greenhouse emissions and is adaptable to the effects of climate change? 			The policy/proposal would reduce energy consumption or increase the amount of renewable energy being used/generated. The policy/proposal would support/encourage sustainable design.
0		Neutral/No effect	The policy/proposal would not have any effect on the achievement of the objective.	
-		Negative	The policy/proposal would lead to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions from the District. The policy/proposal would not increase resilience/decrease vulnerability to climate change effects.	
--		Significant Negative	The policy/proposal would lead to a significant increase in greenhouse gas emissions from the District. The policy/proposal would increase vulnerability to climate change effects.	
?		Uncertain	The policy/proposal has an uncertain relationship to the objective or the relationship is dependent on the way in which the aspect is managed. In addition, insufficient information may be available to enable an assessment to be made.	
12. Resource Use and Waste: To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it minimise the demand for raw materials and assist in maximising the use of recycled and secondary materials (including aggregates)? Will it promote the use of local resources? Will it reduce minerals extracted and imported? Will it increase efficiency in the use of raw materials and promote recycling? Will it avoid sterilisation of mineral reserves? Will it support the objectives and proposals of the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan? Will it assist or facilitate compliance with the waste hierarchy (i.e. reduce first, then re-use, recover, recycle, landfill)? Will it compromise the ongoing operation of existing waste management facilities? 	++	Significant Positive	The policy/proposal would reduce the amount of waste generated through prevention, minimisation and re-use. The policy/proposal would significantly reduce the amount of waste going to landfill through recycling and energy recovery. The policy/proposal would support/encourage investment in waste management facilities.
		+	Positive	The policy/proposal would reduce the amount of waste going to landfill through recycling and energy recovery. The policy/proposal would encourage the use of sustainable materials.
		0	Neutral/No effect	The policy/proposal would not have any effect on the achievement of the objective.
		-	Negative	The policy/proposal would result in an increased amount of waste going to landfill. The policy/proposal would increase the demand for local resources.
		--	Significant Negative	The policy/proposal would result in a significantly increased amount of waste going to landfill. The policy/proposal would significantly increase the demand for local resources. The policy/proposal would result in inappropriate development within a minerals safeguarding area.
		?	Uncertain	The policy/proposal has an uncertain relationship to the objective or the relationship is dependent on the way in which the aspect is managed. In addition, insufficient information may be available to enable an assessment to be made.

SA Objective	Guide Questions	Effect	Description	Illustrative Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it support investment in waste management facilities to meet local needs? Will it support the objectives and proposals of the Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Waste Core Strategy? 			
13. Cultural Heritage: To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it help to conserve and enhance existing features of the historic built environment and their settings, including archaeological assets? Will it reduce the instances and circumstances where heritage assets are identified as being 'at risk'? Will it promote sustainable repair and reuse of heritage assets? Will it protect or enhance the significance of designated heritage assets and their settings? Will it protect or enhance the significance of non-designated heritage assets and their settings? Will it promote local cultural distinctiveness? Will it improve the quality of the built environment, and maintain local distinctiveness and historic townscape character in the District's towns and villages? Will it help to conserve historic buildings, places and spaces that enhance local distinctiveness, character and 	++	Significant Positive	<p>The policy/proposal would protect and enhance the sites, areas and features of historic, cultural, archaeological and architectural interest with national designations (including their setting).</p> <p>The policy/proposal will make use of historic buildings, spaces and places through sensitive adaption and re-use allowing these distinctive assets to be accessed.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would result in an assets(s) being removed from the At Risk Register.</p>
		+	Positive	<p>The policy/proposal would protect and enhance the sites, areas and features of historic, cultural, archaeological and architectural interest with local designations (including their setting).</p> <p>The policy/proposal will increase access to historical/cultural/archaeological/architectural buildings/spaces/places.</p>
		0	Neutral/No effect	The policy/proposal would not have any effect on the achievement of the objective.
		-	Negative	<p>The policy/proposal would lead to the deterioration of and/or harm to sites, areas and features of historic, cultural, archaeological and architectural interest with local designations.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would temporarily restrict access to historical/cultural/archaeological/architectural buildings/spaces/places.</p>
		--	Significant Negative	<p>The policy/proposal would lead to the deterioration of and/or harm to sites, areas and features of historic, cultural, archaeological and architectural interest with national designation or result in the destruction of heritage assets (national or local).</p> <p>The policy/proposal would permanently restrict access to historical/cultural/archaeological/architectural buildings/spaces/places.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would result in an asset being placed on the At Risk Register.</p>
		?	Uncertain	The policy/proposal has an uncertain relationship to the objective or the relationship is dependent on the way in which the aspect is managed. In addition, insufficient information may be available to enable an assessment to be made.

SA Objective	Guide Questions	Effect	Description	Illustrative Guidance
	<p>appearance through sensitive adaptation and re-use?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it provide opportunities for people to value and enjoy Bassetlaw's cultural heritage? Will it improve and promote access to buildings and landscapes of historic/cultural value? 			
14. Landscape and Townscape: To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes? Will it conserve and reinforce special landscape features? Will it promote high quality design in context with its urban and rural landscape? Will it protect and enhance visual amenity? 	++	Significant Positive	The policy/proposal would offer potential to significantly enhance landscape/townscape character.
		+	Positive	The policy/proposal would offer potential to enhance landscape/townscape character.
		0	Neutral/No effect	The policy/proposal would not have any effect on the achievement of the objective.
		-	Negative	The policy/proposal would have an adverse effect on landscape/townscape character.
		--	Significant Negative	The policy/proposal would have a significant adverse effect on landscape/townscape character.
		?	Uncertain	The policy/proposal has an uncertain relationship to the objective or the relationship is dependent on the way in which the aspect is managed. In addition, insufficient information may be available to enable an assessment to be made.

Table A5.2: Site Appraisal Criteria for housing and employment sites (including mixed use and new settlement sites)

SA Objective	Appraisal Criteria	Threshold	Score
1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity: To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.	Proximity to: -statutory international/national nature conservation designations (SAC, SPA, Ramsar, SSSI, National Nature Reserve, Ancient Woodland); -local nature conservation designations (Local Nature Reserve, Local Wildlife Site) -Regionally Important Geological Site (RIGS)	No international/national designations within 500m of site and no local designations (including RIGS) within 100m of site.	0
		Within 100m of a locally designated site (including RIGS)/Within 500m from an international/national site or within 5km of the Sherwood Forest ppSPA.	-
		Within 100m of a statutory international/national designated site (including the Sherwood Forest ppSPA) or locally designated site (including RIGS) within the site option.	--
2. Housing: To ensure that the District's housing needs are met.	Number of (net) new dwellings proposed/loss of dwellings.	100+ dwellings (3ha or more).	++
		1 to 99 dwellings (up to 2.9ha)	+
		0 dwellings.	0
		-1 to -99 dwellings (-2.9ha or more).	-
		-100+ dwellings (-3ha or more).	--
3. Economy and Skills: To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.	Net employment land provision/loss.	5ha+ of land.	++
		0.1ha to 4.99ha of land.	+
		0ha	0
		-01ha to -4.99ha of land.	-
		5ha+ of land.	--
	Proximity to key employment sites. This criterion does not apply to employment sites, as they will be assessed on the basis of net employment land provision only. (i.e. the criterion above).	Within 800m of a major employment site.	+
		In excess of 800m of a major employment site.	0
4. Regeneration and Social Inclusion: To promote regeneration,	Walking distance to key services including: -GP surgeries -Primary schools	Within 800m of all services and/or a town centre.	++
		Within 800m of one or more key services and/or a local centre, and/or within 2,000m of all services/a town centre.	+

SA Objective	Appraisal Criteria	Threshold	Score
tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.	-Secondary schools -Post Offices Proximity to town and local centres. Employment sites will have no effect on this objective.	Within 2,000m of a key service.	0
		In excess of 2,000m from all services/a town centre.	-
5. Health and Wellbeing: To improve health and reduce health inequalities.	Access to: -GP surgeries -Open space (including sports and recreational facilities) Proximity to GP surgeries is not relevant to employment sites, therefore these will be assessed on the basis of proximity to open space only.	Within 800m walking distance of a GP surgery and open space.	++
		Within 800m of a GP surgery or open space.	+
		Within 2,000m of a GP surgery or open space.	0
		In excess of 2,000m from a GP surgery and/or open space.	-
		Loss of open space or sports/recreational facilities.	--
6. Transport: To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.	Access to: -bus stops -railway stations -cycle routes	Within 400m of a bus stop <u>and</u> 1km of a railway station <u>and</u> 400m of a cycle path.	++
		Within 400m of a bus stop <u>or</u> 1km of a railway station <u>or</u> 400m of a cycle path.	+
		More than 400m from a bus stop and 1km from a railway station and 400m from a cycle path.	-
7. Land Use and Soils: To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.	Development of brownfield / greenfield/ mixed land Development of agricultural land including best and most versatile agricultural land (Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) grades 1, 2 and 3)).	Previously developed (brownfield) land.	++
		Mixed greenfield/brownfield land.	+/-
		Greenfield (not in ALC Grades 1, 2 or 3).	-
		Greenfield (in ALC Grade 1, 2 or 3).	--
8. Water: To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.	Proximity to Groundwater Source Protection Zones	Not within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone	0
		Within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone	--
9. Flood Risk: To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District,	Presence of Environment Agency Flood Zones.	Within Flood Zone 1.	0
		Partly or fully within Flood Zone 2 (but not within Flood Zone 3).	-
		Partly or fully within Flood Zone 3a/b.	--

SA Objective	Appraisal Criteria	Threshold	Score
taking into account the effects of climate change.			
10. Air Quality: To improve air quality.	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.	N/A	N/A
11. Climate Change: To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change.	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.	N/A	N/A
12. Resource Use and Waste: To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).	Development in Minerals Safeguarding Areas ⁷⁸ .	Outside a Minerals Safeguarding Area	0
		Within a Minerals Safeguarding Area	--
13. Cultural Heritage: To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.	Effects on designated heritage assets <u>and archaeology</u> .	N/A ⁷⁹	++
		N/A ⁷⁹	+
		No concerns raised by BDC officers	0
		Potential minor effect identified by BDC officers	-
		Potential significant effect identified by BDC officers	--
14. Landscape and Townscape: To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.	Landscape Policy Zone	N/A	++
		Within Landscape Policy Zone for Create and Restore, Create and Reinforce or create or urban site on derelict / degraded land	+
		Within Landscape Policy Zone for Reinforce or Restore. A negligible effect with uncertainty (0?) should be recorded for urban sites that do not consist of derelict/degraded land but would not lead to a loss of landscape features (e.g. public green space or water bodies). The effect for urban sites is uncertain as effects on townscape depend on design of new development.	0

⁷⁸ It is acknowledged that where minerals are present, these may be extracted prior to development, but for the purposes of the SA we have assumed this will not be the case.

⁷⁹ Positive effects are rare, but could potentially be achieved with careful layout and design of development. However, these details will not be confirmed until planning application stage.

SA Objective	Appraisal Criteria	Threshold	Score
		Within Landscape Policy Zone for Conserve and Reinforce, Conserve and Restore or Conserve and Create. A minor negative effect with uncertainty (-?) should be recorded for urban sites that would lead to a loss of landscape features (e.g. public green space or water bodies). The effect for urban sites is uncertain as effects on townscape depend on design of new development.	-
		Within Landscape Policy Zone for Conserve	--

Appendix 6

SA Matrices for Site Options Considered to date

Residential Sites

Table A6 - 1: Montagu House, London Road, Retford (LAA002)

Montagu House, London Road, Retford (LAA002)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	0	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	+	This site could provide 18 new dwellings. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	0	This site is in excess of 800m of a major employment site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	0	This site is within 2km of the town centre of Retford, as well as Welbeck Road local centre and key services including a primary school and a post office. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+	Although the site is not located within 2km of a GP surgery, it is located within 800m of various open spaces including allotments, amenity green space and children's play areas. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	This site is within 400m of a dedicated cycle lane and is adjacent to a bus stop, however it is not within 1km of a railway station. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.

Montagu House, London Road, Retford (LAA002)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	++	The site is a brownfield site. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	--	This site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	--	The site is located within Retford South Conservation Area and, in particular, the Council's heritage officer has identified Montagu House as a positive building within the site. Demolition or redevelopment of Montagu House would therefore harm its significance to the site and the Conservation Area's setting. In addition, the Council's archaeology officer notes that further information is required to evaluate the archaeological potential of the site in order to determine an appropriate mitigation strategy. As such, a significant negative effect is likely in relation to heritage, and a minor negative effect in relation to archaeology.

Montagu House, London Road, Retford (LAA002)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	0?	The site is located within the urban area of Retford and its development would not lead to the loss of landscape features or the redevelopment of derelict land. As such, a negligible effect is likely, but uncertain.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 8: Water

- Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.
- If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.
- The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management⁸⁰ states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.

SA 13: Cultural Heritage

- Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessments and/or and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.
- Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, particularly Montagu House, make consideration of screening, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of heritage and archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible.
- The draft Policies ST44: The Historic Environment and 45: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects.

⁸⁰ Note that throughout this appendix, references to policies providing potential mitigation refer to the draft policies that were current at the time the site options were originally appraised. Some of these policies now have slightly different names or policy reference numbers. Information about the policies in the Publication version of the Local Plan that would provide mitigation for the potential negative effects of other Local Plan policies and site allocations can be found in Table 8.1 in Chapter 8 of the SA Report.

Table A6 - 2: The Drive, Park Lane, Retford (LAA012)

The Drive, Park Lane, Retford (LAA012)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	0	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	+	This site could provide 70 new dwellings. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	0	This site is in excess of 800m of a major employment site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	This site is within 800m of a primary school. The site is also within 2km of all key services and Retford town centre. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+	The site is within 800m of a cemetery and parts of the site are also within 800m of other open spaces including semi natural green space, children's play areas and outdoor sports facilities. The site is also located within 2km of a GP surgery. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	This site is within 400m of a bus stop, however it is not within 1km of a railway station or within 400m of a dedicated cycle route. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--	The site is a greenfield site and the site is situated on Grade 3 agricultural land. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.

The Drive, Park Lane, Retford (LAA012)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
SA 8: Water To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.	--	This site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
SA 9: Flood Risk To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.	0?	The site is within Flood Zone 1. A very small portion of the site in the north eastern corner lies within Flood Zone 2. As such, a negligible effect is likely, but uncertain.
SA 10: Air Quality To improve air quality.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 11: Climate Change To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 12: Resource Use and Waste To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
SA 13: Cultural Heritage To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.	--	The Council's archaeology officer has identified potential archaeological earthworks on the site, including a medieval ridge and furrow, and notes that further information is required to evaluate the archaeological potential of the site in order to determine an appropriate mitigation strategy. No further comments were made by the heritage officer. As such, a significant negative effect is likely in relation to archaeology, and a negligible effect in relation to archaeology.
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.	--	This site is within Idle Lowlands Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone IL08 and is classified for conserve. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'very good' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified		

The Drive, Park Lane, Retford (LAA012)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
SA 7: Land Use and Soils		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.		
SA 8: Water		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.		
SA 13: Cultural Heritage		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessment to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible.The draft Policies ST44: The Historic Environment and 45: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects.		
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character.Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features.The draft Policies ST39: Landscape Character and ST37: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects.		

Table A6 - 3: The Drive, Park Lane (LAA012, LAA022, LAA539)

The Drive, Park Lane (LAA012, LAA022,LAA539)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	-	A portion of this site is within 100m of two Local Wildlife Site (Longholme Pasture, East Retford and Chesterfield Canal (Welham to Misterton)). A significant portion of this site is within 500m of a Special Site of Scientific Interest. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	++	This site could provide 347 new dwellings. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	0	This site is in excess of 800m of a major employment site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	A significant portion of this site is within 800m of a primary school. This site is also within 2km of a post office, a GP surgery, a secondary school, and the town centre of Retford. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+	Parts of the site are located within 800m of allotments, children's play area, a cemetery, outdoor sports facility and semi-natural green space. The site is also located within 2km of a GP surgery. As such a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	A portion of this site is within 400m of a bus stop, however is not within 1km of a railway station or within 400m of a dedicated cycle route. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--	This site is a greenfield site, and the site is situated on Grade 3 agricultural land. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.

The Drive, Park Lane (LAA012, LAA022,LAA539)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	--	This site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	-	A significant portion of the site is within Flood Zone 2. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	--	The Council's heritage officer has identified that the site is located in the setting of two Grade II listed buildings; Moorgate House to the west and Whitsunday Pie Lock to the east. The site is also located within a wider Conservation Area. In addition, the Council's archaeology officer notes that further information is required to evaluate the archaeological potential of the site in order to determine an appropriate mitigation strategy. As such, a significant negative effect is likely in relation to both heritage and archaeology.
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	--	This site is within Idle Lowlands Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone IL08, and is classified for conserve. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'very good' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified		
SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development should be designed to avoid and incorporate buffers around the most sensitive parts of the designated sites and consider measures to reduce recreational pressures, such as via the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to facilitate on-site recreation. • Development should be encouraged to incorporate green infrastructure within the allocated site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity. • The draft Policy ST42: Biodiversity and Geodiversity promotes protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including designations, habitats and species, and is likely to go a long way to mitigating the identified effects. 		
SA 7: Land Use and Soils		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site. • The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land. 		
SA 8: Water		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution. • If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans. • The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects. 		
SA 9: Flood Risk		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development should avoid parts of the site at highest risk of flooding, which could be retained as green space. • Developments should utilise SuDS, or where this is not possible, alternative surface water drainage to help mitigate the risk of flooding by safely managing surface water issues. • The draft Policy ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage should help to mitigate any negative effects, as it requires development to address effects of the proposed development on flood risk and avoid areas at highest risk of flooding. 		
SA 13: Cultural Heritage		

The Drive, Park Lane (LAA012, LAA022,LAA539)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessments and/or and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.• Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of heritage and archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible.• The draft Policies ST44: The Historic Environment and 45: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects.
		<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character.• Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features.• The draft Policies ST39: Landscape Character and ST37: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects.

Table A6 - 4: Bigsby Road, Retford (LAA022)

Bigsby Road, Retford (LAA022)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	-	A small portion of this site is within 100m of a Local Wildlife Site (Longholme Pasture, East Retford). A significant portion of this site is within 500m of a Special Site of Scientific Interest. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	++	This site could provide 250 new dwellings. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	0	This site is in excess of 800m of a major employment site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	A significant portion of this site is within 800m of a primary school. This site is also within 2km of a post office, a GP surgery, a secondary school, and the town centre of Retford. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+	The site is located within 2km of outdoor sports facilities, children's play area and semi natural green space. Parts of the site are also within 800m of allotments and a cemetery. The site is also located within 2km of a GP surgery. As such a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	A portion of this site is within 400m of a bus stop, however is not within 1km of a railway station or within 400m of a dedicated cycle route. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--	This site is a greenfield site, and the site is situated on Grade 3 agricultural land. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.

Biggsby Road, Retford (LAA022)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	--	This site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	-	A significant portion of the site is within Flood Zone 2. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	--	The Council's heritage officer has identified that the site is located in the setting of two Grade II listed buildings; Moorgate House to the west and Whitsunday Pie Lock to the east. The site is also located within a wider Conservation Area. In addition, the Council's archaeology officer notes that further information is required to evaluate the archaeological potential of the site in order to determine an appropriate mitigation strategy. As such, a significant negative effect is likely in relation to both heritage and archaeology.
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	--	This site is within Idle Lowlands Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone IL08, and is classified for conserve. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'very good' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity

- Development should be designed to avoid and incorporate buffers around the most sensitive parts of the designated sites and consider measures to reduce recreational pressures, such as via the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to facilitate on-site recreation.
- Development should be encouraged to incorporate green infrastructure within the allocated site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity.
- The draft Policy ST42: Biodiversity and Geodiversity promotes protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including designations, habitats and species, and is likely to go a long way to mitigating the identified effects.

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 8: Water

- Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.
- If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.
- The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.

SA 9: Flood Risk

- Development should avoid parts of the site at highest risk of flooding, which could be retained as green space.
- Developments should utilise SuDS, or where this is not possible, alternative surface water drainage to help mitigate the risk of flooding by safely managing surface water issues.
- The draft Policy ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage should help to mitigate any negative effects, as it requires development to address effects of the proposed development on flood risk and avoid areas at highest risk of flooding.

SA 13: Cultural Heritage

Biggsby Road, Retford (LAA022)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessments and/or and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.• Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of heritage and archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible.• The draft Policies ST44: The Historic Environment and 45: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects.
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character.• Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features.• The draft Policies ST39: Landscape Character and ST37: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects.

Table A6 - 5: Kenilworth Nursery, Retford (LAA034)

Kenilworth Nursery, Retford (LAA034)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	0	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	+	This site could provide 48 new dwellings. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	0	This site is not within 800m of a major employment site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	This site is within 800m of a primary school. The site is also within 2km of a post office, the town centre of Retford and the local centre of Welbeck Road. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+	The site is located within 800m of several open spaces, including allotments, semi natural green space and outdoor sports facilities. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	-	The site is more than 400m of a bus stop and dedicated cycle path and is not within 1km of a railway station. As such, a minor negative effect is expected.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--	This site is a greenfield site and is also situated on Grade 3 agricultural land. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.

Kenilworth Nursery, Retford (LAA034)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
SA 8: Water To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.	0	This site is not situated within a Source Protection Zone. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
SA 9: Flood Risk To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
SA 10: Air Quality To improve air quality.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 11: Climate Change To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 12: Resource Use and Waste To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
SA 13: Cultural Heritage To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.	--	The western part of the site is located in the Retford South Conservation Area. Kenilworth has been identified as a positive building within the Conservation Area. The Council's archaeology officer notes that the western part of the site is within the Conservation Area, and that the new development would likely interfere with the view from London Road over the nursery to Grove Park, which is an important feature of the Conservation Area. It is noted that part of the site has already undergone evaluation and excavation with Late Iron Age and Romano-British features identified including enclosure ditches and a probable LIA round house structure. The western part will require further work in the form of evaluation to formulate an appropriate mitigation strategy. As such, a significant negative effect is likely in relation to both heritage and archaeology.
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape	--	The site is within Mid-Nottinghamshire Farmland Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone MN04, and is classified for conserve. The condition of the landscape is

Kenilworth Nursery, Retford (LAA034)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.		deemed 'very good' and it received a sensitivity score of 'high'. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 13: Cultural Heritage

- Focus development in the western part of the site.
- Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessments and/or and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.
- Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, maintaining important views, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of heritage and archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible.
- The draft Policies ST44: The Historic Environment and 45: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects.

SA 14: Landscape and Townscape

- Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character.
- Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features.
- The draft Policies ST39: Landscape Character and ST37: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects.

Table A6 - 6: Kenilworth Nursery, South of Coach Grove Road, Grove Coach Road (LAA034, LAA165, LAA275)

Kenilworth Nursery, South of Coach Grove Road, Grove Coach Road (LAA034, LAA165, LAA275)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	0	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	++	This site could provide 250 new dwellings. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	+?	A small portion of this site is within 800m of a major employment site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely, but uncertain.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	The majority of the site is within 800m of a primary school. The site is also within 2km of a post office, the local centre of Welbeck Road, and the town centre of Retford. Part of the site is also within 2km of a GP surgery. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+	The site is within 800m of a various open spaces, including allotments, and semi natural green space. In addition, a large proportion of the site is within 800m of outdoor sports facilities, amenity green space and a children's play area. Part of the site is within 2km of a GP surgery. Therefore a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	A significant portion of the site is within 400m of a bus stop, however it is not within 400m of a dedicated cycle route or 1km of a railway station. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--	This site is a greenfield site, and is also situated on Grade 3 agricultural land. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.

Kenilworth Nursery, South of Coach Grove Road, Grove Coach Road (LAA034, LAA165, LAA275)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	0	This site is not situated within a Source Protection Zone. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	--	<p>The heritage officer notes that the western part of the site is located in the Retford South Conservation Area, and that Kenilworth has been identified as a positive building within the Conservation Area. The heritage officer raises no other comments for the remainder of the site. As such, a negligible effect is likely in relation to heritage.</p> <p>The Council's archaeology officer notes that the western part of the site is within the Conservation Area, and that the new development would likely interfere with the view from London Road over the nursery to Grove Park, which is an important feature of the Conservation Area. It is noted that part of the site has already undergone evaluation and excavation with Late Iron Age and Romano-British features identified including enclosure ditches and a probable LIA round house structure. Therefore, further work will be</p>

Kenilworth Nursery, South of Coach Grove Road, Grove Coach Road (LAA034, LAA165, LAA275)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
		required in the form of a desk based heritage assessment and possible evaluation to formulate an appropriate mitigation strategy. As such, a significant negative effect is likely in relation to archaeology.
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District’s landscape character and townscapes.</p>	--	The majority of the site is within Mid-Nottinghamshire Farmlands Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone MN04, and is classified for conserve. The condition of the landscape is deemed ‘very good’ and it received a sensitivity score of ‘high. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw’s Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 13: Cultural Heritage

- Avoid development in the western part of the site.
- Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessments and/or and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.
- Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, maintaining important views, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of heritage and archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible.
- The draft Policies ST44: The Historic Environment and 45: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects.

SA 14: Landscape and Townscape

- Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character.
- Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features.
- The draft Policies ST39: Landscape Character and ST37: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects.

Table A6 - 7: South of Railway, London Road, Retford (LAA035)

South of Railway, London Road, Retford (LAA035)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	0	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	+	This site could provide 39 new dwellings. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	+	This site is within 800m of a major employment site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	This site is within 800m of a primary school. The site is also within 2km of a post office, a GP surgery, the town centre of Retford, and the local centre of Welbeck Road. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+/--	The site is within 800m of various opens spaces, such as outdoor sports facilities, children's play area and amenity green space. However, the site is also on semi natural green space which could be lost by development of the site. Nonetheless, even if this open space were lost, the site would still be adjacent to the semi natural green space and within 800m of other open space. The site is within 2km of a GP surgery. As such, a mixed minor positive and significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	This site is within 400m of a dedicated cycle lane and a bus stop, however is not within 1km of a railway station. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.

South of Railway, London Road, Retford (LAA035)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	-	This site is a greenfield site. This site is not classified as agricultural land. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	--	This site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAS) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	--	The site is located within a Conservation Area, with the Council's heritage officer noting that the site requires careful consideration due to the views from the London Road over the Idle Valley and Whitehouses Road. As such, a significant negative effect is likely. No known archaeological assets are present within the site, however the site is located west of a known site of late Iron Age occupation. This will require further detailed assessment in the form of geophysical survey and trial trench evaluation in order to determine an appropriate mitigation strategy. As such, a significant negative effect is likely in relation to both heritage and archaeology.

South of Railway, London Road, Retford (LAA035)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	+	This site is within Sherwood Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone SH56, and is classified for restore and create. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'poor' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 5: Health and Wellbeing

- Development should include sufficient replacement or alternative outdoor green space in a location easily accessible by current users and new residents/workers, to mitigate the potential loss and provide for the needs of the new development.
- The draft Policy ST46: Promoting Health and Well-Being seeks to improve access to open space and promote active travel, which is likely to go some way to mitigating these effects.

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 8: Water

- Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.
- If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.
- The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.

SA 13: Cultural Heritage

- Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, maintain important views, make consideration of screening.
- The draft Policies ST44: The Historic Environment and 45: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects.

Table A6 - 8: Tiln Lane, Retford (LAA071)

Tiln Lane, Retford (LAA071)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	-	The western boundary of the site is located within 100m of a Local Wildlife Site (River Idle–Bolham) and a Regionally Important Geological Site. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	++	The northern half of the site could provide 124 new dwellings. The southern half of the site already has planning consent for 175 dwellings. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	+	This site is within 800m of a major employment site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	++	The site is within 2km of the town centre of Retford and it is within 800m of a primary and secondary school. As such, a significant positive effect is expected.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+	The site is located within 2km of a GP surgery and it is located within 800m of various open spaces, including allotments and amenity green space. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	-	The site is more than 400m from any bus stops or cycle paths and is also more than 1km from a railway station. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.

Tiln Lane, Retford (LAA071)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--	The site is greenfield and is comprised of grade 3 agricultural land. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	--	This site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	--	The Council's heritage officer has identified significant negative effects to cultural heritage. The northern part of the site is in the setting of several heritage assets, including Moorgate House (grade II listed), Bolham Manor and the former pumping station (both non-designated heritage assets). With regard to the nearby Moorgate House, development on this site would have only a minimal impact on its setting taking into account the existing approval which is closer to the listed building than this site. Whilst Bolham Manor and the pumping station are non-designated assets, their setting is very much a rural and open one and

Tiln Lane, Retford (LAA071)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
		development would fail to preserve this, which would be contrary to paragraph 192 of the revised NPPF. The existing permitted development on the southern part of the site would already encroach into the countryside setting and additional development to the north would further exacerbate this. However, the Council's archaeology officer raises no concerns in relation to archaeology and identifies a negligible effect for archaeology.
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	--	The site is located within the Idle Lowlands Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone IL08 and is classified for conserve. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'very good' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity

- Development should be designed to avoid and incorporate buffers around the most sensitive parts of the designated sites and consider measures to reduce recreational pressures, such as via the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to facilitate on-site recreation.
- Development should be encouraged to incorporate green infrastructure within the allocated site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity.
- The draft Policy ST42: Biodiversity and Geodiversity promotes protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including designations, habitats and species, and is likely to go a long way to mitigating the identified effects.

SA 6: Transport

- The draft Policy ST57: Promoting Sustainable Transport and Active Travel encourages provision of new and enhanced sustainable transport routes and facilities which should help to mitigate the negative effect of being too distant from existing sustainable transport modes.

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 8: Water

Tiln Lane, Retford (LAA071)

SA Objective

SA Score

Justification

- Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.
- If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.
- The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.

SA 13: Cultural Heritage

- Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessments and/or and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.
- Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, particularly Moorgate House (grade II listed), Bolham Manor and the former pumping station, make consideration of screening, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of heritage and archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible.
- The draft Policies ST44: The Historic Environment and 45: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects.

SA 14: Landscape and Townscape

- Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character.
- Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features.
- The draft Policies ST39: Landscape Character and ST37: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects.

Table A6 - 9: Grove Road, Retford (LAA097)

Grove Road, Retford (LAA097)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	0	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	+	This site could provide 15 new dwellings. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	0	This site is in excess of 800m of a major employment site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	0	This site is within 2km of the town centre of Retford, as well as Walbeck Road local centre and key services including a primary school and a post office. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+	Although the site is not located within 2km of a GP surgery, it is located within 800m of various open spaces including allotments, amenity green space and children's play areas. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	This site is within 400m of a dedicated cycle lane and is adjacent to a bus stop, however it is not within 1km of a railway station. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	-	The site is a greenfield site, however it lies within urban land. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.

Grove Road, Retford (LAA097)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	--	A portion of the site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	-	The site is located within Retford South Conservation Area and, in particular, the Council's heritage officer has identified that the site is within the setting of Montagu House. In addition, The Hardmoors and Montagu Cottage are regarded as positive buildings within the Conservation Area. There are a range of trees on the site that contribute to the character of the Conservation Area. The Council's heritage officer notes that a small number of dwellings could be accommodated without impacting the character, however such development would need to be of traditional form. In addition, the Council's archaeology officer notes that there is no record of archaeology within the site, however cropmarks associated with late Iron Age/Romano-British settlement and agricultural activity are recorded to the south and west. As such, a minor negative effect is likely in relation to heritage, and a minor negative effect in relation to archaeology.

Grove Road, Retford (LAA097)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	0?	The site is located within the urban area of Retford and its development would not lead to the loss of landscape features or the redevelopment of derelict land. As such, a negligible effect is likely, but uncertain.
<p>General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified</p> <p>SA 8: Water</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution. • If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans. • The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management⁸¹ states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects. 		

Table A6 - 10: Fairy Grove Nursery, Retford (LAA127)

Fairy Grove Nursery, Retford (LAA127)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	0	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p>	+	This site could provide 73 new dwellings. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.

⁸¹ Note that throughout this appendix, references to policies providing potential mitigation refer to the draft policies that were current at the time the site options were originally appraised. Some of these policies now have slightly different names or policy reference numbers. Information about the policies in the Publication version of the Local Plan that would provide mitigation for the potential negative effects of other Local Plan policies and site allocations can be found in Table 8.1 in Chapter 8 of the SA Report.

Fairy Grove Nursery, Retford (LAA127)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
To ensure the District's housing need are met.		
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	0	This site is in excess of 800m of a major employment site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	A portion of this site is within 800m of a primary school. This site is also within 2km of a post office, the local centre of Welbeck Road, and the town centre of Redford. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+	The site is adjacent to allotments and is located within 800m of open spaces such as children's play areas, outdoor sports facilities and amenity green space. The site is not within 2km of a GP surgery. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	This site is within 400m of a dedicated cycle lane and is adjacent to a bus stop, however is not within 1km of a railway station. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--	This site is a greenfield site, and the majority of the site is situated on Grade 3 agricultural land. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	--	A portion of this site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.

Fairy Grove Nursery, Retford (LAA127)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 10: Air Quality To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	--	The Council's heritage officer notes that significant negative effects on the cultural heritage are expected as a result of development of this site. In addition, the Council's archaeology officer notes that further information is required to evaluate the archaeological potential of the site in order to determine an appropriate mitigation strategy. As such, a significant negative effect is likely in relation to heritage and a minor negative effect in relation to archaeology.
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	--	This site is within Mid-Nottinghamshire Farmlands Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone MN04, and is classified for conserve. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'very good' and it received a sensitivity score of 'high'. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified</p> <p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site. The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land. <p>SA 8: Water</p>		

Fairy Grove Nursery, Retford (LAA127)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.• If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.• The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.
SA 13: Cultural Heritage		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessments and/or and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.• Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of heritage and archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible.• The draft Policies ST44: The Historic Environment and 45: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects.
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character.• Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features. The draft Policies ST39: Landscape Character and ST37: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects.

Table A6 - 11: Land South of the Common, Ordsall, Retford (LAA141)

Land South of the Common, Ordsall, Retford (LAA141)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	-	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. This assessment site is located entirely within a 5km buffer around the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	++	This site could provide 192 new dwellings. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	0	This site is in excess of 800m of a major employment site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	A significant portion of this site is within 800m of a post office, and the local centre of Welbeck Road. The site is also within 2km of a primary school. A portion of the site is within 2km of the town centre of Retford. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+	The site is within 800m of allotments, semi natural green space, children's play areas and outdoor sports facilities. The site is not within 2km of a GP surgery. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	The majority of this site is within 400m of a bus stop, however is not within 1km of a railway station or within 400m of a dedicated cycle route. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--	This site is a greenfield site, and the site is situated on Grade 2 agricultural land. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.

Land South of the Common, Ordsall, Retford (LAA141)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	--	This site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	--	This site is within a Mineral Safeguarding Area (Sneinton Gunthorpe Clay). As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	-	The Council's archaeology officer notes that further information is required to evaluate the archaeological potential of the site in order to determine an appropriate mitigation strategy. No further comments were made by the heritage officer. As such, a minor negative effect is likely in relation to archaeology, and a negligible effect in relation to heritage assets.
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	-	This site is within Sherwood Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone SH57, and is classified for conserve and create. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'moderate' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.
<p>General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified</p>		

Land South of the Common, Ordsall, Retford (LAA141)

SA Objective

SA Score

Justification

SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity

- Development should be designed to avoid and incorporate buffers around the most sensitive parts of the designated sites and consider measures to reduce recreational pressures, such as via the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to facilitate on-site recreation.
- Development should be encouraged to incorporate green infrastructure within the allocated site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity.
- The draft Policy ST42: Biodiversity and Geodiversity promotes protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including designations, habitats and species, and is likely to go a long way to mitigating the identified effects.
- The effects on the ppSPA will be considered further through the HRA.

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development.
- Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 8: Water

- Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.
- If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.
- The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.

SA 12: Resource Use and Waste

- The mineral resource should be worked prior to development where possible.

SA 14: Landscape and Townscape

- Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character.
- Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features.

Land South of the Common, Ordsall, Retford (LAA141)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The draft Policies ST39: Landscape Character and ST37: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects. 		

Table A6 - 12: Land south of the common, Ordsall, West of Brecks Road (LAA141, LAA270, LAA276, LAA246, LAA247 and LAA508)

Land south of the common, Ordsall, West of Brecks Road (LAA141, LAA270, LAA276, LAA246, LAA247 and LAA508)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	-	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site. Part of the site is adjacent to (and within 100m) of the Retford Golf Course Local Wildlife Site. The site is located entirely within a 5km buffer around the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	++	This site could provide 1579 new dwellings. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	+	Part of this site is within 800m of a major employment site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	Part of this site is within 800m of a post office and within 800m of a primary school, and the local centre of Welbeck Road. The remainder of the site is within 2km of these facilities. The rest of the site is also within 2km of a primary school. A portion of the site is within 2km of the town centre of Retford and a secondary school. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.

Land south of the common, Ordsall, West of Brecks Road (LAA141, LAA270, LAA276, LAA246, LAA247 and LAA508)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
SA 5: Health and Wellbeing To improve health and reduce health inequalities.	+	The majority of the site is within 800m of allotments, semi natural green space, children's play areas, amenity green space, and outdoor sports facilities. The site is not within 2km of a GP surgery. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
SA 6: Transport To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.	+	Part of the site is within 400m of a bus stop, however, is not within 1km of a railway station or within 400m of a dedicated cycle route. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
SA 7: Land Use and Soils To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.	--	This site is a greenfield site, and the site is situated predominantly on Grade 2 agricultural land. The western extent of the site is on Grade 3 agricultural land. A small portion of the north of the site is urban land. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
SA 8: Water To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.	--	This site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
SA 9: Flood Risk To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
SA 10: Air Quality To improve air quality.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 11: Climate Change To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 12: Resource Use and Waste	--	Around one third of the site is within a Mineral Safeguarding Area (Sneinton Gunthorpe Clay). As such, a significant negative effect is likely.

Land south of the common, Ordsall, West of Brecks Road (LAA141, LAA270, LAA276, LAA246, LAA247 and LAA508)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).		
SA 13: Cultural Heritage To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.	--	The Council's archaeology officer notes that there are undated cropmarks contained within part of the site. Further information is also required to evaluate the archaeological potential of the site in order to determine an appropriate mitigation strategy. No further comments were made by the heritage officer. As such, a negligible effect is likely in relation to heritage, and a significant negative in relation to archaeology.
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.	-	This site is within Sherwood Landscape Character Area. The majority of the site is within Landscape Policy Zone SH40, with the remaining in SH57. It is classified for conserve and create. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'moderate' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity

- Development should be designed to avoid and incorporate buffers around the most sensitive parts of the designated sites and consider measures to reduce recreational pressures, such as via the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to facilitate on-site recreation.
- Development should be encouraged to incorporate green infrastructure within the allocated site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity.
- Policy ST40: Biodiversity and Geodiversity promotes protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including designations, habitats and species, and is likely to go a long way to mitigating the identified effects.
- The effects on the ppSPA will be considered further through the HRA.

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 8: Water

- Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.
- If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.

Land south of the common, Ordsall, West of Brecks Road (LAA141, LAA270, LAA276, LAA246, LAA247 and LAA508)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy ST53: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects. 		
SA 12: Resource Use and Waste		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development should be focused within the area of site which lies outside Mineral Safeguarding Areas but if developments fall within safeguarding areas, the mineral resources should be worked prior to development, where possible. 		
SA 13: Cultural Heritage		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessments and/or and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting. Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of heritage and archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible. Policies ST42: The Historic Environment and 43: Designated and Non-Designated Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects. 		
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character. Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features. Policies ST37: Landscape Character and ST35: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects. 		

Table A6 - 13: Former Pupil Referral Unit, Worksop (LAA142)

Former Pupil Referral Unit, Worksop (LAA142)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	-	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. This assessment site is located entirely

Former Pupil Referral Unit, Worksop (LAA142)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.		within a 5km buffer around the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. As such, a minor negative uncertain effect is likely.
SA 2: Housing To ensure the District's housing need are met.	+	This site could provide 23 new dwellings. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
SA 3: Economy and Skills To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.	+	This site is within 800m of a major employment site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.	++	This site is within 800m of all key services and the town centre of Worksop. The site is also within 2km of the local centre of Retford Road. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
SA 5: Health and Wellbeing To improve health and reduce health inequalities.	++	The site is within 800m of various open spaces, including allotments, parks and gardens, children's play area and civic space. The site is also situated on and adjacent to a school outdoor sports facility, however this is no longer in use and therefore the loss of this is considered to be negligible This site is also located within 800m of a GP surgery. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
SA 6: Transport To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.	+	This site is within 400m of a bus stop, however is not within 1km of a railway station or within 400m of a dedicated cycle route. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
SA 7: Land Use and Soils To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.	++	This site is a brownfield site. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
SA 8: Water	--	This site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.

Former Pupil Referral Unit, Worksop (LAA142)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.		
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	-	The Council's archaeology officer notes that further information is required to evaluate the archaeological potential of the site in order to determine an appropriate mitigation strategy. No further comments were made by the heritage officer. As such, a negligible effect is likely in relation to heritage, and a minor negative in relation to archaeology.
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	0?	The site is located in the urban area of Worksop and its development would not lead to the loss of landscape features or the redevelopment of derelict land. As such, a negligible effect is likely, but uncertain.
<p>General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified</p> <p>SA 8: Water</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution. 		

Former Pupil Referral Unit, Worksop (LAA142)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans. The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects. 		

Table A6 - 14: Former Manton Primary School, Worksop (LAA147)

Former Manton Primary School, Worksop (LAA147)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	0	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	++	This site could provide 100 new dwellings. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	+	This site is within 800m of a major employment site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	This site is within 800m of a GP surgery, a post office, and the local centre of Retford Road. The site is also within 2km of a primary school, a secondary school, and the town centre of Worksop. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	++/--	The site is located within 800m of open spaces such as allotments, amenity green spaces and children's play areas. However, the site is also situated on a school outdoor sports facility. Although not publicly accessible, development of the site could nonetheless result in a loss of this

Former Manton Primary School, Worksop (LAA147)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
		sports facility. This site is also located within 800m of a GP surgery. As such, a mixed significant positive and significant negative effect is likely.
SA 6: Transport To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.	+	This site is within 400m of a dedicated cycle lane and is within 400m of a bus stop, however it is not within 1km of a railway station. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
SA 7: Land Use and Soils To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.	++	This site is a brownfield site. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
SA 8: Water To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.	--	This site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
SA 9: Flood Risk To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
SA 10: Air Quality To improve air quality.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 11: Climate Change To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 12: Resource Use and Waste To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.

Former Manton Primary School, Worksop (LAA147)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	-	The Council's archaeology officer notes that further information is required to evaluate the archaeological potential of the site in order to determine an appropriate mitigation strategy. No further comments were made by the heritage officer. As such, a negligible effect is likely in relation to heritage, and a minor negative in relation to archaeology.
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	0?	The site is located in the urban area of Worksop and its development would not lead to the loss of landscape features or the redevelopment of derelict land. As such, a negligible effect is likely, but uncertain.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 5: Health and Wellbeing

- Development should include sufficient replacement or alternative outdoor green space in a location easily accessible by current users and new residents/workers, to mitigate the potential loss and provide for the needs of the new development.
- The draft Policy ST46: Promoting Health and Well-Being seeks to improve access to open space and promote active travel, which is likely to go some way to mitigating these effects.

SA 8: Water

- Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.
- If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.
- The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.

Table A6 - 15: Talbot Road, Worksop (LAA149)

Talbot Road, Worksop (LAA149)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p>	-	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. This assessment site is located entirely

Talbot Road, Worksop (LAA149)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.		within a 5km buffer around the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. As such, a minor negative uncertain effect is likely.
SA 2: Housing To ensure the District's housing need are met.	+	This site could provide 51 new dwellings. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
SA 3: Economy and Skills To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.	+	This site is within 800m of a major employment site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.	++	This site is within 800m of all key services, the local centre of Retford Road, and the town centre of Worksop. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
SA 5: Health and Wellbeing To improve health and reduce health inequalities.	++/--	The site is located within 800m of open spaces such as children's play area, parks and gardens, civic space, cemetery and outdoor sports facilities. However, the site is also situated on amenity green space which could be lost by the development of the site. Nonetheless, even if this open space were lost, the site would still be within 800m of other open space. The site is also within 800m of a GP surgery. As such, a mixed significant positive and significant negative effect is likely.
SA 6: Transport To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.	+	This site is adjacent to a number of bus stops, and the entire site is within 400m of a dedicated cycle lane, however it is not within 1km of a railway station. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
SA 7: Land Use and Soils To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.	-	This site is a greenfield site. The site is not classified as agricultural land. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.
SA 8: Water To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.	--	This site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
SA 9: Flood Risk	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.

Talbot Road, Worksop (LAA149)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.		
SA 10: Air Quality To improve air quality.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 11: Climate Change To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 12: Resource Use and Waste To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
SA 13: Cultural Heritage To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.	-	The Council's archaeology officer notes that further information is required to evaluate the archaeological potential of the site in order to determine an appropriate mitigation strategy. No further comments were made by the heritage officer. As such, a negligible effect is likely in relation to heritage, and a minor negative in relation to archaeology.
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.	0?	The site is located in the urban area of Worksop and its development would not lead to the loss of landscape features or the redevelopment of derelict land. As such, a negligible effect is likely, but uncertain.
General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified		
SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development should be designed to avoid and incorporate buffers around the most sensitive parts of the designated sites and consider measures to reduce recreational pressures, such as via the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to facilitate on-site recreation. • Development should be encouraged to incorporate green infrastructure within the allocated site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity. • Policy ST40: Biodiversity and Geodiversity promotes protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including designations, habitats and species, and is likely to go a long way to mitigating the identified effects. • The effects on the ppSPA will be considered further through the HRA. 		

Talbot Road, Worksop (LAA149)

SA Objective

SA Score

Justification

SA 5: Health and Wellbeing

- Development should include sufficient replacement or alternative outdoor green space in a location easily accessible by current users and new residents/workers, to mitigate the potential loss and provide for the needs of the new development.
- Policy ST44: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles seeks to improve access to open space and promote active travel, which is likely to go some way to mitigating these effects.

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 8: Water

- Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.
- If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.
- Policy ST53: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.

SA 13: Cultural Heritage

- Applications for development should include archaeological investigations, including a geophysical survey and impact assessment, with evaluation trenching.
- Policies ST42: The Historic Environment and 43: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects.

Table A6 - 16: South of Grove Coach Road, Retford (LAA165)

South of Grove Coach Road, Retford (LAA165)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	0	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	+	This site could provide 96 new dwellings. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	0	This site is in excess of 800m of a major employment site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	This site is within 800m of a primary school. The site is also within 2km of a post office, the local centre of Welbeck Road, and the town centre of Retford. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+	The site is within 800m of a various open spaces, including allotments, semi natural green space, outdoor sports facilities and amenity green space. The site is not within 2km of a GP surgery. Therefore a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	A significant portion of the site is within 400m of a bus stop, however it is not within 1km of a railway station or within 400m of a dedicated cycle route. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--	This site is a greenfield site, and the site is situated on Grade 3 agricultural land. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.

South of Grove Coach Road, Retford (LAA165)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
SA 8: Water To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.	0	This site is not within a Source Protection Zone. As such a negligible effect is likely.
SA 9: Flood Risk To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
SA 10: Air Quality To improve air quality.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 11: Climate Change To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 12: Resource Use and Waste To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
SA 13: Cultural Heritage To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.	--	The Council's archaeology officer notes that further information is required in the form of trial trench evaluation in order to determine an appropriate mitigation strategy No further comments were made by the heritage officer. As such, a negligible effect is likely in relation to heritage, and a significant negative in relation to archaeology.
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.	--	This site is within Mid-Nottinghamshire Farmlands Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone MN04, and is classified for conserve. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'very good' and it received a sensitivity score of 'high'. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified		

South of Grove Coach Road, Retford (LAA165)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
SA 7: Land Use and Soils		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site. The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land. 		
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character. Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features. The draft Policies ST39: Landscape Character and ST37: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects. 		

Table A6 - 17: Whitehouse Road, Harworth & Bircotes (LAA194)

Whitehouse Road, Harworth & Bircotes (LAA194)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.	0	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
SA 2: Housing To ensure the District's housing need are met.	+	This site could provide 15 new dwellings. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
SA 3: Economy and Skills	+	This site is within 800m of a major employment site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.

Whitehouse Road, Harworth & Bircotes (LAA194)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.		
SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.	+	This site is within 800m of a primary school and a GP surgery. A portion of this site is within 800m of a post office and the local centre of Harworth Main Street. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
SA 5: Health and Wellbeing To improve health and reduce health inequalities.	++	The site is within 800m of open spaces such as amenity green space, children's play area and semi natural green space. The site is also located within 800m of a GP surgery. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
SA 6: Transport To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.	+	This site is within 400m of a bus stop, however is not within 1km of a railway station or within 400m of a dedicated cycle route. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
SA 7: Land Use and Soils To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.	--	This site is a greenfield site, and is situated on Grade 3 agricultural land. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
SA 8: Water To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.	--	This site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
SA 9: Flood Risk To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
SA 10: Air Quality To improve air quality.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.

Whitehouse Road, Harworth & Bircotes (LAA194)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	--	The Council's heritage and archaeology officers identify minor negative effects to the cultural heritage of the site, with the archaeology officer noting that there is a medium-high chance of archaeological remains being located within the site, with strip maps and a record of condition required. Further information is also required in the form of desk based heritage assessment and evaluation in order to determine an appropriate archaeological mitigation strategy. As such, a minor negative effect is likely in relation to heritage, and a significant negative effect in relation to archaeology.
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	+	This site is within Idle Lowlands Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone IL11, and is classified for create. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'very poor' and it received a sensitivity score of 'low'. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 8: Water

- Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.
- If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.

Whitehouse Road, Harworth & Bircotes (LAA194)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects. 		
SA 13: Cultural Heritage		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessments and/or and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting. Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of heritage and archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible. The draft Policies ST44: The Historic Environment and 45: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects. 		

Table A6 - 18: Mansfield Road, Worksop (LAA206)

Mansfield Road, Worksop (LAA206)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	-	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. This assessment site is located entirely within a 5km buffer around the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	++	This site could provide 110 new dwellings. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	+	The majority of this site is within 800m of a major employment site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.

Mansfield Road, Worksop (LAA206)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	This site is within 2km of a primary school, a GP surgery, a post office, and the town centre of Worksop. A portion of this site is within 2km of a secondary school. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+	The site is located within 800m of amenity green space. The site is also located within 2km of a GP surgery, as well as other open spaces such as allotments and children's play area. Overall, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	The majority of this site is within 400m of a bus stop, however it is not within 1km of a railway station or within 400m of a dedicated cycle route. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--	This site is a greenfield site, and the site is situated on Grade 2 agricultural land. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	--	The majority of this site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.

Mansfield Road, Worksop (LAA206)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	--?	A portion of this site is within a Minerals Safeguarding Area (Limestone Combine). As such, a significant negative effect is likely, but uncertain.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	--	The site is located in the setting of a Grade I listed building; Worksop Manor Lodge and Grade II listed barn and stable at Lodge Farm. The Council's heritage officer notes that developments on this site will have significant negative effects, with a HIA required to ascertain the precise impact on the setting of these listed buildings. The Council's archaeology officer notes that further information is required in the form of a desk based heritage assessment and evaluation in order to determine an appropriate archaeological mitigation strategy. As such, a significant negative effect is likely in relation to both heritage and archaeology.
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	-	This site is within Magnesian Limestone Ridge Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone ML11, and is classified for conserve and reinforce. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'good' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity

- Development should be designed to avoid and incorporate buffers around the most sensitive parts of the designated sites and consider measures to reduce recreational pressures, such as via the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to facilitate on-site recreation.
- Development should be encouraged to incorporate green infrastructure within the allocated site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity.
- The draft Policy ST42: Biodiversity and Geodiversity promotes protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including designations, habitats and species, and is likely to go a long way to mitigating the identified effects.
- The effects on the ppSPA will be considered further through the HRA.

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

Mansfield Road, Worksop (LAA206)

SA Objective

SA Score

Justification

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 8: Water

- Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.
- If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.
- The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.

SA 12: Resource Use and Waste

- Development should be focused within the area of site which lies outside Mineral Safeguarding Areas but if developments fall within safeguarding areas, the mineral resources should be worked prior to development, where possible.

SA 13: Cultural Heritage

- Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessments and/or and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.
- Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of heritage and archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible.
- The draft Policies ST44: The Historic Environment and 45: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects.

SA 14: Landscape and Townscape

- Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character.
- Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features.
- The draft Policies ST39: Landscape Character and ST37: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects.

Table A6 - 19: Peaks Hill Farm, Worksop - medium urban extension to the east of Carlton Road and west of Blyth Road, Worksop (LAA458, LAA462 and LAA469)

Peaks Hill Farm, Worksop - medium urban extension to the east of Carlton Road and west of Blyth Road (LAA458, LAA462 and LAA469)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	-	A very small portion of this site is within 100m of a Regionally Important Geological Site (Carlton Forest Quarry). As such, a minor negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	++	This site could provide 1,080 new dwellings. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	++	The site contains an area with extant planning permission for employment use.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	A portion of this site is within 800m of a primary school. A significant portion is within 2km of a secondary school, a GP surgery, and a post office. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+	The site is within 800m of amenity green space, children's play area and outdoor sports facilities. The site is within 2km of a GP surgery. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	A portion of this site is within 400m of a bus stop. A small portion of the site is within 400m of a dedicated cycle lane. However, it is not within 1km of a railway station. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	+/--	This site is mainly greenfield but a small portion of the east of the site comprises brownfield land. The entire site is classed as Grade 3 agricultural land. As such, a mixed significant negative and minor positive effect is likely.

Peaks Hill Farm, Worksop - medium urban extension to the east of Carlton Road and west of Blyth Road (LAA458, LAA462 and LAA469)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
SA 8: Water To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.	--	This site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
SA 9: Flood Risk To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
SA 10: Air Quality To improve air quality.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 11: Climate Change To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 12: Resource Use and Waste To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).	0?	A significant portion of this site is within a Minerals Safeguarding Area (Sherwood Sandstone), however the Nottinghamshire County Council Minerals Plan outlines that the site is dormant and will be restored to agricultural land. As such, a negligible but uncertain effect is likely.
SA 13: Cultural Heritage To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.	--	The site is located adjacent to a non-designated heritage asset on the east side of the A60. The Council's heritage officer notes that developments could lead to likely significant visual effects on this asset. The Council's archaeology officer notes that undated cropmarks are located within part of the site and that further information is required in the form of a desk based heritage assessment and evaluation in order to determine an appropriate archaeological mitigation strategy. As such, a significant negative effect is likely in relation to both heritage and archaeology.
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.	+/-	This site is within both Sherwood and Idle Lowlands Landscape Character Areas. The site is within Landscape Policy Zones SH37 and IL12. Landscape Policy Zone SH37 is classified for create. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'very poor' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. Landscape Policy Zone IL12 is classified for conserve and reinforce. The condition of

Peaks Hill Farm, Worksop - medium urban extension to the east of Carlton Road and west of Blyth Road (LAA458, LAA462 and LAA469)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
		the landscape is deemed 'good' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. As such, a mixed minor positive and minor negative effect is likely.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity

- Development should be designed to avoid and incorporate buffers around the most sensitive parts of the designated sites and consider measures to reduce recreational pressures, such as via the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to facilitate on-site recreation.
- Development should be encouraged to incorporate green infrastructure within the allocated site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity.
- Policy ST40: Biodiversity and Geodiversity promotes protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including designations, habitats and species, and is likely to go a long way to mitigating the identified effects.

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 8: Water

- Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.
- If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.
- Policy ST53: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.

SA 13: Cultural Heritage

- Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessments and/or and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.
- Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of heritage and archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible.
- Policies ST42: The Historic Environment and 43: Designated and Non-Designated Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects.

SA 14: Landscape and Townscape

- Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character.

Peaks Hill Farm, Worksop - medium urban extension to the east of Carlton Road and west of Blyth Road (LAA458, LAA462 and LAA469)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features.• Policies ST37: Landscape Character and ST35: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects.

Table A6 - 20: Peaks Hill Farm, Worksop - large urban extension to the west and east of Carlton Road (100 dwellings to the west of Carlton Road and 1136 dwellings to the East of Carlton Road), and west of Blyth Road to link the site to Gateford Park, Worksop (LAA210/LAA462/LAA470/LAA458)

Peaks Hill Farm, Worksop - large urban extension to the west and east of Carlton Road (100 dwellings to the west of Carlton Road and 1136 dwellings to the East of Carlton Road), and west of Blyth Road to link the site to Gateford Park (LAA210/LAA462/LAA470/LAA458)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	-	A small portion of this site is within 100m of Regionally Important Geological Sites (Toll Bar Cottage, Wighorpe and Carlton Forest Quarry) and a Local Wildlife Site (Nab's Ashes Marsh, and Nab's Ashes Wood). A small portion is within 100m of an Ancient Woodland. The majority of this assessment site is located within a 5km buffer around the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	++	This site could provide 1136 new dwellings. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	0	This site is in excess of 800m of a major employment site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	A portion of this site is within 800m of a primary school and the local centre of Celtic Point. A significant portion is within 2km of a secondary school, a GP surgery, and a post office. As such, a minor positive effect is likely, but uncertain.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+/--	Site LAA470 is located on amenity green space which could be lost by the development of these sites. Nonetheless, even if these open spaces were lost, the site would still be within 800m of other open space including amenity green space and semi natural green space. The majority of the sites are within 2km of a GP surgery. As such, a mixed minor positive and significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	A portion of this site is within 400m of a bus stop. A small portion of the site is within 400m of a dedicated cycle lane. However it is not within 1km of a railway station. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.

Peaks Hill Farm, Worksop - large urban extension to the west and east of Carlton Road (100 dwellings to the west of Carlton Road and 1136 dwellings to the East of Carlton Road), and west of Blyth Road to link the site to Gateford Park (LAA210/LAA462/LAA470/LAA458)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--	This site is a greenfield site, and the site is situated on Grade 3 agricultural land. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	--	This site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	0?	A portion of this site is within a Minerals Safeguarding Area (Sherwood Sandstone), however the Nottinghamshire County Council Minerals Plan outlines that the site is dormant and will be restored to agricultural land. As such, a negligible but uncertain effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	--	The site is located adjacent to a non-designated heritage asset on the east side of the A60. The Council's heritage officer notes that developments could lead to likely significant negative effects on this asset. The Council's archaeology officer notes that undated cropmarks are located within part of the site and that further information is required in the form of a desk based heritage assessment and evaluation in order to determine an appropriate archaeological mitigation strategy. As such, a significant negative effect is likely in relation to both heritage and archaeology.

Peaks Hill Farm, Worksop - large urban extension to the west and east of Carlton Road (100 dwellings to the west of Carlton Road and 1136 dwellings to the East of Carlton Road), and west of Blyth Road to link the site to Gateford Park (LAA210/LAA462/LAA470/LAA458)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	+/-	<p>This site is within both Sherwood and Idle Lowlands Landscape Character Areas. The site is within Landscape Policy Zones SH37 and IL12. Landscape Policy Zone SH37 is classified for create. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'very poor' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. Landscape Policy Zone IL12 is classified for conserve and reinforce. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'good' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. As such, a mixed minor positive and minor negative effect is likely.</p>

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity

- Development should be designed to avoid and incorporate buffers around the most sensitive parts of the designated sites and consider measures to reduce recreational pressures, such as via the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to facilitate on-site recreation.
- Development should be encouraged to incorporate green infrastructure within the allocated site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity.
- The draft Policy ST42: Biodiversity and Geodiversity promotes protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including designations, habitats and species, and is likely to go a long way to mitigating the identified effects.
- The effects on the ppSPA will be considered further through the HRA.

SA 5: Health and Wellbeing

- Development should include sufficient replacement or alternative outdoor green space in a location easily accessible by current users and new residents/workers, to mitigate the potential loss and provide for the needs of the new development.
- The draft Policy ST46: Promoting Health and Well-Being seeks to improve access to open space and promote active travel, which is likely to go some way to mitigating these effects.

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 8: Water

- Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.

Peaks Hill Farm, Worksop - large urban extension to the west and east of Carlton Road (100 dwellings to the west of Carlton Road and 1136 dwellings to the East of Carlton Road), and west of Blyth Road to link the site to Gateford Park (LAA210/LAA462/LAA470/LAA458)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans. The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects. 		
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development should be focused within the area of site which lies outside Mineral Safeguarding Areas but if developments fall within safeguarding areas, the mineral resources should be worked prior to development, where possible. 		
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessments and/or and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting. Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of heritage and archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible. The draft Policies ST44: The Historic Environment and 45: Heritage Assets provide protection for non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects. 		
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character. Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features. The draft Policies ST39: Landscape Character and ST37: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects. 		

Table A6 - 21: Blyth Road, Harworth & Bircotes (LAA222)

Blyth Road, Harworth & Bircotes (LAA222)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	0	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	++	This site could provide 178 new dwellings. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	+	This site is within 800m of a major employment site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	This site is within 800m of a primary school, a post office, and the local centres of Scrooby Road and Harworth Main Street. The site is also within 2km of a GP surgery. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+	The site is within 800m of various open spaces including amenity green space, outdoor sports facilities and semi natural green space. The site is also within 2km of a GP surgery. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	This site is within 400m of a bus stop, however it is not within 1km of a railway station or within 400m of a dedicated cycle route. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--	This site is a greenfield site, and the site is situated on Grade 3 agricultural land. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.

Blyth Road, Harworth & Bircotes (LAA222)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	--	This site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	--	The Council's heritage officer has identified that the site does not contribute significantly to the setting of heritage assets and that no significant view would be affected. This is, however, subject to a suitable layout, design/materials, scale and landscaping. In addition, the Council's archaeology officer notes that the map regression survey for the site suggests that during the medieval period this site was used for agricultural purposes and that a site visit identified a surface scatter of material which included medieval pottery, although this may be part of a manuring scatter as well as more modern material. They note that immediately south of this site there are some cropmark which have been tentatively interpreted as being Roman. However, the Council's archaeology officer notes that further information is required to evaluate the archaeological potential of the site. As such, a minor negative effect is likely in relation to heritage, and a significant negative effect in relation to archaeology.

Blyth Road, Harworth & Bircotes (LAA222)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District’s landscape character and townscapes.</p>	+	This site is within Idle Lowlands Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone IL11, and is classified for create. The condition of the landscape is deemed ‘very poor’ and it received a sensitivity score of ‘low’. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw’s Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 8: Water

- Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.
- If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.
- The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.

SA 13: Cultural Heritage

- Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessments and/or and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.
- Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of heritage and archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible.
- The draft Policies ST44: The Historic Environment and 45: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects.

Table A6 - 22: East of Styrrup Road, Harworth & Bircotes (LAA225)

East of Styrrup Road, Harworth & Bircotes (LAA225)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	-	A significant portion of this site is within 500m of Ancient Woodland (Crow Wood). As such, a minor negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	+	This site could provide 76 new dwellings. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	+	This site is within 800m of a major employment site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	This site is within 800m of a post office and the local centre of Harworth Main Street. A portion of the site is within 800m of a primary school. The site is also within 2km of a GP surgery. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+	The site is within 800m of open spaces such as outdoor sports facilities, children's play area and amenity green space. The site is also within 2km of a GP surgery. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	This site is within 400m of a bus stop, however it is not within 1km of a railway station or within 400m of a dedicated cycle route. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--	This site is identified by Bassetlaw Council as a greenfield site, and the site is situated on Grade 3 agricultural land. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.

East of Styrrup Road, Harworth & Bircotes (LAA225)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	--	This site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	--	The Council's heritage officer identifies potential for minor negative effects with regards to the cultural heritage. The Council's archaeology officer notes that there is a medium-high chance of archaeological remains being located within the site, including crop marks and Roman finds. Further information is also required in the form of desk based heritage assessment and evaluation in order to determine an appropriate archaeological mitigation strategy. As such, minor negative effect is likely in relation to heritage, and a significant negative effect in relation to archaeology.
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	+	This site is within Idle Lowlands Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone IL11, and is classified for create. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'very poor' and it received a sensitivity score of 'low'. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified		
SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development should be designed to avoid and incorporate buffers around the most sensitive parts of the designated sites and consider measures to reduce recreational pressures, such as via the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to facilitate on-site recreation. Development should be encouraged to incorporate green infrastructure within the allocated site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity. The draft Policy ST42: Biodiversity and Geodiversity promotes protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including designations, habitats and species, and is likely to go a long way to mitigating the identified effects. 		
SA 7: Land Use and Soils		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site. The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land. 		
SA 8: Water		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution. If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans. The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects. 		
SA 13: Cultural Heritage		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessments and/or and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting. Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of heritage and archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible. The draft Policies ST44: The Historic Environment and 45: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects. 		

Table A6 - 23: South of Common Lane, Harworth & Bircotes (LAA226)

South of Common Lane, Harworth & Bircotes (LAA226)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	-	A portion of this site is within 500m of Ancient Woodland (Crow Wood). As such, a minor negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	+	This site could provide 78 new dwellings. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	+	The majority of this site is within 800m of a major employment site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	This site is within 800m of a post office and the local centre of Harworth Main Street. The site is also within 2km of a primary school and a GP surgery. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+	The site is adjacent to (within 800m of) amenity green space (Common Lane). The site is also within 2km of a GP surgery and other open spaces including allotments, children's play area and outdoor sports facilities. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	This site is within 400m of a bus stop, however it is not within 1km of a railway station or within 400m of a dedicated cycle route. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p>	--	This site is a greenfield site, and the site is situated on Grade 3 agricultural land. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.

South of Common Lane, Harworth & Bircotes (LAA226)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.		
SA 8: Water To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.	--	This site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
SA 9: Flood Risk To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
SA 10: Air Quality To improve air quality.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 11: Climate Change To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 12: Resource Use and Waste To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
SA 13: Cultural Heritage To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.	--	The Council's heritage officer identifies minor negative effects to the cultural heritage. The Council's archaeology officer notes that there is a medium-high chance of archaeological remains being located within the site, including flint tools. Field walking, trial trenching and geophysical investigations may be necessary. Further information is also required in the form of desk based heritage assessment and evaluation in order to determine an appropriate archaeological mitigation strategy. As such, minor negative effect is likely in relation to heritage, and a significant negative effect in relation to archaeology.

South of Common Lane, Harworth & Bircotes (LAA226)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	+	This site is within Idle Lowlands Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone IL11, and is classified for create. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'very poor' and it received a sensitivity score of 'low'. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity

- Development should be designed to avoid and incorporate buffers around the most sensitive parts of the designated sites and consider measures to reduce recreational pressures, such as via the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to facilitate on-site recreation.
- Development should be encouraged to incorporate green infrastructure within the allocated site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity.
- The draft Policy ST42: Biodiversity and Geodiversity promotes protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including designations, habitats and species, and is likely to go a long way to mitigating the identified effects.

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 8: Water

- Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.
- If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.
- The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.

SA 13: Cultural Heritage

- Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessments and/or and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.
- Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of heritage and archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible.

South of Common Lane, Harworth & Bircotes (LAA226)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The draft Policies ST44: The Historic Environment and 45: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects. 		

Table A6 - 24: Corner Farm, Tickhill Road, Harworth & Bircotes (LAA227)

Corner Farm Tickhill Road, Harworth & Bircotes (LAA227)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	0	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	+	This site could provide 12 new dwellings. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	+	This site is within 800m of a major employment site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	This site is within 800m of a primary school, a post office and the local centres of Harworth Main Street and Scooby Road. The site is also within 2km of a GP surgery. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+	The site is within 800m of various open spaces, including amenity green space, semi natural green space and outdoor sports facilities. The site is also within 2km of a GP surgery. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.

Corner Farm Tickhill Road, Harworth & Bircotes (LAA227)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	This site is within 400m of a bus stop, however it is not within 1km of a railway station or within 400m of a dedicated cycle route. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--	This site is a greenfield site, and the site is situated on Grade 3 agricultural land. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	--	This site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAS) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p>	--	The Council's heritage officer identifies minor negative effects to the cultural heritage, noting the location of the Grade II listed church to the west of the site. The heritage officer also suggests that

Corner Farm Tickhill Road, Harworth & Bircotes (LAA227)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.		any developments must be sensitive to the listed buildings nearby. The Council's archaeology officer notes that there is a medium-high chance of alluvium covered-archaeological remains being located within the site. Further information is also required in the form of desk based heritage assessment and evaluation in order to determine an appropriate archaeological mitigation strategy. As such, minor negative effect is likely in relation to heritage, and a significant negative effect in relation to archaeology.
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.	0?	The site is located beyond the settlement boundary of Harworth and is not located within a Landscape Policy Zone. However, it is a greenfield site which could have some impact on landscape character in that location, but this is uncertain. Therefore, a negligible but uncertain effect is identified.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 8: Water

- Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.
- If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.
- The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.

SA 13: Cultural Heritage

- Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessments and/or and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.
- Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of heritage and archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible.

Corner Farm Tickhill Road, Harworth & Bircotes (LAA227)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The draft Policies ST44: The Historic Environment and 45: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects.

Table A6 - 25: Brookside Walk, Thoresby Close & Dorchester Road, Harworth & Bircotes (LAA242)

Brookside Walk, Thoresby Close & Dorchester Road, Harworth & Bircotes (LAA242)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	--	This site contains part of a Local Wildlife Site (Snipe Park Wood) and is within 500m of an area of ancient woodland. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	++	This site could provide 105 new dwellings. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	+	This site is within 800m of a major employment site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	This site is within 800m of a primary school, a GP surgery, a post office, and the local centre of Scrooby Road. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	++/--	The site is adjacent to semi natural green space and is within 800m of open spaces such as outdoor sports facilities, civic space and children's play area. However, the site is situated on amenity green space (Thoresby Close) and semi natural green space (Snipe Park Wood) which could be lost by the development of the site. Nonetheless, even if this open space were lost, the site would still be adjacent to semi natural green space and within 800m of other open spaces. The site is also located next to a school outdoor sports facility. The site is within 800m of a GP surgery. As such, a mixed significant positive and significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	This site is within 400m of a bus stop, however it is not within 1km of a railway station or within 400m of a dedicated cycle route. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.

Brookside Walk, Thoresby Close & Dorchester Road, Harworth & Bircotes (LAA242)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--	This site is a greenfield site, and the site is situated on Grade 3 agricultural land. As such, a significant effect is likely.
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	--	This site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	-	The Council's heritage officer identifies minor negative effects to the cultural heritage of the site. In addition, the archaeology officer notes that the site is located in an area of parkland, with undated cropmarks are located close to the site. Further information is also required in the form of desk based heritage assessment and evaluation in order to determine an appropriate archaeological mitigation strategy. As such, a minor negative effect is likely in relation to both heritage and archaeology.

Brookside Walk, Thoresby Close & Dorchester Road, Harworth & Bircotes (LAA242)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	+	This site is within Idle Lowlands Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone IL11, and is classified for create. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'very poor' and it received a sensitivity score of 'low'. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity

- Development should be designed to avoid and incorporate buffers around the most sensitive parts of the designated sites and consider measures to reduce recreational pressures, such as via the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to facilitate on-site recreation.
- Development should be encouraged to incorporate green infrastructure within the allocated site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity.
- The draft Policy ST42: Biodiversity and Geodiversity promotes protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including designations, habitats and species, and is likely to go a long way to mitigating the identified effects.

SA 5: Health and Wellbeing

- Development should include sufficient replacement or alternative outdoor green space in a location easily accessible by current users and new residents/workers, to mitigate the potential loss and provide for the needs of the new development.
- Development should enhance and encourage access to the adjacent countryside.
- The draft Policy ST46: Promoting Health and Well-Being seeks to improve access to open space and promote active travel, which is likely to go some way to mitigating these effects.

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 8: Water

- Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.
- If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.

Brookside Walk, Thoresby Close & Dorchester Road, Harworth & Bircotes (LAA242)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects. 		
SA 13: Cultural Heritage		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessments and/or and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting. Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of heritage and archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible. The draft Policies ST44: The Historic Environment and 45: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects. 		

Table A6 - 26 South East of Ollerton Road, Retford (LAA246/LAA247)

South East of Ollerton Road, Retford (LAA246/LAA247)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	-	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. This assessment site is located entirely within a 5km buffer around the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	++	This site could provide 270 new dwellings. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	+?	A significant portion of this site is within 800m of a major employment site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely, but uncertain.

South East of Ollerton Road, Retford (LAA246/LAA247)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	This site is within 800m of a post office and the local centre of Welbeck Road. The site is also within 2km of a primary school and the town centre of Retford. A small portion of this site is within 2km of a secondary school. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+	The site is situated with close proximity to amenity green space and is within 800m of other open spaces, including children's play area, semi natural green space and outdoor sports facilities. The site is not within 2km of a GP surgery. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	A significant portion of this site is within 400m of a bus stop, however it is not within 1km of a railway station or 400m of a dedicated cycle route. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--	This site is a greenfield site, a large portion of the site is situated on Grade 2 and 3 agricultural land. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	--	This site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0?	The site is within Flood Zone 1. A small portion of the northeast corner lies within Flood Zone 3. As such, a negligible effect is likely, but uncertain.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.

South East of Ollerton Road, Retford (LAA246/LAA247)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	--	A portion of this site is within a Minerals Safeguarding Area (Sneinton Gunthorpe Clay). As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	--	The Council's archaeology officer notes that there are potential archaeological earthworks on site, with further information is required to evaluate the archaeological potential of the site in order to determine an appropriate mitigation strategy. No further comments were made by the heritage officer. As such, a negligible effect is identified in relation to heritage, and a significant negative effect in relation to archaeology.
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	-	This site is within Sherwood Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone SH57, and is classified for conserve and create. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'moderate' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity

- Development should be designed to avoid and incorporate buffers around the most sensitive parts of the designated sites and consider measures to reduce recreational pressures, such as via the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to facilitate on-site recreation.
- Development should be encouraged to incorporate green infrastructure within the allocated site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity.
- The draft Policy ST42: Biodiversity and Geodiversity promotes protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including designations, habitats and species, and is likely to go a long way to mitigating the identified effects.
- The effects on the ppSPA will be considered further through the HRA.

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

South East of Ollerton Road, Retford (LAA246/LAA247)

SA Objective

SA Score

Justification

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 8: Water

- Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.
- If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.
- The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.

SA 12: Resource Use and Waste

- Development should be focused within the area of site which lies outside Mineral Safeguarding Areas but if developments fall within safeguarding areas, the mineral resources should be worked prior to development, where possible.

SA 13: Cultural Heritage

- Applications for development should include a desk based Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.
- Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, increase public access and understanding of heritage assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible.
- The draft Policies ST44: The Historic Environment and 45: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects.

SA 14: Landscape and Townscape

- Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character.
- Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features.
- The draft Policies ST39: Landscape Character and ST37: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects.

Table A6 - 27: South east of Ollerton Road (LAA246, LAA247, LAA067)

South east of Ollerton Road (LAA246, LAA247, LAA067)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	-	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. The majority of the site is located within a 5km buffer around the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	++	This site could provide 440 new dwellings. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	+	Part of the site is within of 800m of a major employment site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	A large portion of this site is within 800m of a post office and the local centre of Welbeck Road. The site is also within 2km of a primary school. A portion of this site is within 2km of the town centre of Retford. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+	The majority of the site is within 800m of children's play areas, semi natural green space, amenity green spaces and a significant proportion of the site is within 800m of outdoor sports facilities. Part of the site is also within 800m of allotments. The site is not within 2km of a GP surgery. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	The majority of the site is within 400m of a bus stop, however is not within 1km of a railway station or within 400m of a dedicated cycle lane. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--	This site is a greenfield site and the site is situated on predominantly Grade 2 agricultural land. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.

South east of Ollerton Road (LAA246, LAA247, LAA067)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	--	The majority of this site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0?	The site is within Flood Zone 1. A small portion of the northeast corner lies within Flood Zone 3. As such, a negligible effect is likely, but uncertain.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	--	A large portion of the site is within a Mineral Safeguarding Area (Sneinton Gunthorpe Clay). As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	--	The Council's archaeology officer notes that there are undated cropmarks within the site boundary and that potential archaeological earthworks are present on the site. They note that further information is required to evaluate the archaeological potential of the site in order to determine an appropriate mitigation strategy. No further comments were made by the heritage officer. As such, a negligible effect is identified in relation to heritage, and a significant negative effect in relation to archaeology.
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	-	This site is within Sherwood Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone SH57, and is classified for conserve and create. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'moderate' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity

- Development should be designed to avoid and incorporate buffers around the most sensitive parts of the designated sites and consider measures to reduce recreational pressures, such as via the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to facilitate on-site recreation.
- Development should be encouraged to incorporate green infrastructure within the allocated site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity.
- The draft Policy ST42: Biodiversity and Geodiversity promotes protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including designations, habitats and species, and is likely to go a long way to mitigating the identified effects.
- The effects on the ppSPA will be considered further through the HRA.

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 8: Water

- Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.
- If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.
- The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.

SA 12: Resource Use and Waste

- The mineral resource should be worked prior to development where possible.

SA 13: Cultural Heritage

- Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessment to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.
- Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible.

South east of Ollerton Road (LAA246, LAA247, LAA067)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The draft Policies ST44: The Historic Environment and 45: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects. 		
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character. Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features. The draft Policies ST39: Landscape Character and ST37: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects. 		

Table A6 - 28: Grove Coach Road, Retford (LAA275)

Grove Coach Road, Retford (LAA275)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.	0	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
SA 2: Housing To ensure the District's housing need are met.	++	This site could provide 250 158 new dwellings. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
SA 3: Economy and Skills To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.	+?	A portion of this site is within 800m of a major employment site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely, but uncertain.

Grove Coach Road, Retford (LAA275)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.	+	This site is within 800m of a primary school. The site is also within 2km of a post office, the local centre of Welbeck Road, and the town centre of Retford. The majority of the site is within 2km of a GP surgery. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
SA 5: Health and Wellbeing To improve health and reduce health inequalities.	+	The site is located within 800m of semi natural green space, allotments and amenity green space. The majority of the site is situated within 2km of a GP surgery (except the southeast corner). As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
SA 6: Transport To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.	+	A significant portion of this site is within 400m of a bus stop, however it is not within 1km of a railway station or within 400m of a dedicated cycle route. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
SA 7: Land Use and Soils To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.	--	This site is a greenfield site, and the site is situated on Grade 3 agricultural land. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
SA 8: Water To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.	0	This site is not within a Source Protection Zone. As such a negligible effect is likely.
SA 9: Flood Risk To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.	0?	The site is within Flood Zone 1. A small portion of the western boundary lies within Flood Zone 2. As such, a negligible effect is likely, but uncertain.
SA 10: Air Quality To improve air quality.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.

Grove Coach Road, Retford (LAA275)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	--	The Council's archaeology officer notes that there is no specific site information, however Iron Age and Romano-British occupation activity is noted to the south-west following evaluation and excavation. However, further information is required to evaluate the archaeological potential of the site in order to determine an appropriate mitigation strategy. No further comments were made by the heritage officer. As such, a negligible effect is likely in relation to heritage, and a significant negative effect in relation to archaeology.
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	--	The majority of this site is within Mid-Nottinghamshire Farmland Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone MN04, and is classified for conserve. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'very good' and it received a sensitivity score of 'high'. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 14: Landscape and Townscape

- Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character.
- Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features.

Grove Coach Road, Retford (LAA275)

SA Objective

SA Score

Justification

- The draft Policies ST39: Landscape Character and ST37: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects.

Table A6 - 29: North of Thornhill Road, Harworth & Bircotes (LAA288)

North of Thornhill Road, Harworth & Bircotes (LAA288)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	0	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	++	This site could provide 209 new dwellings. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	0	This site is in excess of 800m of a major employment site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	This site is within 800m of a post office and the local centre of Harworth Main Street. The site is also within 2km of a primary school and a GP surgery. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+	The site is situated within 800m of amenity green space, outdoor sports facilities and a cemetery. The site is also located within 2km of a GP surgery. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	A portion of this site is within 400m of a bus stop, however it is not within 1km of a railway station or within 400m of a dedicated cycle route. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.

North of Thornhill Road, Harworth & Bircotes (LAA288)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--	This site is a greenfield site, and the site is situated on Grade 3 agricultural land. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	--	This site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0?	The majority of this site is within Flood Zone 1. A small portion along the north/north eastern boundary lies within Flood Zone 3. As such, a negligible effect is likely, but uncertain.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAS) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	--	The Council's heritage officer identifies minor negative effects to the cultural heritage of the site. The Council's archaeology officer notes that there is a medium-high chance of archaeological remains being located within the site, including crop marks. Further information is also required in the form of desk based heritage assessment and evaluation in order to determine an appropriate archaeological mitigation strategy. As such, a minor negative effect is likely in relation to heritage, and a significant negative effect in relation to archaeology.

North of Thornhill Road, Harworth & Bircotes (LAA288)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	+	This site is within Idle Lowlands Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone IL11, and is classified for create. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'very poor' and it received a sensitivity score of 'low'. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 8: Water

- Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.
- If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.
- The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.

SA 13: Cultural Heritage

- Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessments and/or and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.
- Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of heritage and archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible.
- The draft Policies ST44: The Historic Environment and 45: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects.

Table A6 - 30: North View Farm, Bawtry Road, Harworth & Bircotes (LAA346)

North View Farm, Bawtry Road, Harworth & Bircotes (LAA346)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	-	A significant portion of this site is within 100m of a Local Wildlife Site (Bawtry Road, Bircotes). As such a minor negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	+	This site could provide 75 new dwellings. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	+	A significant portion of this site is within 800m of a major employment site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	0	This site is within 2km of a primary school, a GP surgery, a post office, and the local centres of Harworth Main Street and Scrooby Road. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+	The site is located within 800m of various open spaces, including amenity green space, semi natural green space, children's play area and outdoor sports facilities. The site is also located within 2km of a GP surgery. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	A portion of this site is within 400m of a bus stop, however it is not within 1km of a railway station or within 400m of a dedicated cycle route. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--	This site is a greenfield site, and the site is situated on Grade 3 agricultural land. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.

North View Farm, Bawtry Road, Harworth & Bircotes (LAA346)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	--	This site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	--	The Council's heritage officer identifies minor negative effects to the cultural heritage of the site. The Council's archaeology officer notes that there is a medium-high chance of significant archaeological remains being located within the site, including crop marks. Further information is also required in the form of desk based heritage assessment and evaluation in order to determine an appropriate archaeological mitigation strategy. As such, a minor negative effect is likely in relation to heritage, and a significant negative effect in relation to archaeology.
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	+	This site is within Idle Lowlands Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone IL11, and is classified for create. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'very poor' and it received a sensitivity score of 'low'. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified		
SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development should be designed to avoid and incorporate buffers around the most sensitive parts of the designated sites and consider measures to reduce recreational pressures, such as via the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to facilitate on-site recreation. • Development should be encouraged to incorporate green infrastructure within the allocated site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity. • The draft Policy ST42: Biodiversity and Geodiversity promotes protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including designations, habitats and species, and is likely to go a long way to mitigating the identified effects. 		
SA 7: Land Use and Soils		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site. • The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land. 		
SA 8: Water		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution. • If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans. • The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects. 		
SA 13: Cultural Heritage		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessments and/or and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting. • Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of heritage and archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible. • The draft Policies ST44: The Historic Environment and 45: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects. 		

Table A6 - 31: Land to the north of Gateford Toll Bar and east of A57, Shireoaks (LAA365)

Land to the north of Gateford Toll Bar and east of A57, Shireoaks (LAA365)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	-	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. This assessment site is located entirely within a 5km buffer around the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	+	This site could provide 45 new dwellings. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	+	This site is within 800m of a major employment site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	This site is within 800m of a primary school. A portion of the site is within 800m of a post office. The site is also within 2km of the local centre of Celtic Point. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+	The site is located within 800m of amenity green space and semi natural green space, with a children's play area within 800m of the southwestern part of the site The site is not within 2km of a GP surgery. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	++	This site is within 400m of a dedicated cycle lane and is adjacent to a bus stop. A portion of the site is also within 1km of a railway station. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--	This site is a greenfield site, and the site is situated on Grade 3 agricultural land. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.

Land to the north of Gateford Toll Bar and east of A57, Shireoaks (LAA365)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	--	This site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	-	The site is located adjacent to the Old Gateford Conservation Area. The Council's heritage officer advises that development of this site could result in minor negative effects with regards to cultural heritage. The Council's archaeology officer notes that there is no specific site information and that further information is required in the form of desk based heritage assessment and evaluation in order to determine an appropriate archaeological mitigation strategy. As such, a minor negative effect is likely in relation to both heritage and archaeology.
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	-	This site is within Magnesian Limestone Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone ML08, and is classified for conserve and reinforce. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'good' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.

Land to the north of Gateford Toll Bar and east of A57, Shireoaks (LAA365)

SA Objective

SA Score

Justification

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity

- Development should be designed to avoid and incorporate buffers around the most sensitive parts of the designated sites and consider measures to reduce recreational pressures, such as via the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to facilitate on-site recreation.
- Development should be encouraged to incorporate green infrastructure within the allocated site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity.
- The draft Policy ST42: Biodiversity and Geodiversity promotes protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including designations, habitats and species, and is likely to go a long way to mitigating the identified effects.
- The effects on the ppSPA will be considered further through the HRA.

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 8: Water

- Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.
- If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.
- The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.

SA 13: Cultural Heritage

- Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessments and/or and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.
- Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of heritage and archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible.
- The draft Policies ST44: The Historic Environment and 45: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects.

Land to the north of Gateford Toll Bar and east of A57, Shireoaks (LAA365)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character. Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features. The draft Policies ST39: Landscape Character and ST37: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects. 		

Table A6 - 32: Former Elizabethan School, Leafield, Retford (LAA413)

Former Elizabethan School, Leafield, Retford (LAA413)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.	0	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
SA 2: Housing To ensure the District's housing need are met.	+	This site could provide 46 new dwellings. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
SA 3: Economy and Skills To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.	+	The site is within 800m of a major employment site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.	+	This site is within 800m of a post office, primary and secondary school, and GP surgery. The site is also partially within 800m of Retford Town Centre, with the remainder of the site within 2km. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.

Former Elizabethan School, Leafield, Retford (LAA413)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	++	The site is within 800m of a GP surgery and amenity green space, allotments, a cemetery, children's play area, parks and gardens, and semi-natural green space. The site is also within 2km of other open spaces including outdoor sports facilities, and civic space. As such, a major positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	This site is within 400m of a bus stop, however it is not within 1km of a railway station or within 400m of a dedicated cycle route. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	++	This site is a brownfield. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	--	This site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAS) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p>	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.

Former Elizabethan School, Leafield, Retford (LAA413)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).		
SA 13: Cultural Heritage To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.	0	The Council's heritage officer notes that there are no conservation concerns with the allocation of this site. The archaeology officer notes that there is no known archaeological impact, and subsequently no objection from archaeological grounds. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.	0?	The site is located within the urban area of Retford and its development would not lead to the loss of landscape features or the redevelopment of derelict land. As such, a negligible effect is likely, but uncertain.
General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified		
SA 8: Water		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution. If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans. The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects. 		

Table A6 - 33: Car Park & Builders Yard, Gateford Road, Worksop (LAA465)⁸²

Car Park & Builders Yard, Gateford Road, Worksop (LAA465)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	-	A significant portion of this site is within 100m of a Local Wildlife Site (Chesterfield Canal). This assessment site is located entirely within a 5km buffer around the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.

⁸² Note that this site is also being considered through the Worksop DPD as sites DPD003 and DPD004

Car Park & Builders Yard, Gateford Road, Worksop (LAA465)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.		
SA 2: Housing To ensure the District's housing need are met.	+	This site could provide 30 new dwellings. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
SA 3: Economy and Skills To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.	+	This site is within 800m of a major employment site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.	++	This site is within 800m of all key services and the town centre of Worksop. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
SA 5: Health and Wellbeing To improve health and reduce health inequalities.	++	The site is located within 800m of various open spaces, including civic space, amenity green space, a cemetery, children's play area and parks and gardens. The site is also located in close proximity (less than 100m) to a GP surgery (Christine Park). As such a significant positive effect is likely.
SA 6: Transport To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.	++	This site is adjacent to a dedicated cycle lane and a bus stop, and is within 1km of a railway station. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
SA 7: Land Use and Soils To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.	++	This site is a brownfield site. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
SA 8: Water To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.	--	This site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.

Car Park & Builders Yard, Gateford Road, Worksop (LAA465)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	--	The site is located within the Worksop Conservation Area and the Council's heritage officer has identified a former malting complex from the 19 th century (within the site) as a positive building within the Conservation Area. Development could result in significant negative effects on this feature if it is not retained. The Council's archaeology officer notes that there is no specific site information and that further information is required in the form of desk based heritage assessment and evaluation in order to determine an appropriate archaeological mitigation strategy. As such, a significant negative effect is likely in relation to heritage, and a minor negative in relation to archaeology.
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	0?	The site is located within the urban area of Worksop and its development would not lead to the loss of landscape features or the redevelopment of derelict land. As such, an negligible uncertain effect is likely.
<p>General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified</p>		

Car Park & Builders Yard, Gateford Road, Worksop (LAA465)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Development should be designed to avoid and incorporate buffers around the most sensitive parts of the designated sites and consider measures to reduce recreational pressures, such as via the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to facilitate on-site recreation.• Development should be encouraged to incorporate green infrastructure within the allocated site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity.• The draft Policy ST42: Biodiversity and Geodiversity promotes protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including designations, habitats and species, and is likely to go a long way to mitigating the identified effects.• The effects on the ppSPA will be considered further through the HRA.		
SA 8: Water		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.• If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.• The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.		
SA 13: Cultural Heritage		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessments and/or and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.• Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of heritage and archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible.• The draft Policies ST44: The Historic Environment and 45: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects.		

Table A6 - 34: Station Road, Retford (LAA472)

Station Road, Retford (LAA472)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	0	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	+	This site could provide 5 new dwellings. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	+	This site is within 800m of a major employment site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	++	This site is within 800m of the town centre of Retford, as well as a primary school, a post office, and the local centre of Welbeck Road and. The site is also within 2km of a secondary school and a GP surgery. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+	The site is located within 800m of various open spaces, including allotments, children's play area, amenity green space, cemetery and parks and gardens. The site is also located within 2km of a GP surgery. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	This site is adjacent to a bus stop and a railway station, however it is not within 400m of a dedicated cycle lane. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p>	++	This site is brownfield land. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.

Station Road, Retford (LAA472)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.		
SA 8: Water To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.	--	This site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
SA 9: Flood Risk To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
SA 10: Air Quality To improve air quality.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAS) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 11: Climate Change To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 12: Resource Use and Waste To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
SA 13: Cultural Heritage To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.	--	The site is located within Retford Station and West Fields Conservation Area. The Council's heritage officer notes that significant negative effects could occur as a result of development, although development could also facilitate improvements to this part of the Conservation Area. No known archaeological assets are present. This will require further detailed assessment if taken forward. As such, a significant negative effect is likely in relation to heritage, and a minor negative effect in relation to archaeology.

Station Road, Retford (LAA472)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	0?	The site is located within the urban area of Retford and its development would not lead to the loss of landscape features or the redevelopment of derelict land. As such, a negligible uncertain effect is likely.
<p>General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified</p> <p>SA 8: Water</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution. • If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans. • The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects. <p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applications for development should include a desk based Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting. • Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, increase public access and understanding of heritage assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible. • The draft Policies ST44: The Historic Environment and 45: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects. 		

Table A6 - 35: Milnercroft, Trinity Road, Retford (LAA485)

Milnercroft, Trinity Road, Retford (LAA485)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	0	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.

Milnercoft, Trinity Road, Retford (LAA485)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	+	This site could provide 5 new dwellings. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	+	The site is within 800m of a major employment site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	This site is within 800m of a post office, primary school and secondary school. The site is also within 2km of a GP surgery and Retford Town Centre. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+/-	The site is within 800m of amenity green space, including a cemetery, children's play area and semi-natural green space. The site is also within 2km of a GP surgery and other open spaces including parks and gardens, outdoor sports facilities, and civic space. As such, a minor positive effect is likely. However, there are allotments onsite which could be lost to development so there may also be a significant negative effect in combination.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	This site is within 400m of a bus stop, however it is not within 1km of a railway station or within 400m of a dedicated cycle route. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	-	This site is a greenfield site. This site is not classified as agricultural land. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	--	This site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p>	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.

Milnercoft, Trinity Road, Retford (LAA485)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.		
SA 10: Air Quality To improve air quality.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 11: Climate Change To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 12: Resource Use and Waste To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
SA 13: Cultural Heritage To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.	0	The Council's heritage officer notes that there are no conservation concerns with the allocation of this site. The archaeology officer notes that there is no know archaeological impact, and subsequently no objection from archaeological grounds. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.	0?	The site is located within the urban area of Retford. However, it is a greenfield site which could have some impact on landscape character in that location, but this is uncertain. Therefore, a negligible but uncertain effect is identified.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 8: Water

- Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.
- If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.

Milnercoft, Trinity Road, Retford (LAA485)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects. 		

Table A6 - 36: St Michael's, Hallcroft Road, Retford (LAA490)

St Michael's, Hallcroft Road, Retford (LAA490)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	0	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	+	This site could provide 20 new dwellings. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	+	A portion of this site is within 800m of a major employment site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	This site is within 800m of a post office, primary school, GP surgery, and Retford Town Centre. The site is also within 2km of a secondary school. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	++	The site is within 800m of a GP surgery and amenity green space, allotments, a cemetery, children's play area, parks and gardens, civic space, and semi-natural green space. The site is also within 2km of outdoor sports facilities. As such, a major positive effect is likely.

St Michael's, Hallcroft Road, Retford (LAA490)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	This site is within 400m of a bus stop, however it is not within 1km of a railway station or within 400m of a dedicated cycle route. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	++	This site is a brownfield. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	--	This site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAS) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	0	A small proportion of the site is within a Minerals Safeguarding Area for sand and gravel. However, the majority of the site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p>	-	The Council's heritage officer has identified that the site is located in the setting of several listed buildings, including Grade II West Retford Hotel. The site is also located in the setting of the

St Michael's, Hallcroft Road, Retford (LAA490)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.		Retford Conservation Area. In addition, the Council's archaeology officer notes that whilst there is no known archaeological impact, there will be some impact on the setting of listed buildings. There is no objection in principle subject to design/layout/scale/materials which helps to preserve the setting of the nearby Conservation Area and Listed Building. In addition, an impact assessment on designated assets is required. As such, a minor negative effect is likely in relation to both heritage and archaeology.
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	0?	The site is located within the urban area of Retford and its development would not lead to the loss of landscape features or the redevelopment of derelict land. As such, a negligible effect is likely, but uncertain.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 8: Water

- Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.
- If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.
- The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.

SA 13: Cultural Heritage

- Applications for development should include a desk based Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.
- Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessment to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.
- Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, increase public access and understanding of heritage assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible.
- The draft Policies ST44: The Historic Environment and 45: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects.

Table A6 - 37: Trinity Farm, Retford (LAA133 and LAA134) - Mixed use (housing and employment) site

Trinity Farm land North Road, Retford (LAA133 and LAA134)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	-	There are no local designations within 100m of the site; however, the site is within 500m of a SSSI (Sutton and Lound Gravel Pits). As such, a minor negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	++	The adjoining site has planning permission for 196 dwellings and it is noted that this site could accommodate a further 305 dwellings. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	++	This site could provide 11.11ha of employment land. The site also falls within 800m of a major employment area. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	The site is located within 2km of a post office. Part of the Site is located within 800m walking distance of Hallcroft Primary School and Elizabeth Academy (Secondary School). The site is also partially within 2km of a GP surgery. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+	The site is located within 800m of open space, including amenity green space, allotments and a children's play area. The site is predominantly not within 2km of a GP surgery; with only the southeast area of the site within that boundary. Overall, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	The site is within 400m of a bus stop. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--	This site is a greenfield site, and the site is situated on Grade 2 agricultural land. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	--	This site is within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p>	--	A small proportion of the site is within Flood Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.

Trinity Farm land North Road, Retford (LAA133 and LAA134)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.		
SA 10: Air Quality To improve air quality.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 11: Climate Change To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 12: Resource Use and Waste To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).	--	This site is within a Mineral Safeguarding Area (Sand and Gravel Resource). As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
SA 13: Cultural Heritage To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.	--	The Council's archaeology and heritage officers note that the northern part of the site lies within an archaeological zone. In addition, the Council's archaeology officer notes that the site contains potentially significant crop marks of field and settlement remains. Further information is required to evaluate the archaeological potential of the site in order to determine an appropriate mitigation strategy. As such, a minor negative effect is likely in relation to heritage, and a significant negative effect in relation to archaeology.
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.	-	The majority of this site is within Idle Lowlands Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone IL10, and is classified for conserve and reinforce. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'good' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.
General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified		
SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development should be designed to avoid and incorporate buffers around the most sensitive parts of the designated sites and consider measures to reduce recreational pressures, such as via the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to facilitate on-site recreation. Development should be encouraged to incorporate green infrastructure within the allocated site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity. 		

Trinity Farm land North Road, Retford (LAA133 and LAA134)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
		<p>Policy ST40: Biodiversity and Geodiversity promotes protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including designations, habitats and species, and is likely to go a long way to mitigating the identified effects. SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development.• Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.• Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.
		<p>SA 8: Water</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.• If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.• Policy ST53: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.
		<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Development should avoid parts of the site at highest risk of flooding, which could be retained as green space.• Developments should utilise SuDS, or where this is not possible, alternative surface water drainage to help mitigate the risk of flooding by safely managing surface water issues.• Policy ST52: Flood Risk and Drainage should help to mitigate any negative effects, as it requires development to address effects of the proposed development on flood risk and avoid areas at highest risk of flooding.
		<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The mineral resource should be worked prior to development where possible.
		<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessment to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.• Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible.
		<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character.

Trinity Farm land North Road, Retford (LAA133 and LAA134)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features.• Policies ST37: Landscape Character and ST35: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects.

Table A6 - 39: Land north of Bevercotes Lane, Tuxford (NP03, LAA089)

Land north of Bevercotes Lane, Tuxford (NP03, LAA089)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	0	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	+	The site could provide 21 new dwellings. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	+	This site is within 800m of a major employment site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	This site is within 800m of a primary school, a GP surgery, a post office and the Local Centre of Tuxford. The site is also within 2km of a secondary school. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	++	The site is within 800m of various opens spaces, such as a cemetery, children's play area and amenity green space. The site is also within 800m of a GP surgery. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	This site is within 400m of a bus stop, however it is not within 1km of a railway station or within 400m of a dedicated cycle lane. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>TO encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--	The site is a greenfield site and the site is situated on Grade 2 agricultural land. As such, a significate negative effect is likely.

Land north of Bevercotes Lane, Tuxford (NP03, LAA089)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	0	This site is not within a Source Protection Zone. As such a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	--	The site is located within a Conservation Area; contributing to the character of the Conservation Area and the setting of listed buildings located nearby. The Council's heritage officer notes that the southern part of the site could accommodate small developments (1-2 storey dwellings) that have a lower position compared to the surrounding landscape. However, the heritage officer also notes that any developments on the northern part of the site would not be supported, as developments would affect the rural character of that part of the Conservation Area which has elevated topography. As such, a significant negative effect is likely. The Council's archaeology officer notes that an earthwork bank is in the field to the east (now destroyed) and cropmarks are recorded to the west. Furthermore, ridge and furrow cultivation is recorded south of the site. As such, further information is required in the form of initial desk based heritage assessment with possible further

Land north of Bevercotes Lane, Tuxford (NP03, LAA089)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
		requirements for evaluation in order to determine an appropriate mitigation strategy. A minor negative effect is identified in relation to archaeology.
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	-	This site is within Mid-Nottinghamshire Farmlands Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone MN11 and is classified for conserve and reinforce. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'good' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 13: Cultural Heritage

- Applications for development should include a desk based Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.
- Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, increase public access and understanding of heritage assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible.
- The draft Policies ST44: The Historic Environment and 45: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects.

SA 14: Landscape and Townscape

- Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character.
- Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features.
- The draft Policies ST39: Landscape Character and ST37: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects.

Table A6 - 40: Land south of Ollerton Road, Tuxford (LAA476A)

Land south of Ollerton Road, Tuxford (LAA476A)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	0	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	+	This site could provide 75 new dwellings. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	+	This site is within 800m of a major employment site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	The site is within 800m of a primary school, a GP surgery, a post office and the Local Centre of Tuxford. The site is also within 2km of a secondary school. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	++	The site is within 800m of various opens spaces, such as a cemetery, civic space, children's play area and amenity green space. In addition, the site is within 800m of semi natural greenspace and a GP surgery. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	The site is within 400m of a bus stop, however it is not within 1km of a railway station or within 400m of a dedicated cycle lane. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>TO encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--	The site is a greenfield site and the site is situated on Grade 2 agricultural land. As such, a significate negative effect is likely.

Land south of Ollerton Road, Tuxford (LAA476A)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	0	This site is not within a Source Protection Zone. As such a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	--	The site (alongside Ollerton Road) is located in the setting of a Conservation Area and various listed buildings. The Council's heritage officer notes that views would not be affected by developments at the site; with no conservation concerns associated with the site. As such, a negligible effect is likely in relation to cultural heritage. The archaeology officer notes that there are concentrations of Neolithic flint tools and debitage recorded to the west of the site, and a scatter of Neolithic flints recorded to the north. In addition, ridge and furrow cultivation is present to the north-east. Therefore, there is moderate potential for Neolithic flint finds and later features. As such, further information is required including results of a field walking survey to identify concentrations of flint scatters and geophysical survey to identify features. There may also be possible further requirements for evaluation including trial trenching to determine mitigation A significant negative effect is identified in relation to archaeology.

Land south of Ollerton Road, Tuxford (LAA476A)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.	-	This site is within Mid-Nottinghamshire Farmlands Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone MN11 and is classified for conserve and reinforce. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'good' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 14: Landscape and Townscape

- Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character.
- Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features.
- The draft Policies ST39: Landscape Character and ST37: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects.

Table A6 - 41: Land west of Newcastle Street, Tuxford (NP05, LAA477)

Land west of Newcastle Street, Tuxford (NP05, LAA477)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	0	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	+	The site could provide 59 new dwellings. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	+	This site is within 800m of a major employment site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	This site is within 800m of a primary school, a GP surgery, a post office and the Local Centre of Tuxford. The site is also within 2km of a secondary school. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	++	The site is within 800m of various opens spaces, such as a cemetery, children's play area and amenity green space. The site is also within 800m of a GP surgery. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	This site is within 400m of a bus stop; however it is not within 1km of a railway station or within 400m of a dedicated cycle lane. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>TO encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--	The site is a greenfield site and the site is situated on Grade 2 agricultural land. As such, a significate negative effect is likely.

Land west of Newcastle Street, Tuxford (NP05, LAA477)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	0	This site is not within a Source Protection Zone. As such a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	-	This site is located in the setting of a Conservation Area, although the Council's heritage officer notes that there are no listed buildings in the nearest part of the Conservation Area (Newcastle Street). These buildings are considered to have a neutral impact on the Conservation Area's character and appearance. The heritage officer also notes that the site does contribute to the countryside character of the Conservation Area, with only one important view from Long Lane towards the church, which would not be directly affected. If not appropriately designed, development could affect the setting of the Conservation Area and the setting of nearby listed buildings (especially the church). As such, a minor negative effect is likely in relation to cultural heritage. The Council's archaeology office notes that two earthwork banks (scarps) are recorded along the eastern boundary, and that further information is required in the form of an initial desk based heritage

Land west of Newcastle Street, Tuxford (NP05, LAA477)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
		assessment with possible further requirements for evaluation in order to determine an appropriate mitigation strategy. A minor negative effect has been identified in relation to archaeology.
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	-	This site is within Mid-Nottinghamshire Farmlands Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone MN11 and is classified for conserve and reinforce. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'good' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 13: Cultural Heritage

- Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, increase public access and understanding of heritage.

SA 14: Landscape and Townscape

- Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character.
- Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features.
- The draft Policies ST39: Landscape Character and ST37: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects.

Table A6 - 42: Triangular site north of railway line and south of St John's College Farm NP16 site, Tuxford (NP06, LAA478)

Triangular site north of railway line and south of St John's College Farm NP16 site, Tuxford (NP06, LAA478)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	0	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	+	The site could provide 6 new dwelling. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	+	This site is within 800m of a major employment site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	This site is within 800m of a primary school, a GP surgery, a post office and the Local Centre of Tuxford. The site is also within 2km of a secondary school. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	++	The site is within 800m of various opens spaces, such as a cemetery, children's play area and amenity green space. The site is also within 800m of a GP surgery. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	This site is within 400m of a bus stop, however it is not within 1km of a railway station or within 400m of a dedicated cycle lane. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>TO encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--	The site is a greenfield site and the site is situated on Grade 2 agricultural land. As such, a significate negative effect is likely.

Triangular site north of railway line and south of St John's College Farm NP16 site, Tuxford (NP06, LAA478)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	0	This site is not within a Source Protection Zone. As such a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	--	The site is located within a Conservation Area, although the nearest part of the Conservation Area does not contribute significantly to its character and appearance. The Council's heritage officer notes that the site is shielded from views eastwards from Egmonton Road, although notes that development could result in a minor negative effect on this SA objective. The archaeology officer notes that the entire site contains a medieval ridge and furrow earthworks are recorded. It is the last large area of surviving ridge and furrow in the settlement and is a significant part of the conservation area. As such, further information is required in the form of a detailed earthwork survey to inform quality of surviving earthworks. It is noted that it is likely that even if low quality, in conjunction with its contribution to the CA, recommendation would be for refusal for development. A significant negative effect is identified in relation to archaeology.

Triangular site north of railway line and south of St John's College Farm NP16 site, Tuxford (NP06, LAA478)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	-	<p>This site is within Mid-Nottinghamshire Farmlands Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone MN11 and is classified for conserve and reinforce. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'good' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.</p>

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 13: Cultural Heritage

- Applications for development should include a desk based Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.
- Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, increase public access and understanding of heritage assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible.
- The draft Policies ST44: The Historic Environment and 45: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects.

SA 14: Landscape and Townscape

- Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character.
- Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features.
- The draft Policies ST39: Landscape Character and ST37: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects.

Table A6 - 43: Eastfield Nurseries, Darlton Road, Tuxford (NP09, LAA038)

Eastfield Nurseries, Darlton Road, Tuxford (NP09, LAA038)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	0	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	+	The site could provide 30 new dwellings. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	0	This site is in excess of 800m of a major employment site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	++	This site is within 800m of all services and the Local Centre of Tuxford. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+	The site is within 800m of a few opens spaces, such as an outdoor sport's facility. The site is also within 2km of a GP surgery. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	This site is within 400m of a bus stop, however it is not within 1km of a railway station or within 400m of a dedicated cycle lane. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>TO encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--	The site is a greenfield site and the site is situated on Grade 3 agricultural land. As such, a significate negative effect is likely.

Eastfield Nurseries, Darlton Road, Tuxford (NP09, LAA038)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	0	This site is not within a Source Protection Zone. As such a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0?	A small portion of the western boundary of the site is within Flood Zone 3. As such, a negligible effect is likely, but uncertain.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	-	The Council's heritage officer notes that no heritage assets would be affected by the allocation of the site. As such, a negligible effect is likely in relation to cultural heritage. The archaeology officer notes that there is no site specific information but that the site is adjacent to the 19 th century gas works. Further information is required in the form of an initial desk-based heritage assessment with possible further requirements for evaluation in order to determine an appropriate mitigation strategy. As such, a minor negative effect is identified in relation to archaeology.
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p>	--	This site is within Mid-Nottinghamshire Farmlands Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone MN11 and MN08. Landscape Policy Zone MN11 is classified for conserve and reinforce. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'good' and it received a sensitivity score

Eastfield Nurseries, Darlton Road, Tuxford (NP09, LAA038)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.		of 'moderate'. Landscape Policy Zone MN08 is classified for conserve. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'very good' and it received a sensitivity score of 'very high'. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified		
SA 7: Land Use and Soils		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site. The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land. 		
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character. Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features. The draft Policies ST39: Landscape Character and ST37: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects. 		

Table A6 - 44: Land to the rear of Ashvale Road, Tuxford (NP11, LAA087)

Land to the rear of Ashvale Road, Tuxford (NP11, LAA087)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.	0	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
SA 2: Housing	+	The site could provide 60 new dwellings. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.

Land to the rear of Ashvale Road, Tuxford (NP11, LAA087)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
To ensure the District's housing need are met.		
SA 3: Economy and Skills To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.	+	This site is within 800m of a major employment site, with two employment sites adjacent to the east and west. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.	++	Part of the site is within 800m of services including a primary school, GP surgery, post office and the Local Centre of Tuxford. The entirety of the site is within 800m of a secondary school. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
SA 5: Health and Wellbeing To improve health and reduce health inequalities.	+	The site is within 800m of various opens spaces, such as an allotment, cemetery, children's play area and amenity green space. The majority of the site is also within 800m of a GP surgery. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
SA 6: Transport To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.	+	The majority of this site is within 400m of a bus stop, however it is not within 1km of a railway station or within 400m of a dedicated cycle lane. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
SA 7: Land Use and Soils TO encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.	--	The site is a greenfield site and the site is situated on Grade 2 agricultural land. As such, a significate negative effect is likely.
SA 8: Water To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.	0	This site is not within a Source Protection Zone. As such a negligible effect is likely.
SA 9: Flood Risk To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.

Land to the rear of Ashvale Road, Tuxford (NP11, LAA087)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	--	The Council's heritage officer notes that no heritage assets would be affected by the allocation of the site. As such, a negligible effect is likely in relation to cultural heritage. The archaeology officer notes that there are earthworks recorded on the site, along with cropmarks. Therefore, further information is required in the form of an initial desk based heritage assessment to include the results of a geophysical survey and survey of the earthwork if appropriate. Furthermore, possible further requirements for evaluation in order to determine an appropriate mitigation strategy may be required. As such, a significant negative effect is identified in relation to cultural heritage.
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	-	This site is within Mid-Nottinghamshire Farmlands Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone MN11 and is classified for conserve and reinforce. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'good' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.
<p>General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified</p> <p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site. 		

Land to the rear of Ashvale Road, Tuxford (NP11, LAA087)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land. 		
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character. Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features. The draft Policies ST39: Landscape Character and ST37: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects. 		

Table A6 - 45: Land at St John's College Farm, off Newcastle Street, Tuxford (NP16, LAA202)

Land at St John's College Farm, off Newcastle Street, Tuxford (NP16, LAA202)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	0	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	+	The site could provide 51 new dwellings. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	+	This site is within 800m of a major employment site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.

Land at St John's College Farm, off Newcastle Street, Tuxford (NP16, LAA202)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	This site is within 800m of a primary school, a GP surgery, a post office and the Local Centre of Tuxford. The site is also within 2km of a secondary school. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	++	The site is within 800m of various opens spaces, such as a cemetery, children's play area and amenity green space. The site is also within 800m of a GP surgery. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	This site is within 400m of a bus stop, however it is not within 1km of a railway station or within 400m of a dedicated cycle lane. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>TO encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--	The site is a greenfield site and the site is situated on Grade 2 agricultural land. As such, a significate negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	0	This site is not within a Source Protection Zone. As such a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.

Land at St John's College Farm, off Newcastle Street, Tuxford (NP16, LAA202)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	--	<p>A small part of the site is within an area identified as having potential for archaeology. This will require further detailed assessment if taken forward. The site is located within the Conservation Area and is part of an area of open space that is considered to have a positive impact on the Conservation Area. The heritage officer also notes that the site includes a historic agricultural building range, which provides a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. A Grade II listed building is also located adjacent to the site and the setting of this could be harmed by development. As such, a significant negative effect is likely in relation to cultural heritage.</p> <p>The archaeology officer notes that the entire site contains a medieval ridge and furrow earthworks. It is the last large area of surviving ridge and furrow in the settlement and is a significant part of the conservation area. As such, further information is required in the form of a detailed earthwork survey to inform quality of surviving earthworks. It is noted that it is likely that even if low quality, in conjunction with its contribution to the CA, recommendation would be for refusal for development. A significant negative effect is identified in relation to archaeology.</p>
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	-	This site is within Mid-Nottinghamshire Farmlands Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone MN11 and is classified for conserve and reinforce. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'good' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.
<p>General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified</p> <p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p>		

Land at St John's College Farm, off Newcastle Street, Tuxford (NP16, LAA202)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site. The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land. 		
SA 13: Cultural Heritage		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applications for development should include a desk based Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting. Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, increase public access and understanding of heritage assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible. The draft Policies ST44: The Historic Environment and 45: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects. 		
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character. Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features. The draft Policies ST39: Landscape Character and ST37: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects. 		

Table A6 - 46: Land at 56 Lincoln Road, Tuxford (NP17, LAA158)

Land at 56 Lincoln Road, Tuxford (NP17, LAA158)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	0	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p>	+	The site could provide 9 new dwellings. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.

Land at 56 Lincoln Road, Tuxford (NP17, LAA158)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
To ensure the District's housing need are met.		
SA 3: Economy and Skills To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.	+	This site is within 800m of a major employment site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.	++	This site is within 800m of all services and the Local Centre of Tuxford. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
SA 5: Health and Wellbeing To improve health and reduce health inequalities.	++	The site is within 800m of various opens spaces, such as a cemetery, children's play area and amenity green space. The site is also within 800m of a GP surgery. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
SA 6: Transport To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.	+	This site is adjacent to a bus stop, however it is not within 1km of a railway station or within 400m of a dedicated cycle lane. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
SA 7: Land Use and Soils TO encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.	--	The site is a greenfield site and the site is situated on Grade 2 agricultural land. As such, a significate negative effect is likely.
SA 8: Water To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.	0	This site is not within a Source Protection Zone. As such a negligible effect is likely.
SA 9: Flood Risk To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.

Land at 56 Lincoln Road, Tuxford (NP17, LAA158)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
SA 10: Air Quality To improve air quality.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 11: Climate Change To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 12: Resource Use and Waste To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
SA 13: Cultural Heritage To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.	--	<p>This site is identified as having potential for archaeology. This will require further detailed assessment if taken forward. Part of the site is located within a Conservation Area and contains a historic building range that has been regarded as having a positive impact on the Conservation Area's character and appearance. The Council's heritage officer notes that the loss of the historic building range would not be supported; suggesting that the site is removed from the boundary of the building. The site is also located close to a Grade II listed building on Lincoln Road. The heritage officer notes that there are no concerns for development on land to the east and southeast of the site, however, development elsewhere could result in a significant negative effect.</p> <p>The archaeology officer notes that the site lies partially within the Tuxford CA and close to historic core of the settlement. In addition, it is adjacent to Grade II Listed Building 42 Lincoln Road (early C19), and also within 50m of other historic buildings including a C19 malthouse. Therefore, it is suggested that further information is required in the form of an initial desk-based heritage assessment with possible further requirements for evaluation in order to determine an appropriate mitigation strategy. A minor negative effect is expected in relation to archaeology.</p>
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.	-	This site is within Mid-Nottinghamshire Farmlands Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone MN11 and is classified for conserve and reinforce. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'good' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.

Land at 56 Lincoln Road, Tuxford (NP17, LAA158)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified		
SA 7: Land Use and Soils		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.• The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.		
SA 13: Cultural Heritage		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Applications for development should include a desk based Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.• Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, increase public access and understanding of heritage assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible.• The draft Policies ST44: The Historic Environment and 45: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects.		
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character.• Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features.• The draft Policies ST39: Landscape Character and ST37: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects.		

Table A6 - 47: Radford Street (LAA219)

Radford Street, Worksop (LAA219)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	-	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. This assessment site is located entirely within a 5km buffer around the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. As such, a minor negative uncertain effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	++	This site could provide 120 new dwellings. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	+	This site is within 800m of a major employment site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	++	This site is within 800m of all key services, the local centre of Retford Road, and the town centre of Worksop. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	++/--	The site is located within 800m of open spaces such as allotments, amenity greenspace, cemeteries, children's play area, parks and gardens, semi-natural greenspace and outdoor sports facilities. However, the site is also situated on disused allotments which would be lost by the development of the site. Nonetheless, even if this open space were lost, the site would still be within 800m of other open space. The site is also within 800m of a GP surgery. As such, a mixed significant positive and significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	This site is adjacent to a number of bus stops, and the part of the site is within 400m of a dedicated cycle lane, however it is not within 1km of a railway station. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.

Radford Street, Worksop (LAA219)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	-	This site is a greenfield site. The site is not classified as agricultural land. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	--	This site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	0	The Council's heritage officer notes that there are no conservation or archaeological concerns with the allocation of this site. The site is a significant distance from the nearest heritage asset and is well screened by several rows of dwellings. As such, a negligible effect is likely in relation to heritage and archaeology.

Radford Street, Worksop (LAA219)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.	0?	The site is located in the urban area of Worksop and its development would not lead to the loss of landscape features or the redevelopment of derelict land. As such, a negligible effect is likely, but uncertain.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity

- Development should be designed to avoid and incorporate buffers around the most sensitive parts of the designated sites and consider measures to reduce recreational pressures, such as via the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to facilitate on-site recreation.
- Development should be encouraged to incorporate green infrastructure within the allocated site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity.
- The draft Policy ST42: Biodiversity and Geodiversity promotes protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including designations, habitats and species, and is likely to go a long way to mitigating the identified effects.
- The effects on the ppSPA will be considered further through the HRA.

SA 5: Health and Wellbeing

- Development should include sufficient replacement or alternative outdoor green space in a location easily accessible by current users and new residents/workers, to mitigate the potential loss and provide for the needs of the new development.
- The draft Policy ST46: Promoting Health and Well-Being seeks to improve access to open space and promote active travel, which is likely to go some way to mitigating these effects.

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 8: Water

- Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.
- If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.

Radford Street, Worksop (LAA219)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.		

Employment Sites

Table A6 - 48: Bawtry Road, Harworth and Bircotes (LAA091)

Bawtry Road, Harworth and Bircotes (LAA091)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	--	A small portion of the north east of the site is within 100m of Ancient Woodland. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	0	This site would not provide or result in the loss of residential dwellings. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	++	This site could provide 33.5 ha of employment land. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	N/A	The location of employment sites will have no effect on this objective.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+	The site is within 800m of open spaces such as accessible countryside and semi natural green space. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	-	The site is not within 400m of a bus stop of cycle path and is also not within 1km of a railway station. As such, a minor negative effect is expected.

Bawtry Road, Harworth and Bircotes (LAA091)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
SA 7: Land Use and Soils To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.	--	This site is a greenfield site, and is situated on Grade 3 agricultural land. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
SA 8: Water To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.	--	This site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
SA 9: Flood Risk To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
SA 10: Air Quality To improve air quality.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 11: Climate Change To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 12: Resource Use and Waste To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
SA 13: Cultural Heritage To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.	-	The Council's archaeology officer noted that there are extensive crop marks around the site and that there is a potential for late Iron Age/Romano-British activity in the surrounding area to extend onto the site. The archaeology officer noted that the site will need to be subject to archaeological investigation prior to development. The Council's heritage officer recommended that Doncaster MBC are consulted given the site fronts one of the main approaches into the Bawtry Conservation Area. As such, a minor negative effect is likely in relation to heritage and a minor negative effect is likely in relation to archaeology.,

Bawtry Road, Harworth and Bircotes (LAA091)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.	+	This site is within Idle Lowlands Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone IL11, and is classified for create. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'very poor' and it received a sensitivity score of 'low'. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity

- Development should be designed to avoid and incorporate buffers around the most sensitive parts of the designated sites and consider measures to reduce recreational pressures, such as via the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to facilitate on-site recreation.
- Development should be encouraged to incorporate green infrastructure within the allocated site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity.
- Policy ST40: Biodiversity and Geodiversity promotes protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including designations, habitats and species, and is likely to go a long way to mitigating the identified effects.

SA 6: Transport

-
- Development should ensure people can travel easily, safely and sustainably, whilst managing the potential adverse effects on existing transport infrastructure and the environment in the District.
- Policy ST55: Promoting Sustainable Transport and Active Travel may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it supports development that offers a range of public transport and active travel choices. It also requires proposals for residential development of 10 or more dwellings to assist in the improvement of transport infrastructure to minimise travel demand by car, and to provide access that prioritises the needs of pedestrians and cyclists.

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 8: Water

- Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.
- If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.
- Policy ST53: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.

SA 13: Cultural Heritage

- Applications for development should include archaeological investigations, including a geophysical survey and impact assessment, with evaluation trenching.

Bawtry Road, Harworth and Bircotes (LAA091)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies ST42: The Historic Environment and 43: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects. •

Table A6 - 49: East of Markham Moor, Markham Moor (LAA263)

East of Markham Moor, Markham Moor (LAA263)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	--	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site; however, the Cliff Gate Grassland Local Wildlife Site is within the site option and Beacon Hill Grassland is adjacent to the site. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	0	This site would not provide or result in the loss of residential dwellings. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	++	This site could provide 8.5ha of employment land. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	N/A	The location of employment sites will have no effect on this objective.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	0	The site is located within 2km of CROW open access areas, amenity green space, a cemetery and a children's play area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.

East of Markham Moor, Markham Moor (LAA263)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	A large portion of the site is within 400m of a bus stop. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--	This is a greenfield site, and is situated on Grade 2 and 3 agricultural land.
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	--	The majority of this site is within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAS) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p>	--	The Council's heritage officer notes that the site is located within the setting of several listed buildings, including Markham Moor Hotel, Markham Moor House and the Milestone (all Grade II)

East of Markham Moor, Markham Moor (LAA263)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.		and development could harm the settings of these. The Council's archaeology officer notes that there is no specific site information, but that the site lies close to shrunken medieval settlement of West Markham, a Scheduled Monument. Further information is required to evaluate the archaeological potential of the site in order to determine an appropriate mitigation strategy. As such, a significant negative effect is likely in relation to both heritage and archaeology.
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.	-	The majority of this site is within Mid-Nottinghamshire Farmlands Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone MN11 and is classified for conserve and reinforce. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'very good' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity

- Development should be designed to avoid and incorporate buffers around the most sensitive parts of the designated sites and consider measures to reduce recreational pressures, such as via the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to facilitate on-site recreation.
- Development should be encouraged to incorporate green infrastructure within the allocated site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity.
- The draft Policy ST42: Biodiversity and Geodiversity promotes protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including designations, habitats and species, and is likely to go a long way to mitigating the identified effects.

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development.
- Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 8: Water

- Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.
- If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.
- The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.

East of Markham Moor, Markham Moor (LAA263)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
SA 13: Cultural Heritage		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessments and/or and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting. Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of heritage and archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible. The draft Policies ST44: The Historic Environment and 45: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects. 		
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character. Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features. The draft Policies ST39: Landscape Character and ST37: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects. 		

Table A6 – 50: Snape Lane, Harworth and Bircotes (LAA320)

Snape Lane, Harworth and Bircotes (LAA320)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.	--	The site is within 100m of a Local Wildlife Site (Coronation Clump Sandpit) and a Regionally Important Geological Site (Serlby Quarry). As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
SA 2: Housing To ensure the District's housing need are met.	0	This site would not provide or result in the loss of residential dwellings. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
SA 3: Economy and Skills	++	This site could provide 41.3ha of employment land. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.

Snape Lane, Harworth and Bircotes (LAA320)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.		
SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.	N/A	The location of employment sites will have no effect on this objective.
SA 5: Health and Wellbeing To improve health and reduce health inequalities.	+	The site is within 800m of open spaces such as amenity green space, accessible countryside and semi natural green space. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
SA 6: Transport To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.	+	A small portion of this site is within 400m of a bus stop, however the site is not within 1km of a railway station or within 400m of a dedicated cycle route. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
SA 7: Land Use and Soils To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.	--	This site is a greenfield site, and is situated on Grade 3 agricultural land. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
SA 8: Water To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.	--	This site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
SA 9: Flood Risk To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.

Snape Lane, Harworth and Bircotes (LAA320)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
SA 10: Air Quality To improve air quality.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 11: Climate Change To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 12: Resource Use and Waste To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).	--	A large proportion of the site is within a Mineral Safeguarding Area (Sherwood Sandstone). As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
SA 13: Cultural Heritage To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.	--	The site is located in a large area of open countryside with woodland backdrop, in the setting of various listed buildings and non-designated heritage assets. These include Harworth Lodge and Bawtry Lodge (both grade II Listed Buildings), and the Serlby Hall unregistered park & garden. The Council's heritage officer noted that the site highly contributes to the rural setting of all 3 heritage assets mentioned and, therefore, raised concern that development on this site would fail to preserve that rural and open countryside setting. The Council's archaeology officer noted that extensive, well-defined cropmarks have been identified on the site associated with late Iron Age/Romano-British settlement activity and post-medieval structural remains were recorded on the western boundary. The archaeology officer noted that the site will need to be subject to archaeological investigation prior to development. As such, a significant negative effect is likely in relation to heritage and a minor negative effect is likely in relation to archaeology.
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.	+	This site is within Idle Lowlands Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone IL11, and is classified for create. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'very poor' and it received a sensitivity score of 'low'. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified		
SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development should be designed to avoid and incorporate buffers around the most sensitive parts of the designated sites and consider measures to reduce recreational pressures, such as via the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to facilitate on-site recreation. 		

Snape Lane, Harworth and Bircotes (LAA320)

SA Objective

SA Score

Justification

- Development should be encouraged to incorporate green infrastructure within the allocated site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity.
- Policy ST40: Biodiversity and Geodiversity promotes protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including designations, habitats and species, and is likely to go a long way to mitigating the identified effects.

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 8: Water

- Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.
- If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.
- Policy ST53: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.

SA 12: Resource Use and Waste

- Development should be focused within the area of site which lies outside Mineral Safeguarding Areas but if developments fall within safeguarding areas, the mineral resources should be worked prior to development, where possible.

SA 13: Cultural Heritage

- Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessments and/or and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.
- Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of heritage and archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible.
- Policies ST424: The Historic Environment and 43: Designated and Non-Designated Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects.

Table A6 - 51: Apleyhead, Worksop (LAA338)

Apleyhead, Worksop (LAA338)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	--	The site is approximately 500m from a SSSI and a local wildlife site is located within the site option (Top Wood/Great Whin Covert). This assessment site is located entirely within a 5km buffer around the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. The HRA identifies that this site could support ppSPA birds. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	0	This site would not provide or result in the loss of residential dwellings. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	++	This site could provide 188.5ha of employment land. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	N/A	The location of employment sites will have no effect on this objective.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+	The site is adjacent to a country park (Clumber). The site is also located within 2km of CROW open access areas. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	A portion of the site is within 400m of a cycle path. The site is located adjacent to two bus stops. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p>	--	This is a greenfield site, the majority of which is situated on Grade 3 agricultural land. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.

Apleyhead, Worksop (LAA338)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.		
SA 8: Water To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.	--	This site is within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
SA 9: Flood Risk To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
SA 10: Air Quality To improve air quality.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAS) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 11: Climate Change To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 12: Resource Use and Waste To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
SA 13: Cultural Heritage To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.	--	The site is adjacent to Clumber Park, a registered park and garden, south of the A57. The Council's heritage officer notes that the whole site was formally part of Osberton Hall's wider park. The Council's archaeology officer notes that the east and west of the site is within an important archaeological zone. The site also includes undated cropmarks and further information is therefore required to evaluate the archaeological potential of the site in order to determine an appropriate mitigation strategy. As such, a minor negative effect is likely in relation to heritage, and a significant negative effect in relation to archaeology.

Apleyhead, Worksop (LAA338)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	-	The majority of this site is within Sherwood Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone SH40, and is classified for conserve and create. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'moderate' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity

- Development should be designed to avoid and incorporate buffers around the most sensitive parts of the designated sites and consider measures to reduce recreational pressures, such as via the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to facilitate on-site recreation.
- Development should be encouraged to incorporate green infrastructure within the allocated site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity.
- The draft Policy ST42: Biodiversity and Geodiversity promotes protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including designations, habitats and species, and is likely to go a long way to mitigating the identified effects.
- The effects on the ppSPA will be considered further through the HRA.

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development.
- Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 8: Water

- Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.
- If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.
- The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.

SA 13: Cultural Heritage

- Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessments and/or and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.

Apleyhead, Worksop (LAA338)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of heritage and archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible. The draft Policies ST44: The Historic Environment and 45: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects. 		
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character. Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features. The draft Policies ST39: Landscape Character and ST37: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects. 		

Table A6 - 52: South of Markham Moor, West Markham (LAA368)

South of Markham Moor, West Markham (LAA368)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	-	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. A portion of this assessment site is located within a 5km buffer around the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	0	This site would not provide or result in the loss of residential dwellings. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	++	This site could provide 15.9ha of employment land. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.

South of Markham Moor, West Markham (LAA368)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	N/A	The location of employment sites will have no effect on this objective.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+	The site is within 800m of a cemetery, which could be used for walking/jogging and is also partially located within 2km of amenity green space and a children's play area in the east of the site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	The majority of the site is within 400m of a bus stop. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--	This is a greenfield site, and is situated on Grade 2 and 3 agricultural land. As such a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	--	This site is within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.

South of Markham Moor, West Markham (LAA368)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	--	This site is within a Mineral Safeguarding Area (Sneinton Gunthorpe Clay). As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	--	The site is located in the setting of various designated heritage assets. These include Milton Mausoleum (Grade I) and West Markham DMV (scheduled Ancient Monument). The Council's archaeology officer noted that the site lies close to the shrunken medieval settlement of West Markham, a Scheduled Monument. The archaeology officer noted that the site will need to be subject to archaeological investigation prior to development. As such, a significant negative effect is likely in relation to heritage and archaeology.
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	-	The majority of this site is within Mid-Nottinghamshire Farmlands Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone MN11 and is classified for conserve and reinforce. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'very good' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.
<p>General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified</p> <p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development should be designed to avoid and incorporate buffers around the most sensitive parts of the designated sites and consider measures to reduce recreational pressures, such as via the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to facilitate on-site recreation. • Development should be encouraged to incorporate green infrastructure within the allocated site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity. • The draft Policy ST42: Biodiversity and Geodiversity promotes protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including designations, habitats and species, and is likely to go a long way to mitigating the identified effects. • The effects on the ppSPA will be considered further through the HRA. <p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p>		

South of Markham Moor, West Markham (LAA368)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development.Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.
SA 8: Water		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.
SA 12: Resource Use and Waste		<ul style="list-style-type: none">The mineral resource should be worked prior to development where possible.
SA 13: Cultural Heritage		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessments and/or and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of heritage and archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible.The draft Policies ST44: The Historic Environment and 45: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects.
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character.Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features.The draft Policies ST39: Landscape Character and ST37: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects.

Table A6 – 53: South of Markham Moor pt 2, West Markham (LAA527)

South of Markham Moor pt 2, West Markham (LAA527)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	-	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. A portion of this assessment site is located within a 5km buffer around the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	0	This site would not provide or result in the loss of residential dwellings. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	++	This site could provide 13.8ha of employment land. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	N/A	The location of employment sites will have no effect on this objective.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+	The site is within 800m of a cemetery, which could be used for walking/jogging and is also partially located within 2km of amenity green space and a children's play area in the east of the site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.

<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	The majority of the site is within 400m of a bus stop. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--	This is a greenfield site, and is situated on Grade 2 and 3 agricultural land. As such a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	--	This site is within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	--	This site is within a Mineral Safeguarding Area (Sneinton Gunthorpe Clay). As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p>	--	The site is located in the setting of various designated heritage assets. These include Milton Mausoleum (Grade I) and West Markham DMV (scheduled Ancient Monument). The Council's archaeology officer noted that the site lies

To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.		close to the shrunken medieval settlement of West Markham, a Scheduled Monument. The archaeology officer noted that the site will need to be subject to archaeological investigation prior to development. As such, a significant negative effect is likely in relation to heritage and archaeology.
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.	-	The site is within Mid-Nottinghamshire Farmlands Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone MN11 and is classified for conserve and reinforce. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'very good' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity

- Development should be designed to avoid and incorporate buffers around the most sensitive parts of the designated sites and consider measures to reduce recreational pressures, such as via the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to facilitate on-site recreation.
- Development should be encouraged to incorporate green infrastructure within the allocated site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity.
- Policy ST40: Biodiversity and Geodiversity promotes protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including designations, habitats and species, and is likely to go a long way to mitigating the identified effects.
- The effects on the ppSPA will be considered further through the HRA.

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development.
- Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 8: Water

- Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.
- If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.
- Policy ST53: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.

SA 12: Resource Use and Waste

- The mineral resource should be worked prior to development where possible.

SA 13: Cultural Heritage

- Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessments and/or and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.
- Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of heritage and archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible.
- Policies ST42: The Historic Environment and 43: Designated and Non-Designated Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects.

SA 14: Landscape and Townscape

- Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character.
- Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features.
- Policies ST38: Green Gaps and ST35: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects.

Table A6 – 54: South of Markham Moor pt 3, West Markham (LAA528)

South of Markham Moor pt 3, West Markham (LAA528)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.	-	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. A portion of this assessment site is located within a 5km buffer around the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.
SA 2: Housing	0	This site would not provide or result in the loss of residential dwellings. As such, a negligible effect is likely.

South of Markham Moor pt 3, West Markham (LAA528)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
To ensure the District's housing need are met.		
SA 3: Economy and Skills To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.	++	This site could provide 6.85ha of employment land. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.	N/A	The location of employment sites will have no effect on this objective.
SA 5: Health and Wellbeing To improve health and reduce health inequalities.	+	The site is within 800m of a cemetery, which could be used for walking/jogging and is also partially located within 2km of amenity green space and a children's play area in the east of the site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
SA 6: Transport To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.	+	The majority of the site is within 400m of a bus stop. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
SA 7: Land Use and Soils To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.	--	This is a greenfield site, and is situated on Grade 2 and 3 agricultural land. As such a significant negative effect is likely.
SA 8: Water	--	This site is within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.

South of Markham Moor pt 3, West Markham (LAA528)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.		
SA 9: Flood Risk To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
SA 10: Air Quality To improve air quality.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 11: Climate Change To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 12: Resource Use and Waste To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).	--	This site is within a Mineral Safeguarding Area (Sneinton Gunthorpe Clay). As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
SA 13: Cultural Heritage To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.	--	The site is located in the setting of various designated heritage assets. These include Milton Mausoleum (Grade I) and West Markham DMV (scheduled Ancient Monument). The Council's archaeology officer noted that the site lies close to the shrunken medieval settlement of West Markham, a Scheduled Monument. The archaeology officer noted that the site will need to be subject to archaeological investigation prior to development. As such, a significant negative effect is likely in relation to heritage and archaeology.
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.	-	The majority of this site is within Mid-Nottinghamshire Farmlands Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone MN11 and is classified for conserve and reinforce. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'very good' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.

South of Markham Moor pt 3, West Markham (LAA528)

SA Objective

SA Score

Justification

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity

- Development should be designed to avoid and incorporate buffers around the most sensitive parts of the designated sites and consider measures to reduce recreational pressures, such as via the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to facilitate on-site recreation.
- Development should be encouraged to incorporate green infrastructure within the allocated site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity.
- Policy ST40: Biodiversity and Geodiversity promotes protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including designations, habitats and species, and is likely to go a long way to mitigating the identified effects.
- The effects on the ppSPA will be considered further through the HRA.

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development.
- Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 8: Water

- Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.
- If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.
- Policy ST53: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.

SA 12: Resource Use and Waste

- The mineral resource should be worked prior to development where possible.

SA 13: Cultural Heritage

- Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessments and/or and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.

South of Markham Moor pt 3, West Markham (LAA528)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of heritage and archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible.• Policies ST42: The Historic Environment and 43: Designated and Non-Designated Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects.		
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character.• Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features.• Policies ST38: Green Gaps and ST35: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects.		

Table A6 - 55: High Marnham Power Station, Marnham (LAA369)

High Marnham Power Station, Marnham (LAA369)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	--	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site; however, there are local wildlife sites within the site option (Marnham Railway Yard and Fledborough to Harby Dismantled Railway) and within 100m of the site (Old Trent, Marnham). As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	0	This site would not provide or result in the loss of residential dwellings. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	++	This site could provide 149.9ha 60 ha of employment land. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	N/A	The location of employment sites will have no effect on this objective.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	-?	The site is within 2km of a cemetery which could be used for walking/jogging. However, the site also contains CROW open access land, although this appears to be restricted to a footpath, which could be lost by development of the site. As the loss of CROW open access land is a footpath, rather than open space or a sports facility, an uncertain minor negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport⁸³</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	-	There is not a railway station within 1km of the site, nor is there a bus stop within 400m. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p>	+/-	This site is a mixed greenfield/brownfield site. As such, a mixed effect is likely.

⁸³ Note that the effect recorded against SA objective 6: Transport has changed from the minor positive effect previously recorded as it has come to light that there is not a bus stop within 400m of the site.

High Marnham Power Station, Marnham (LAA369)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.		
SA 8: Water To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.	0	This site is not within a Source Protection Zone. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
SA 9: Flood Risk To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.	--	The south eastern side of the site is within Flood Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
SA 10: Air Quality To improve air quality.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 11: Climate Change To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 12: Resource Use and Waste To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).	--	A significant portion of this site is within a Mineral Safeguarding Area (Sand and Gravel Resource). As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
SA 13: Cultural Heritage To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.	--	The Council's heritage officer notes that the site is located in the setting of various listed buildings and non-designated heritage assets. These include St Gregory's Church (Grade I) and Manor Farm (Grade II) and the viaduct and bridge over the River Trent. The heritage officer also notes that other heritage assets are located the east side of the River Trent, within Newark and Sherwood District. The Council's archaeology officer notes that undated cropmarks are located close to the site. In addition, there is no specific site information and further information is required to evaluate the archaeological potential of the site in order to determine an appropriate mitigation strategy. As such, a significant negative effect is likely in relation to heritage, and a minor negative effect in relation to archaeology.

High Marnham Power Station, Marnham (LAA369)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	+/-	<p>This site is within Trent Washlands and Mid-Nottinghamshire Farmlands Landscape Character Areas. The site is within Landscape Policy Zones TW20 and MN12. Landscape Policy Zone TW20 is classified for conserve and create. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'moderate' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. As such, a minor negative effect for that part of the site is likely. Landscape Policy Zone MN12 is classified for conserve. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'moderate' and it received a sensitivity score of 'very high'. However, the development of the site could also lead to the redevelopment of degraded land at an old power station site. Overall, a mixed minor positive and minor negative effect is likely. Landscape Policy Zone MN12 is classified for conserve. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'moderate' and it received a sensitivity score of 'very high', and a significant negative effect for that part of the site is likely. However, the development of the site could also lead to the redevelopment of degraded land at an old power station site. Overall, a mixed minor positive and minor negative effect is likely.</p>

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity

- Development should be designed to avoid and incorporate buffers around the most sensitive parts of the designated sites and consider measures to reduce recreational pressures, such as via the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to facilitate on-site recreation.
- Development should be encouraged to incorporate green infrastructure within the allocated site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity.
- Policy ST40: Biodiversity and Geodiversity promotes protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including designations, habitats and species, and is likely to go a long way to mitigating the identified effects.

SA 5: Health and Wellbeing

- Development should include sufficient replacement or alternative outdoor green space in a location easily accessible by current users and new residents/workers, to mitigate the potential loss and provide for the needs of the new development.
- Development should enhance and encourage access to the adjacent countryside.
- Policy ST44: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles seeks to improve access to open space and promote active travel, which is likely to go some way to mitigating these effects.

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development.
- Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

High Marnham Power Station, Marnham (LAA369)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
SA 9: Flood Risk		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Development should avoid parts of the site at highest risk of flooding, which could be retained as green space.• Developments should utilise SuDS, or where this is not possible, alternative surface water drainage to help mitigate the risk of flooding by safely managing surface water issues.• Policy ST52: Flood Risk and Drainage should help to mitigate any negative effects, as it requires development to address effects of the proposed development on flood risk and avoid areas at highest risk of flooding.		
SA 12: Resource Use and Waste		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Development should be focused within the area of site which lies outside Mineral Safeguarding Areas but if developments fall within safeguarding areas, the mineral resources should be worked prior to development, where possible.		
SA 13: Cultural Heritage		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessments and/or and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.• Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of heritage and archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible.• Policies ST42: The Historic Environment and 43: Designated and Non-Designated Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects.		
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character.• Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features.• Policies ST37: Landscape Character and ST35: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects.		

Table A6 - 56: South of Gamston Airfield - Bunker's Hill part only, Elkesley (LAA432A)

South of Gamston Airfield - Bunker's Hill part only, Elkesley (LAA432A)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	-	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. This assessment site is located entirely within a 5km buffer around the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	0	This site would not provide or result in the loss of residential dwellings. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	++	This site could provide 11.46ha of employment land. As such a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	N/A	The location of employment sites will have no effect on this objective.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+	The site is situated within 800m of a cemetery, which could provide space for walking/jogging. The site is predominantly within 2km of children's play area and outdoor sports facilities, with only the southwest area of the site located within 800m of these open spaces. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	The site is within 400m of a bus stop. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--	This site is a greenfield site, and the site is on Grade 2 agricultural land. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.

South of Gamston Airfield - Bunker's Hill part only, Elkesley (LAA432A)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	--	This site is within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	--	The Council's heritage officer has identified no conservation concerns for this site. As such, a negligible effect is likely in relation to heritage. The archaeology officer notes that the site is located in an area of Roman settlement activity. Further information is required in the form of initial desk based heritage assessment with possible further requirements for evaluation in order to determine an appropriate mitigation strategy. As such a significant negative effect is identified in relation to archaeology.
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	-	This site is within the Sherwood Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone SH57 and is classified as conserve and create. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'moderate' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.

South of Gamston Airfield - Bunker's Hill part only, Elkesley (LAA432A)

SA Objective

SA Score

Justification

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity

- Development should be designed to avoid and incorporate buffers around the most sensitive parts of the designated sites and consider measures to reduce recreational pressures, such as via the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to facilitate on-site recreation.
- Development should be encouraged to incorporate green infrastructure within the allocated site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity.
- The draft Policy ST42: Biodiversity and Geodiversity promotes protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including designations, habitats and species, and is likely to go a long way to mitigating the identified effects.
- The effects on the ppSPA will be considered further through the HRA.

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development.
- Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 8: Water

- Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.
- If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.
- The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.

SA 14: Landscape and Townscape

- Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character.
- Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features.
- The draft Policies ST39: Landscape Character and ST37: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects.

Table A6 - 57: Coalpit Lane, Elkesley (LAA456)

Coalpit Lane, Elkesley (LAA456)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	-	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. This assessment site is located entirely within a 5km buffer around the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	0	This site would not provide or result in the loss of residential dwellings. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	++	This site could provide 17.7ha of employment land. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	N/A	The location of employment sites will have no effect on this objective.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+	The site is located within 2km of a cemetery, children's play area and outdoor sports facilities, with the eastern area of the site also located within 800m of these open spaces. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	The site is within 400m of a bus stop. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p>	--	This site is a greenfield site, and is situated on Grade 3 agricultural land. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.

Coalpit Lane, Elkesley (LAA456)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.		
SA 8: Water To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.	--	This site is within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
SA 9: Flood Risk To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
SA 10: Air Quality To improve air quality.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 11: Climate Change To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 12: Resource Use and Waste To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
SA 13: Cultural Heritage To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.	--	The Council's archaeology officer notes that large Roman settlement cropmarks and other undated cropmarks are located adjacent to the site. In addition, further information is required, in the form of a geophysical survey and trial trench evaluation, to evaluate the archaeological potential of the site in order to determine an appropriate mitigation strategy. No further comments were made by the heritage officer. As such, an uncertain minor negative effect is likely in relation to heritage, and a significant negative effect in relation to archaeology..
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape	-	The majority of this site is within Sherwood Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone SH40, and is classified for conserve and create. The condition of the

Coalpit Lane, Elkesley (LAA456)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.		landscape is deemed 'moderate' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity

- Development should be designed to avoid and incorporate buffers around the most sensitive parts of the designated sites and consider measures to reduce recreational pressures, such as via the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to facilitate on-site recreation.
- Development should be encouraged to incorporate green infrastructure within the allocated site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity.
- The draft Policy ST42: Biodiversity and Geodiversity promotes protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including designations, habitats and species, and is likely to go a long way to mitigating the identified effects.
- The effects on the ppSPA will be considered further through the HRA.

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development.
- Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 8: Water

- Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.
- If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.
- The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.

SA 13: Cultural Heritage

- Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessment to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.
- Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible.

SA 14: Landscape and Townscape

Coalpit Lane, Elkesley (LAA456)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character. Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features. The draft Policies ST39: Landscape Character and ST37: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects. 		

Table A6 - 58: Carlton Forest, Carlton in Lindrick (LAA468)

Carlton Forest (LAA468)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	--	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site. However, the site coincides with a Regionally Important Geological Site. This assessment site is located entirely within a 5km buffer around the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	0	This site would not provide or result in the loss of residential dwellings. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	++	This site could provide 13.4ha of employment land. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	N/A	The location of employment sites will have no effect on this objective.

Carlton Forest (LAA468)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
SA 5: Health and Wellbeing To improve health and reduce health inequalities.	+	The site is located within 800m of various open spaces including amenity green space, outdoor sport facilities and children's' play areas. As such, a minor positive effect is likely ⁸⁴ .
SA 6: Transport To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.	+	A small portion of this site is within 400m of a bus stop. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
SA 7: Land Use and Soils To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.	--	This site is a greenfield site, and is situated on Grade 3 agricultural land. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
SA 8: Water To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.	--	This site is within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
SA 9: Flood Risk To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
SA 10: Air Quality To improve air quality.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAS) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 11: Climate Change To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.

⁸⁴ The assessment of SA objective 5 has been updated to correct an error in the previous assessment.

Carlton Forest (LAA468)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	--	<p>This site is within a Mineral Safeguarding Area (Sand and Gravel Resource). As such, a significant negative effect is likely.</p>
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	-	<p>The Council's archaeology officer notes that undated cropmarks are located within the vicinity of the site. In addition, further information is required to evaluate the archaeological potential of the site in order to determine an appropriate mitigation strategy. No further comments were made by the heritage officer. As such, a minor negative effect is likely in relation to archaeology, and a negligible effect in relation to heritage.</p>
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	+	<p>The majority of this site is within Sherwood Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone SH37, and is classified for create. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'very poor' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.</p>

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity

- Development should be designed to avoid and incorporate buffers around the most sensitive parts of the designated sites and consider measures to reduce recreational pressures, such as via the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to facilitate on-site recreation.
- Development should be encouraged to incorporate green infrastructure within the allocated site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity.
- The draft Policy ST42: Biodiversity and Geodiversity promotes protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including designations, habitats and species, and is likely to go a long way to mitigating the identified effects.
- The effects on the ppSPA will be considered further through the HRA.

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development.
- Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 8: Water

Carlton Forest (LAA468)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution. If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans. The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects. 		
SA 12: Resource Use and Waste		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The mineral resource should be worked prior to development where possible. 		
SA 13: Cultural Heritage		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applications for development should include a desk based Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting. Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, increase public access and understanding of heritage assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible. The draft Policies ST44: The Historic Environment and 45: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects. 		

Table A6 – 59: Land North of Plumtree, Harworth and Bircotes (LAA532)

Land north of Plumtree, Harworth and Bircotes (LAA532)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	--	The northern edge of the site is within 100m of Ancient Woodland. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	0	This site would not provide or result in the loss of residential dwellings. As such, a negligible effect is likely.

Land north of Plumtree, Harworth and Bircotes (LAA532)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	++	This site could provide 5.5ha of employment land. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	N/A	The location of employment sites will have no effect on this objective.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+	The site is within 800m of open spaces such as amenity green space, accessible countryside and semi natural green space. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	A majority portion of this site is within 400m of a bus stop, however is not within 1km of a railway station or within 400m of a dedicated cycle route. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--	This site is a greenfield site, and is situated on Grade 3 agricultural land. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	--	This site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.

Land north of Plumtree, Harworth and Bircotes (LAA532)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	-	This site is in the setting of non-designated assets, both Plumtree Lodge and Plumtree Farm. The Council's heritage officer noted that future development should not physically affect these heritage assets. The heritage officer also noted that development in the north east corner of the site should be set back to retain the prominence of the lodge. The Council's archaeology officer noted that there are extensive crop marks around the site and that there is a potential for late Iron Age/Romano-British activity in the surrounding area to extend onto the site. The archaeology officer noted that the site will need to be subject to archaeological investigation prior to development. As such, a minor negative effect is likely in relation to heritage and a minor negative effect is likely in relation to archaeology.
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	+	This site is within Idle Lowlands Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone IL11, and is classified for create. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'very poor' and it received a sensitivity score of 'low'. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity

- Development should be designed to avoid and incorporate buffers around the most sensitive parts of the designated sites and consider measures to reduce recreational pressures, such as via the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to facilitate on-site recreation.
- Development should be encouraged to incorporate green infrastructure within the allocated site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity.
- Policy ST40: Biodiversity and Geodiversity promotes protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including designations, habitats and species, and is likely to go a long way to mitigating the identified effects.

Land north of Plumtree, Harworth and Bircotes (LAA532)

SA Objective

SA Score

Justification

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 8: Water

- Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.
- If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.
- Policy ST53: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.

SA 13: Cultural Heritage

- Applications for development should include archaeological investigations, including a geophysical survey and impact assessment, with evaluation trenching.
- Policies ST42: The Historic Environment and 43: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects.

Table A6 – 60: Carlton Forest Quarry, Carlton in Lindrick (LAA535)

Carlton Forest Quarry, Carlton in Lindrick (LAA535)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	--	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site. However, the site coincides with a Regionally Important Geological Site (Carlton Forest Quarry). This assessment site is located entirely within a 5km buffer around the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. As such, a significant negative effect is likely
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	0	This site would not provide or result in the loss of residential dwellings. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	++	This site could provide 7.8ha of employment land. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	N/A	The location of employment sites will have no effect on this objective.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+	The site is located within 800m of various open spaces including amenity green space, outdoor sport facilities and children's' play areas. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	A portion of the site is within 400m of a bus stop. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--	This is a greenfield site and lies within Grade 3 agricultural land, as such a significant negative effect is likely.

Carlton Forest Quarry, Carlton in Lindrick (LAA535)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	--	The entirety of this site is within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	--	This site is within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	-	The Council's heritage officer notes that there is only one nearby heritage asset at Carton Forest Farm, a non-designated heritage asset. However, it is on the opposite side of the Blyth Road and is a considerable distance from the two quarried areas. As such, no concerns with the principle of development were noted. The Council's archaeology officer notes that there is some archaeological potential relating to cropmark enclosures to the south and north. There is also no objection to development of the site on archaeological grounds. As such, a minor negative effect is likely in relation to archaeology, and a negligible effect in relation to heritage.
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	+	This site is within Sherwood Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone SH37, and is classified for create. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'very poor' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.

Carlton Forest Quarry, Carlton in Lindrick (LAA535)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified		
SA 8: Water		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.• If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.• The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.		
SA 12: Resource Use and Waste		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The mineral resource should be worked prior to development where possible.		
SA 13: Cultural Heritage		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessments and/or and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.• Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of heritage and archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible.• The draft Policies ST44: The Historic Environment and 45: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects.		
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character.• Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features.• The draft Policies ST39: Landscape Character and ST37: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects.		

Table A6 – 61: South of Gamston Airport (LAA537)

South of Gamston Airport (LAA537)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	0	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	0	This site would not provide or result in the loss of residential dwellings. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	+	This site could provide 3.8ha of employment land. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	N/A	The location of employment sites will have no effect on this objective.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+	The site is located within 800m of various open spaces including cemeteries, outdoor sport facilities and children's' play areas. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	The site is within 400m of a bus stop. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	++	This is a brownfield site, as such a significant positive effect is likely.

South of Gamston Airport (LAA537)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
SA 8: Water To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.	--	The entirety of this site is within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
SA 9: Flood Risk To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
SA 10: Air Quality To improve air quality.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 11: Climate Change To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 12: Resource Use and Waste To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
SA 13: Cultural Heritage To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.	0	The Council's heritage officer notes that there are various building on the site, all dating to 1942-44, and are considered to be of some historic significance. Whilst individually, none are likely to be considered heritage assets in their own right, the site as a whole does comply with the Council's non-designated heritage asset identification criteria. As such, there are no concerns in principle, although a full building recording survey of the surviving World War II buildings should be carried out. The Council's archaeology officer notes that there is potential for surviving remains pre-dating the airfield construction, but it is very minimal. The main concern is the RAF buildings, however there is no objection to allocation based on archaeological grounds. As such, a negligible effect is likely in relation to both heritage and archaeology.
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape	-	This site is within Sherwood Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone SH57, and is classified for conserve and create. The condition of the landscape is deemed

South of Gamston Airport (LAA537)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
To conserve and enhance the District’s landscape character and townscapes.		‘moderate’ and it received a sensitivity score of ‘moderate’. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 8: Water

- Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.
- If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.
- The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.

SA 13: Cultural Heritage

- Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessments and/or and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.
- Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of heritage and archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible.
- The draft Policies ST44: The Historic Environment and 45: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects.

SA 14: Landscape and Townscape

- Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character.
- Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features.
- The draft Policies ST39: Landscape Character and ST37: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects.

Table A6 – 62: Harworth and Bircotes Town Centre extension, Scrooby Road (HB001/LAA538)

Note that this site is considered for town centre uses.

Harworth and Bircotes Town Centre extension, Scrooby Road (HB001/LAA538)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	0	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site and no local designations within 100m of the site. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	0	This site would not provide or result in the loss of residential dwellings. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	+	In providing for town centre uses, this site is expected to provide a small amount of employment opportunities, particularly in retail and associated roles. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	As an extension to the Haworth and Bircotes town centre, this site is expected to improve the range of services and facilities available in the town centre, and is expected to help regenerate the town centre. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+	The site is within 800m of various open spaces including amenity green space, outdoor sports facilities and semi natural green space. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.

Harworth and Bircotes Town Centre extension, Scrooby Road (HB001/LAA538)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	This site is within 400m of a bus stop, however it is not within 1km of a railway station or within 400m of a dedicated cycle route. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--	This site is a greenfield site, and the site is situated on Grade 3 agricultural land. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	--	This site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p>	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.

Harworth and Bircotes Town Centre extension, Scrooby Road (HB001/LAA538)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).		
SA 13: Cultural Heritage To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.	-	The Council's heritage officer confirmed that there are no above-ground heritage constraints. The Council's archaeology officer noted that this site lies close to areas of cropmarks relating to pre-historic and Romano-British settlement and agricultural activity, however, the officer considered that archaeological potential is low to moderate. The archaeology officer noted that a desk based assessment should be submitted with any future application. As such, a negligible effect is likely in relation to heritage and a minor negative effect is likely in relation to archaeology.
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.	+	This site is within Idle Lowlands Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone IL11, and is classified for create. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'very poor' and it received a sensitivity score of 'low'. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 8: Water

- Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.
- If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.
- Policy ST53: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.

SA 13: Cultural Heritage

- Applications for development should include archaeological investigations, including a geophysical survey and impact assessment, with evaluation trenching.
- Policies ST42: The Historic Environment and 43: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects.

Table A6 – 63: Land to the North of Serlby Road, Harworth and Bircotes (LAA580)

Land to the North of Serlby Road, Harworth and Bircotes (LAA580)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	-	Crow Wood, an ancient woodland, is within 500m of the site and there are no local designations within 100m of the site, therefore a minor negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	0	This site would not provide or result in the loss of residential dwellings. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	++	This site will provide 7.4 Ha employment land. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	N/A	The location of employment sites will have no effect on this objective.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+	The site is within 800m of various open spaces including amenity green space, outdoor sports facilities, allotments and children's play facilities. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and</p>	+	This site is within 400m of a bus stop, however it is not within 1km of a railway station or within 400m of a dedicated cycle route. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.

Land to the North of Serlby Road, Harworth and Bircotes (LAA580)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
align investment in infrastructure with growth.		
SA 7: Land Use and Soils To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.	--	This site is a greenfield site, and the site is situated on Grade 3 agricultural land. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
SA 8: Water To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.	--	This site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
SA 9: Flood Risk To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
SA 10: Air Quality To improve air quality.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 11: Climate Change To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 12: Resource Use and Waste	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.

Land to the North of Serlby Road, Harworth and Bircotes (LAA580)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).		
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	--	The Council's heritage officer has no concerns regarding this site, given the distance between the sites and any heritage assets, as well as the presence of the A1 and adjacent industrial estate. The archaeology officer identified the site as having moderate to high archaeological potential associated with late Iron Age / Roman rural settlement activity, as well as cropmarks on adjacent sites to the east and west. As such, a geophysical survey is recommended to inform archaeological mitigation for any future application. As such, a negligible effect is likely in relation to heritage and a significant negative effect is likely in relation to archaeology.
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	+	This majority of the site is within Idle Lowlands Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone IL11, and is classified for create. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'very poor' and it received a sensitivity score of 'low'. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity

- Development should be designed to avoid and incorporate buffers around the most sensitive parts of the designated sites and consider measures to reduce recreational pressures, such as via the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to facilitate on-site recreation.
- Development should be encouraged to incorporate green infrastructure within the allocated site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity.
- Policy ST40: Biodiversity and Geodiversity promotes protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including designations, habitats and species, and is likely to go a long way to mitigating the identified effects.

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 8: Water

- Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.
- If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.

Land to the North of Serlby Road, Harworth and Bircotes (LAA580)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy ST53: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects. <p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applications for development should include archaeological investigations, including a geophysical survey and impact assessment, with evaluation trenching. Policies ST42: The Historic Environment and 43: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects. 		

Table A6 – 64: Land to the North of Old Coach Road – Manton Wood, Worksop (LAA581)

Land to the North of Old Coach Road – Manton Wood, Worksop (LAA581)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	--	This site is adjacent to the Sherwood Forest ppSPA and Coach Road Plantation LWS, which coincides with the ppSPA. The site is also within 100m of two more LWS' and within 500m of Clumber Park SSSI. As such, significant negative effects are likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	0	This site would not provide or result in the loss of residential dwellings. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	+	This site will provide for around 4.2 Ha employment land. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.

Land to the North of Old Coach Road – Manton Wood, Worksop (LAA581)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	N/A	The location of employment sites will have no effect on this objective.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+	The site is within 800m of a country park. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	This site is within 400m of a bus stop and a dedicated cycle route. However it is not within 1km of a railway station. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--	This site is a greenfield site, and the site is situated partly on Grade 3 agricultural land. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	--	This site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.

Land to the North of Old Coach Road – Manton Wood, Worksop (LAA581)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 10: Air Quality To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	--	This site is within the immediate setting of the Grade I Clumber Park Registered Park & Garden and contributes to its historic woodland setting. In addition, the site is also in close proximity to Manton Lodge and Manton Forest Farm, which are both non-designated heritage assets. The Council's heritage officer considers that development of the site would constitute substantial harm and that the public benefits of development here would not outweigh the harm to the historic wooded character of the site and its contribution to the setting of Clumber Park. The archaeology officer identified the site as having moderate to high archaeological potential for pre-historic and Roman rural settlement activity, as well as cropmarks to the northeast and west of the site (with potential for further cropmarks in an area currently covered by woodland). As such, site specific evaluation comprising trial trenching is recommended to accompany any future application. As such, a significant negative effect is likely in relation to both heritage and archaeology.
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	--	This site is within Sherwood Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone SH31, and is classified for conserve. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'good' and it received a sensitivity score of 'high'. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified</p> <p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p>		

Land to the North of Old Coach Road – Manton Wood, Worksop (LAA581)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development should be designed to avoid and incorporate buffers around the most sensitive parts of the designated sites and consider measures to reduce recreational pressures, such as via the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to facilitate on-site recreation. Development should be encouraged to incorporate green infrastructure within the allocated site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity. Policy ST40: Biodiversity and Geodiversity promotes protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including designations, habitats and species, and is likely to go a long way to mitigating the identified effects.
SA 7: Land Use and Soils		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development. Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site. Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.
SA 8: Water		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution. If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans. Policy ST53: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.
SA 13: Cultural Heritage		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applications for development should include archaeological investigations, including a geophysical survey and impact assessment, with evaluation trenching. Policies ST42: The Historic Environment and 43: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects.
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character. Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features. The draft Policies ST39: Landscape Character and ST37: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects.

New Settlement Sites

Table A6 - 65: High Marnham Power Station (LAA369)

High Marnham Power Station (LAA369)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	--	There are no statutory international/national nature conservation designations within 500m of the site; however, there are local wildlife sites within the site option and within 100m of the site, including Marnham Railway Yard and Fledborough to Harby Dismantled Railway, respectively. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	++	This site could provide 2,400 new dwellings. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	+	New settlements would be expected to provide small scale employment opportunities and job provision. The site is not within 800m of a major employment site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	New settlements would be expected to provide a number of key services including a primary school, local centre and GP surgery. The site is partially within 2km of a primary school. The site is not within 2km of a post office or a secondary school. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	++/-?	The site contains CROW open access land, although this appears to be restricted to a footpath, which could be lost by the development of the site resulting in a minor negative effect. However, this is uncertain as existing footpaths could be retained and improved as part of any new settlement. New settlements would be expected to provide a high level of open greenspace and a GP surgery. Therefore, a mixed significant positive and uncertain minor negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	New settlements would be expected to provide sustainable transport links, including new bus stops and cycle routes. There is not a railway station within 1km of the site (nor is there currently a bus stop within 400m). As such, a minor positive effect is likely.

High Marnham Power Station (LAA369)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	+/-	This site is a mixed greenfield/brownfield site. As such, a mixed effect is likely.
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	0	This site is not within a source protection zone. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	--	The eastern side of this site is within Flood Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	--	A portion of this site is within a Minerals Safeguarding Area (Sand and Gravel Resource). As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	--	The site is located within the setting of listed buildings including Fledborough, St Gregory's Church (Grade I) and Manor Farm (Grade II). The Council's heritage officer notes that various non-designated heritage assets are located within the vicinity of the site, including a viaduct and a bridge over the River Trent, with other heritage assets on the east side of the River Trent, (within Newark and Sherwood District). The Council's archaeology officer notes that undated crop marks are located close to the site; however, there is no specific site information. In addition, further information is required to evaluate the archaeological potential of the site in order to determine an

High Marnham Power Station (LAA369)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
		appropriate mitigation strategy. As such, a significant negative effect is likely in relation to heritage, and a minor negative effect in relation to archaeology.
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District’s landscape character and townscapes.</p>	+/-	<p>This site is within Trent Washlands and Mid-Nottinghamshire Farmlands Landscape Character Areas. The site is within Landscape Policy Zones TW20 and MN12. Landscape Policy Zone TW20 is classified for conserve and create. The condition of the landscape is deemed ‘moderate’ and it received a sensitivity score of ‘moderate’. As such, a minor negative effect for that part of the site is likely. Landscape Policy Zone MN12 is classified for conserve. The condition of the landscape is deemed ‘moderate’ and it received a sensitivity score of ‘very high’, and a significant negative effect for that part of the site is likely. However, the development of the site could also lead to the redevelopment of degraded land at an old power station site. Overall, a mixed minor positive and minor negative effect is likely.</p>

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity

- Development should be designed to avoid and incorporate buffers around the most sensitive parts of the designated sites and consider measures to reduce recreational pressures, such as via the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to facilitate on-site recreation.
- Development should be encouraged to incorporate green infrastructure within the allocated site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity.
- The draft Policy ST42: Biodiversity and Geodiversity promotes protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including designations, habitats and species, and is likely to go a long way to mitigating the identified effects.

SA 5: Health and Wellbeing

- Development should include sufficient replacement or alternative outdoor green space in a location easily accessible by current users and new residents/workers, to mitigate the potential loss and provide for the needs of the new development.
- Developments should enhance and encourage access to the adjacent countryside.
- The draft Policy ST46: Promoting Health and Well-Being seeks to improve access to open space and promote active travel, which is likely to go some way to mitigating these effects.

SA 9: Flood Risk

- Development should avoid parts of the site at highest risk of flooding, which could be retained as green space.
- Developments should utilise SuDS, or where this is not possible, alternative surface water drainage to help mitigate the risk of flooding by safely managing surface water issues.

High Marnham Power Station (LAA369)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">The draft Policy ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage should help to mitigate any negative effects, as it requires development to address effects of the proposed development on flood risk and avoid areas at highest risk of flooding.
SA 12: Resource Use and Waste		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Development should be focused within the area of site which lies outside Mineral Safeguarding Areas but if developments fall within safeguarding areas, the mineral resources should be worked prior to development, where possible.The mineral resource should be worked prior to development where possible.Development should be designed to incorporate reuse of building materials and space for storage and collection of waste for composting and recycling.The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy promotes reuse of existing buildings and brownfield land, which will help to support this.
SA 13: Cultural Heritage		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessments and/or and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of heritage and archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible.The draft Policies ST44: The Historic Environment and 45: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects.
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character.Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features.The draft Policies ST39: Landscape Character and ST37: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects.

Table A6 - 66: Upper Morton Garden Village (Bassetlaw Garden Village) (LAA453/LAA455)

Upper Morton Garden Village (Bassetlaw Garden Village) (LAA453/LAA455)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	--	A very small portion of this site is within 100m of a Local Wildlife Site (Top Wood/Great Whin Covert). This assessment site is located entirely within a 5km buffer around the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. The HRA identifies that this site could support ppSPA birds. There could be a negative effect on the Clumber Park SSSI as a result of increased recreation pressure. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	++	This site could provide 4,000 new dwellings. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	+	New settlements would be expected to provide small scale employment opportunities and job provision. The site is not within 800m of a major employment site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	New settlements would be expected to provide a number of key services including a primary school, local centre and GP surgery. The site is not within 2km of any existing key services or town centre. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	++	The site is partially within 2km of country parks, and CROW open access areas. The site is not located within 2km of an existing GP surgery. However, new settlements would be expected to provide a high level of open greenspace and a GP surgery. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	New settlements would be expected to provide sustainable transport links, including new bus stops and cycle routes. There is not a railway station within 1km of the site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--	This site is a greenfield site, and the site is situated in Grade 3 agricultural land. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.

Upper Morton Garden Village (Bassetlaw Garden Village) (LAA453/LAA455)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	--	This site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	0	This site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	--	The Council's heritage officer notes that Morton Hill Farm is located within the site and has identified possible minor negative effects as a result of development. The farm is a non-designated heritage asset, for which the surrounding countryside (which could be partly lost to development) contributes to the farm's setting. The Council's archaeology officer notes that this site is located near potentially regionally significant archaeological remains, including settlement features. In addition, further information is required to evaluate the archaeological potential of the site in order to determine an appropriate mitigation strategy. As such, a minor negative effect is likely in relation to heritage, and a significant negative effect in relation to archaeology.
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p>	-	The majority of this site is within Sherwood Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone SH40, and is classified for conserve and create. The condition of the

Upper Morton Garden Village (Bassetlaw Garden Village) (LAA453/LAA455)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.		landscape is deemed 'moderate' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity

- Development should be designed to avoid and incorporate buffers around the most sensitive parts of the designated sites and consider measures to reduce recreational pressures, such as via the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to facilitate on-site recreation.
- Development should be encouraged to incorporate green infrastructure within the allocated site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity.
- Policy ST40: Biodiversity and Geodiversity promotes protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including designations, habitats and species, and is likely to go a long way to mitigating the identified effects.
- The effects on the ppSPA will be considered further through the HRA.

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development.
- Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 8: Water

- Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.
- If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.
- Policy ST53: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.

SA 13: Cultural Heritage

- Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessments and/or and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.
- Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of heritage and archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible.
- Policies ST42: The Historic Environment and 43: Designated and Non-Designated Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects.

SA 14: Landscape and Townscape

Upper Morton Garden Village (Bassetlaw Garden Village) (LAA453/LAA455)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character. Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features. Policies ST37: Landscape Character and ST35: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects. 		

Table A6 – 67: Gamston Airport (LAA432)

Gamston Airport (LAA432)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	--	A small portion of this site is within 100m of Local Wildlife Sites (Gaston Airport Scrub and Grassland, Brock Yard Road Ponds, Dover Holt Wetland). This assessment site is located entirely within a 5km buffer around the Sherwood forest Important Bird Area, the potential site for the Sherwood Forest ppSPA and the January 2019 HRA Screening identified that this site could support ppSPA birds. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	++	This site could provide 2,500 new dwellings. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	+/-	Redevelopment of the site will lead to the loss of employment associated with the airport. However, the airport is small-scale and does not have a large number of employment opportunities. This site is adjacent to the Gamston Airport North key employment site. In addition, a new garden settlement would be expected to provide small scale employment opportunities and job provision. Therefore, a mixed minor positive and minor negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	New settlements would be expected to provide a number of key services including a primary school, local centre and GP surgery. In addition, this site is within 800m of the villages of Elkesley and Gamston, where a number of existing key services are located including several primary schools, a medical centre and a post office.

Gamston Airport (LAA432)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
SA 5: Health and Wellbeing To improve health and reduce health inequalities.	++	The site is partially within 2km of a children's play area and outdoor sports facilities. The site is not located within 2km of an existing GP surgery. New settlements would be expected to provide a high level of open greenspace and a GP surgery. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
SA 6: Transport To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.	+	New settlements would be expected to provide sustainable transport links, including new bus stops and cycle routes. There is not a railway station within 1km of the site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
SA 7: Land Use and Soils To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.	+/-	As an airfield, this site is identified as brownfield land, in line with the NPPF definition. However, there are substantial areas of land between the runways that appear to be in agricultural use. The site also consists of Grades 2 and 3 agricultural land. Development at this site could lead to the loss best and most versatile agricultural land but would also utilise brownfield land. As such, a mixed effect is likely.
SA 8: Water To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.	--	This site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
SA 9: Flood Risk To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.	0	The site is within Flood Zone 1. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
SA 10: Air Quality To improve air quality.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAS) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 11: Climate Change To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 12: Resource Use and Waste	--	A portion of this site is within a Minerals Safeguarding Area (Sneinton Gunthorpe Clay). As such, a significant negative effect is likely.

Gamston Airport (LAA432)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).		
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District’s historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	-	The heritage officer raises no conservation concerns. The archaeology officer notes that the site is located between large areas of cropmarks, with evidence of a Roman settlement to the west. It is noted that likely activity extends onto the airport site, however some truncation to archaeological deposits from the airport is to be expected. Further information in the form of geophysical survey followed by trial trench evaluation to determine appropriate mitigation strategy. As such, a minor negative effect is identified in relation to both heritage and archaeology. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District’s landscape character and townscapes.</p>	-	This site is within the Sherwood Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone SH57 and is classified as conserve and create. The condition of the landscape is deemed ‘moderate’ and it received a sensitivity score of ‘moderate’. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity

- Development should be designed to avoid and incorporate buffers around the most sensitive parts of the designated sites and consider measures to reduce recreational pressures, such as via the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to facilitate on-site recreation.
- Development should be encouraged to incorporate green infrastructure within the allocated site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity.
- The draft Policy ST42: Biodiversity and Geodiversity promotes protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including designations, habitats and species, and is likely to go a long way to mitigating the identified effects.
- The effects on the ppSPA will be considered further through the HRA.
- Applicants should undertake bird surveys at appropriate times of the year to determine whether the site contains specific species (nightjar/woodlark) or functional habitat used by them. A project-level HRA should be carried out if necessary and provide specific mitigation measures for these bird species.

SA 3: Economy and Skills

- The draft Policy ST11: Existing Employment Sites suggests that loss of employment sites to alternative uses should only be permitted where the land or building is no longer physically suitable for employment uses and there is no realistic prospect of re-use or re-development for employment uses.

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

Gamston Airport (LAA432)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development.Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.
SA 8: Water		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.
SA 12: Resource Use and Waste		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Development should be focused within the area of site which lies outside Mineral Safeguarding Areas but if developments fall within safeguarding areas, the mineral resources should be worked prior to development, where possible.The mineral resource should be worked prior to development where possible.Development should be designed to incorporate reuse of building materials and space for storage and collection of waste for composting and recycling.The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy promotes reuse of existing buildings and brownfield land, which will help to support this.
SA 13: Cultural Heritage		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessments and/or and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of heritage and archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible.The draft Policies ST44: The Historic Environment and 45: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects.
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character.Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features.

Gamston Airport (LAA432)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The draft Policies ST39: Landscape Character and ST37: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects. 		

Table A6 - 68: Bevercotes (LAA431)⁸⁵

Bevercotes (LAA431)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	--	The site contains Local Wildlife Sites (Bevercotes Colliery Site and Lawn Cover and Fox Covert, West Drayton). This assessment site is located entirely within a 5km buffer around the Sherwood forest Important Bird Area, the potential site for the Sherwood Forest ppSPA and the HRA has identified that this site could support ppSPA birds. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	++	This site could provide 1,500 new dwellings. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	+?	New settlements would be expected to provide small scale employment opportunities and job provisions. In addition, the site contains a permitted major employment site. It is assumed that the development of a new settlement on this site would not cause the loss of this permitted employment land. As such, a minor positive yet uncertain effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	New settlements would be expected to provide a number of key services including a primary school, local centre and GP surgery. However, the site is also partially located within 2km of an existing primary school and a post office. The site is also not within 2km of secondary school. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	++	The site is within 2km of a cemetery, children's play area and outdoor sports facilities. The site is not located within 2km of an existing GP surgery. However, New settlements would be expected to

⁸⁵ Note that this site has planning permission for employment uses. It has not been assessed separately for employment use, as that reflects the likely future baseline without the Local Plan. However, it has been assessed as a new settlement option, as this is considered a potential different future scenario for the site.

Bevercotes (LAA431)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
		provide a high level of open greenspace and a GP surgery. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
SA 6: Transport To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.	+	New settlements would be expected to provide sustainable transport links, including new bus stops and cycle routes. There is not a railway station within 1km of the site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
SA 7: Land Use and Soils To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.	+/-	The site is a mix of both greenfield and brownfield land related to the previous use of the site for mineral extraction. As such, a mixed effect is likely.
SA 8: Water To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.	--	This site is situated within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
SA 9: Flood Risk To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.	-	A small portion of the southwest boundary is within Flood Zone 2 and 3. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.
SA 10: Air Quality To improve air quality.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 11: Climate Change To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 12: Resource Use and Waste To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).	--	The majority of this site is within a Minerals Safeguarding Area (Sneiton Gunthorpe Clay). As such, a significant negative effect is likely.

Bevercotes (LAA431)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District’s historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	-	The heritage officer notes that the site is in the Haughton Park unregistered park & garden and in the setting of several other heritage assets including Listed Buildings. However, much of the site is hidden behind trees, so the any visual impact is likely to be minor. No comments were received in terms of archaeology. As such a minor negative effect is identified in relation to heritage.
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District’s landscape character and townscapes.</p>	-	This site is within Sherwood Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone SH35, and is classified for conserve and reinforce. The condition of the landscape is deemed ‘good’ and it received a sensitivity score of ‘moderate’. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity

- Development should be designed to avoid and incorporate buffers around the most sensitive parts of the designated sites and consider measures to reduce recreational pressures, such as via the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to facilitate on-site recreation.
- Development should be encouraged to incorporate green infrastructure within the allocated site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity.
- The draft Policy ST42: Biodiversity and Geodiversity promotes protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including designations, habitats and species, and is likely to go a long way to mitigating the identified effects.
- The effects on the ppSPA will be considered further through the HRA.
- Applicants should undertake bird surveys at appropriate times of the year to determine whether the site contains specific species (nightjar/woodlark) or functional habitat used by them. A project-level HRA should be carried out if necessary and provide specific mitigation measures for these bird species.

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development.
- Development should reuse building materials and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw’s Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 8: Water

- Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.
- If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.

Bevercotes (LAA431)

SA Objective

SA Score

Justification

- The draft Policy ST55: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.

SA 9: Flood Risk

- Development should avoid parts of the site at highest risk of flooding, which could be retained as green space.
- Developments should utilise SuDS, or where this is not possible, alternative surface water drainage to help mitigate the risk of flooding by safely managing surface water issues.
- The draft Policy ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage should help to mitigate any negative effects, as it requires development to address effects of the proposed development on flood risk and avoid areas at highest risk of flooding.

SA 12: Resource Use and Waste

- Development should be focused within the area of site which lies outside Mineral Safeguarding Areas but if developments fall within safeguarding areas, the mineral resources should be worked prior to development, where possible.
- The mineral resource should be worked prior to development where possible.
- Development should be designed to incorporate reuse of building materials and space for storage and collection of waste for composting and recycling.
- The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy promotes reuse of existing buildings and brownfield land, which will help to support this.

SA 13: Cultural Heritage

- Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessments and/or and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.
- Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of heritage and archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible.
- The draft Policies ST44: The Historic Environment and 45: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects.

SA 14: Landscape and Townscape

- Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character.
- Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features.

Bevercotes (LAA431)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The draft Policies ST39: Landscape Character and ST37: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects. 		

Table A6 - 69: Cottam Power Station (LAA473)

Cottam Power Station (LAA473)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	--?	This site contains a small portion of a Local Wildlife Site (Cottam Wetlands). Due to the small size of the area of overlap between the site and Local Wildlife Site, a significant negative effect is likely, but uncertain.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	++	This site could provide 1,650 new dwellings. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	+	New settlements would be expected to provide small scale employment opportunities and job provisions. The power station is due to close in September 2019 therefore development would not lead to loss of existing employment. However, the site is not within 800m of any major employment site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	New settlements would be expected to provide a number of key services including a primary school, local centre and GP surgery. However, the site is not within 2km of any services and town centres. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	++	The site is located partially within 800m of a cemetery and outdoor sports facilities. The site is not within 2km of a GP surgery. New settlements would be expected to provide a high level of open greenspace and a GP surgery. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.

Cottam Power Station (LAA473)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	New settlements would be expected to provide sustainable transport links, including new bus stops and cycle routes. The site is also partially situated within 400m of an existing bus stop. There is not a railway station within 1km of the site. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	++	The site is a brownfield site. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	0	This site is not within a source protection zone. As such, a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	-	A significant portion of the site is within Flood Zone 2 and a very small portion of the site is within Flood Zone 3. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	--	This site is within a Minerals Safeguarding Area (Sand and Gravel Resource). As such, a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p>	--	The Council's heritage officer notes that although the power station has been given a non-designated heritage asset status, this has not secured a future for the historic buildings on the site

Cottam Power Station (LAA473)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.		(cooling towers and engine house). The heritage officer also notes that the Fleet Plantation moat, a Scheduled Ancient Monument is within the site and that there are other important heritage assets in the vicinity of the site, including other scheduled monuments and Grade I and II* listed buildings, such as Torksey Castle, Torksey Medieval Settlement, St Peter's Church, and Torksey Viaduct. There is therefore an opportunity to preserve and enhance the heritage assets and the setting in which they are located. The archaeology officer notes that the Scheduled Ancient Monument and a significant area around it should be removed from the allocation site boundary to preserve the SM and its setting, and that the setting of SMs relating to Torksey Castle and Torksey Medieval town also need to be considered carefully in relation to plan. Further information required in the form of initial desk based heritage assessment with possible further requirements for evaluation in order to determine an appropriate mitigation strategy. As such, a significant negative effect is likely in relation to both heritage and archaeology.
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	+/-	The site is not within a Landscape Policy Zone. However, it is surrounded by the Trent Washlands Landscape Character Area, which is within Landscape Policy Zone TW20. Landscape Policy Zone TW20 is classified for conserve and create. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'moderate' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. As such, a minor negative effect for that part of the site is likely. However, redevelopment of the site could lead to the redevelopment of degraded land at the old power station site. As such, a mixed minor positive and minor negative effect is expected.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity

- Development should be designed to avoid and incorporate buffers around the most sensitive parts of the designated sites and consider measures to reduce recreational pressures, such as via the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to facilitate on-site recreation.
- Development should be encouraged to incorporate green infrastructure within the allocated site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity.
- The draft Policy ST42: Biodiversity and Geodiversity promotes protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including designations, habitats and species, and is likely to go a long way to mitigating the identified effects.

SA 9: Flood Risk

- Development should avoid parts of the site at highest risk of flooding, which could be retained as green space.

Cottam Power Station (LAA473)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Developments should utilise SuDS, or where this is not possible, alternative surface water drainage to help mitigate the risk of flooding by safely managing surface water issues.• The draft Policy ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage should help to mitigate any negative effects, as it requires development to address effects of the proposed development on flood risk and avoid areas at highest risk of flooding.		
SA 12: Resource Use and Waste		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Development should be focused within the area of site which lies outside Mineral Safeguarding Areas but if developments fall within safeguarding areas, the mineral resources should be worked prior to development, where possible.• The mineral resource should be worked prior to development where possible.• Development should be designed to incorporate reuse of building materials and space for storage and collection of waste for composting and recycling.• The draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy promotes reuse of existing buildings and brownfield land, which will help to support this.		
SA 13: Cultural Heritage		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessments and/or and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.• Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of heritage and archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible.• The draft Policies ST44: The Historic Environment and 45: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects.		
SA 14: Landscape and Townscape		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character.• Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features. <p>The draft Policies ST39: Landscape Character and ST37: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects.</p>		

Gypsy and Traveller Sites⁸⁶

Table A6 - 70: Land at North Blyth, North Blythe (GT005 / LAA541)

Land at North Blyth, North Blythe (GT005 / LAA541)		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	0	The site is not within 500m of any international/national designations and not within 100m of any local designations. In addition, the site is not within 5km of the ppSPA. As such, negligible effects are expected.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	+	This site will provide four Gypsy and Traveller pitches, therefore a minor positive effect is considered likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	0	The site is not within 800m of a major employment site, therefore negligible effects are expected.
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	-	The site is not within 2km of any services and facilities (although it is just further than 2km of a post office). As such, minor negative effects are identified.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	0	The site is not within 800m of a GP surgery or any open space. However, the site is within 2km of amenity green space, a cemetery, a children's play area, an outdoor sports facility and the southern tip of the site is also within 2km of allotments.
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	The site is within 400m of a bus stop, but is not within 400m of a cycle path or within 1km of a railway station. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.

⁸⁶ Note that the assessments of sites GT005 and GT006 have been carried out on a red line only basis, but it is acknowledged that they are currently in (unauthorised) use as Gypsy and Traveller sites.

Land at North Blyth, North Blyth (GT005 / LAA541)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--?	The site consists of Grade 3 agricultural land. However, this site would be used for provision of Gypsy and Traveller pitches, which may result in a reversible, rather than a permanent, loss of high quality agricultural land. As such, a significant negative effect is recorded, but this is uncertain.
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	--	The site lies within SPZ 3, therefore a significant negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0	The site is within flood zone 1, therefore a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAS) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	0	The site does not lie within a Minerals Safeguarding Area, therefore a negligible effect is likely.
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	-	The Council's archaeology officer notes that there is a multiphase, Bronze Age, Iron Age and Roman archaeology recording in the field to the south. There was also a Roman enclosure recorded during a recent excavation on a site to the north on the other side of Blyth Road and there is high potential for activity to extend onto the proposed site. It is recommended that any application is accompanied by a Heritage Impact Assessment to include the results of a trial trench evaluation. The heritage officer did not make any additional comments. As such, the site is

Land at North Blyth, North Blyth (GT005 / LAA541)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
		expected to have minor negative effects with regards to archaeology and negligible effects with regards to heritage.
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	+	This site lies within the Idle Lowlands Landscape Character Area which is within Landscape Policy Zone IL11. This is a 'create' Landscape Policy Zone, therefore a minor positive effect is expected.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion

- Given the small size of this site it is not practical to provide additional services on site. Instead the Council should work with service providers and developers to ensure services and facilities can be easily accessed via good public transport links.

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development.
- Development should minimise the amount of hard infrastructure on-site (thereby minimising irreversible loss of agricultural land) and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 8: Water

- Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.
- If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.
- Policy ST53: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.

SA 13: Cultural Heritage

- Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessments and/or and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.
- Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of heritage and archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible.

Land at North Blyth, North Blyth (GT005 / LAA541)

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policies ST42: The Historic Environment and 43: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects. 		

Table A6 - 71: Land at Elkesley (GT006 / LAA540)

Land at Elkesley		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	-	The site is adjacent to Warsop Colliery Line Cutting RIGS and the site is within 5km of the Sherwood Forest ppSPA (the nearest part of the SPA is just over 500m from the site). As such, a minor negative effect is likely.
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	+	This site will provide nine Gypsy and Traveller pitches, therefore a minor positive effect is considered likely.
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	+	The site is around 800m from the Gamston Airport North employment site, therefore a minor positive effects is expected,
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	The site is within 800m of Elkesley Primary School and within 800m of a post office, therefore minor positive effects are identified.
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+	The site is further than 2km from a GP surgery. However, it is within 800m of a cemetery, a children's play area and a public outdoor sports facility (playing field behind Elkesley Memorial Hall. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.

Land at Elkesley		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
SA 6: Transport To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.	+	The site is within 400m of a bus stop, although it is not within 400m of a cycle path or within 1km of a railway station. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.
SA 7: Land Use and Soils To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.	--?	The site consists of Grade 3 agricultural land. However, this site would be used for provision of Gypsy and Traveller pitches, which may result in a reversible, rather than a permanent, loss of high quality agricultural land. As such, a significant negative effect is recorded, but this is uncertain.
SA 8: Water To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.	--	The site lies within SPZ 3, therefore a significant negative effect is likely.
SA 9: Flood Risk To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.	0	The site lies entirely within flood zone 1, therefore a negligible effect is expected.
SA 10: Air Quality To improve air quality.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 11: Climate Change To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.	N/A	It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.
SA 12: Resource Use and Waste To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).	0	The site does not lie within a Minerals Safeguarding Area, therefore a negligible effect is likely.

Land at Elkesley

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	-	The Council's archaeology officer notes that there are cropmarks including trackways and boundaries to the north-west and south of the site. Medieval earthwork to the east including a probable hollow way and ridge and furrow. While there are no archaeology assets recorded within the site boundary, this surrounding activity may extend into the site. It is recommended that any application is accompanied by a Heritage Impact Assessment to include the results of a desk-based assessment and further field evaluation is likely to be required post-consent. The heritage officer did not make any additional comments. As such, the site is expected to have minor negative effects with regards to archaeology and negligible effects with regards to heritage.
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	-	This site lies within the Sherwood Landscape Character Area which is within Landscape Policy Zone SH40. This is a 'conserve and create' Landscape Policy Zone, therefore a minor negative effect is expected.

General Mitigation for potential negative effects identified

SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity

- Development should be designed to avoid and incorporate buffers around the most sensitive parts of the designated sites and consider measures to reduce recreational pressures, such as via the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to facilitate on-site recreation.
- Development should be encouraged to incorporate green infrastructure within the allocated site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity.
- Policy ST40: Biodiversity and Geodiversity promotes protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including designations, habitats and species, and is likely to go a long way to mitigating the identified effects.

SA 7: Land Use and Soils

- Loss of greenfield land cannot be avoided without relocating the proposed development.
- Development should minimise the amount of hard infrastructure on-site (thereby minimising irreversible loss of agricultural land) and provide adequate green open space provision within the site.
- Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy may go some way to help minimise negative effects, as it promotes the re-use of previously developed land and minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3a agricultural land.

SA 8: Water

- Development should provide surface water management measures to reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways and mitigate water pollution.
- If necessary, further measures to prevent potential pollution incidents during construction could include careful handling of materials and spill response plans.

Land at Elkesley

SA Objective

SA Score

Justification

- Policy ST53: Protecting Water Quality and Management states that development will not be supported where it could negatively impact surface or groundwater. It also requires assessment of risk to groundwater if development occurs in a Source protection Zone, which should mitigate against any negative effects.

SA 13: Cultural Heritage

- Applications for development should include desk based archaeological assessments and/or and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of the development on the assets and their setting.
- Developments should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas, make consideration of screening, record archaeological remains, and increase public access and understanding of heritage and archaeological assets, as well as enhance the setting of such assets where possible.
- Policies ST42: The Historic Environment and 43: Heritage Assets provide protection for both designated and non-designated assets and are therefore expected to go a long way to help mitigate any negative effects.

SA 14: Landscape and Townscape

- Development should respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone to help mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character.
- Development should be designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and encouraged to incorporate and enhance green infrastructure at sites to reduce the impact of loss of landscape features.
Policies ST37: Landscape Character and ST35: Design Quality could promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to minimise and mitigate any potential negative effects.

Appendix 7

SA Matrices for Strategic Site Options from the Part 1 Bassetlaw Local Plan (January 2019)

Table A7.1 Land East of Carlton-in-Lindrick

Land East of Carlton-in-Lindrick		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	0	<p>Likely sustainability effects: This assessment site does not lie within 500m of a statutory international/national nature conservation designation or 100m of a local designation. Therefore, a negligible effect is likely.</p> <p>Mitigation: None identified.</p> <p>Assumptions: As the site is not located within close proximity to any biodiversity or geodiversity designations it is assumed the effects in relation to this SA objective are limited.</p> <p>Uncertainties: There is a small local wildlife site just over 100m to the southeast of the site, which may be impacted by development at this site.</p>
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	++	<p>Likely sustainability effects: The assessment site's area is measured at around 73 hectares. All new garden communities are expected to provide in excess of 1,000 new dwellings. Therefore, a significant positive effect is likely.</p> <p>Mitigation: Not applicable as a positive effect has been identified.</p> <p>Assumptions: It is assumed that larger sites will be able to incorporate a mix of dwelling types and tenures as well as a level of affordable housing.</p> <p>Uncertainties: None identified.</p>
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	+	<p>Likely sustainability effects: This assessment site is approximately 800m to the nearest key employment site and it is expected that the scheme would provide small scale employment opportunities. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.</p> <p>Mitigation: Not applicable as a positive effect has been identified.</p> <p>Assumptions: None identified.</p> <p>Uncertainties: It is uncertain what skill level and type of jobs would be provided through any development at the site.</p>

Land East of Carlton-in-Lindrick		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	<p>Likely sustainability effects: The new garden community scheme is expected to provide a number of key services including a primary school, local centre and GP surgery. In addition, the site is within 800m of key services in Carlton-in-Lindrick local centre, including Kingston Park Academy primary school and nursery and a post office. Langold, 1.8km from the site contains a post office, GP, shops and primary school. This is likely to result in a minor positive impact.</p> <p>Mitigation: Not applicable as a positive effect has been identified.</p> <p>Assumptions: It is assumed that resident will be able to walk to key services provided at the site.</p> <p>Uncertainties: It is uncertain whether new key services provided would be sufficient to support new and existing development.</p>
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	++	<p>Likely sustainability effects: The new garden community is expected to provide a high level of open greenspace and a GP Surgery. In addition, there is an outdoor sport facility at Kingston Park and Ramsden Primary Schools and a GP surgery approximately 800m from the site. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.</p> <p>Mitigation: Not applicable as a positive effect has been identified.</p> <p>Assumptions: It is assumed that no loss of the existing PROW or cycle routes will result at the site.</p> <p>Uncertainties: It is uncertain what type of green space provision would be made at the site.</p>
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	<p>Likely sustainability effects: The new garden community is expected to provide sustainable transport links, including new bus stops and cycle routes. The site is also situated within 400m of a number of existing bus stops along the A60 in Carlton-in-Lindrick. There is not a railway station within 1km of the site. Therefore, a minor positive effect is likely.</p> <p>Mitigation: The provision of public transport links at the site may help to mitigate the issue of the distance to the railway station.</p> <p>Assumptions: It is assumed that no loss of the existing PROW or cycle routes will result at the site.</p> <p>Uncertainties: The use of public transport links will ultimately be dependent upon the decisions made by residents.</p>

Land East of Carlton-in-Lindrick		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>TO encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--	<p>Likely sustainability effects: This site is made up of entirely greenfield land and Grade 3 agricultural land. Development in this site would lead to the loss of greenfield and the best and most versatile agricultural land. Therefore, a significant negative effect is likely.</p> <p>Mitigation: Encourage the reuse of building materials for development and provide adequate green open space provision to mitigate the loss of greenfield.</p> <p>Assumptions: None identified.</p> <p>Uncertainties: It is uncertain whether the Grade 3 agricultural land within the site is Grade 3a or 3b.</p>
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	--	<p>Likely sustainability effects: This site is situated within source protection zone 3. Therefore, a significant negative effect is likely.</p> <p>Mitigation: The provision of surface water management measures will reduce the runoff of pollutants into waterways.</p> <p>Assumptions: None identified.</p> <p>Uncertainties: None identified.</p>
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0	<p>Likely sustainability effects: This site is situated within flood zone 1. As such a negligible effect is likely.</p> <p>Mitigation: The use of SuDS will help mitigate the risk of flooding by safely managing surface water issues.</p> <p>Assumptions: None identified.</p> <p>Uncertainties: None identified.</p>
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	<p>Likely sustainability effects: It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.</p> <p>Mitigation: None identified.</p> <p>Assumptions: None identified.</p>

Land East of Carlton-in-Lindrick		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
		Uncertainties: None identified.
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	<p>Likely sustainability effects: It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.</p> <p>Mitigation: None identified.</p> <p>Assumptions: None identified.</p> <p>Uncertainties: None identified.</p>
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	0	<p>Likely sustainability effects: This assessment site lies outside a Minerals Safeguarding Area. Therefore, a negligible effect is likely.</p> <p>Mitigation: None identified.</p> <p>Assumptions: None identified.</p> <p>Uncertainties: None identified.</p>
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	-	<p>Likely sustainability effects: The site is within the setting of the Carlton in Lindrick Conservation Area and the wider setting of a number of listed buildings. In addition, a local heritage monument and a number of heritage elements are located at this garden settlement site. Historic maps suggest that the site has been agricultural fields since the mid-19th-century although has probably always been fields since the medieval period. Existing field boundaries are likely to date from the Enclosure Acts of the 19th-century. The Nottinghamshire Historic Environmental Record (HER) suggests that there has been human activity at the site in the pre-historic periods and possibly during the Roman period. As such, a minor negative effect has been identified.</p> <p>Mitigation: Applications for substantial development at the site are likely to require a desk based archaeological assessment and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of development on the setting of built heritage.</p> <p>Assumptions: None identified.</p> <p>Uncertainties: None identified.</p>

Land East of Carlton-in-Lindrick

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>Likely sustainability effects: This assessment site lies within Idle Lowlands landscape character area. The site is within landscape policy zone (IL12), which is for Conserve and Reinforce as it is in 'good' condition and has a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. Therefore, a minor negative effect is likely.</p> <p>Mitigation: Applications will be required to respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone which will help to mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character.</p> <p>Assumptions: None identified.</p> <p>Uncertainties: None identified.</p>

Table A7.2 Land West of Beckingham

Land West of Beckingham		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	0	<p>Likely sustainability effects: This assessment site does not lie within 500m of a statutory international/national nature conservation designation or 100m of a local designation. Therefore, a negligible effect is likely.</p> <p>Mitigation: None identified.</p> <p>Assumptions: As the site is not located within close proximity to any biodiversity or geodiversity designations it is assumed the effects in relation to this SA objective are limited.</p> <p>Uncertainties: None identified.</p>
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	++	<p>Likely sustainability effects: The area of the site is approximately 102 hectares, where all new garden communities are expected to provide more than 1,000 dwellings. Therefore, a significant positive effect is likely.</p> <p>Mitigation: Not applicable as a positive effect has been identified.</p> <p>Assumptions: It is assumed that larger sites will be able to incorporate a mix of dwelling types and tenures as well as a level of affordable housing.</p> <p>Uncertainties: None identified.</p>
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	+	<p>Likely sustainability effects: This assessment site is within excess of 800m of a major employment site and the new garden settlement is expected to provide small scale employment and job provision of up to 5 hectares in size. Whilst a small number of local businesses currently operate on the site, development is not expected to lead a net loss in employment land. Therefore, a minor positive effect is likely.</p> <p>Mitigation: Not applicable as a positive effect has been identified.</p> <p>Assumptions: It is assumed that the net gain relating to employment would outweigh any loss.</p> <p>Uncertainties: It is uncertain what skill level and type of jobs would be provided through the any development at the site.</p>

Land West of Beckingham		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	<p>Likely sustainability effects: The new garden community scheme is expected to provide a number of key services within the site such as a primary school, local centre and a GP. In addition, the site is within 2km of a number of key services, located in the local centre of Beckingham and Gringley on the Hill either side of the site. Therefore, a minor positive effect is likely.</p> <p>Mitigation: Not applicable as a positive effect has been identified.</p> <p>Assumptions: It is assumed that resident will be able to walk to new key services provided at the site.</p> <p>Uncertainties: It is uncertain whether new key services provided would be sufficient to support new and existing development.</p>
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	++	<p>Likely sustainability effects: The new garden settlement scheme is expected to provide high level open greenspace and a GP surgery. In addition, there are a number of outdoor recreation facilities located just over 800m from the site. Therefore, a significant positive effect is likely.</p> <p>Mitigation: Not applicable as a positive effect has been identified.</p> <p>Assumptions: None identified.</p> <p>Uncertainties: It is uncertain what type of green space provision would be made at the site.</p>
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	<p>Likely sustainability effects: The new garden settlement scheme is expected to provide sustainable transport modes such as a number of bus stops and cycle routes. However, the site is located more than 400m from an existing bus stop and cycle path and it is further than 1km to the nearest railway station. Therefore, a minor positive effect is likely.</p> <p>Mitigation: The provision of public transport links at the site may help to mitigate the issue of the distance to the railway station..</p> <p>Assumptions: None identified.</p> <p>Uncertainties: The use of public transport links will ultimately be dependent upon the decisions made by residents.</p>

Land West of Beckingham		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>TO encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--	<p>Likely sustainability effects: This site lies entirely within greenfield and Grade 3 agricultural land. Development at this site would lead to the loss of greenfield and the best and most versatile agricultural land. Therefore, a significant negative effect is likely.</p> <p>Mitigation: Encourage the reuse of building materials for development and provide adequate green open space provision to mitigate the loss of greenfield.</p> <p>Assumptions: None identified.</p> <p>Uncertainties: It is uncertain whether the Grade 3 agricultural land within the site is Grade 3a or 3b.</p>
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	0	<p>Likely sustainability effects: This site is not within a source protection zone. As such a negligible effect is likely.</p> <p>Mitigation: None identified.</p> <p>Assumptions: None identified.</p> <p>Uncertainties: None identified.</p>
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0	<p>Likely sustainability effects: The site is situated within flood zone 1. Therefore, a negligible effect is likely.</p> <p>Mitigation: The use of SuDS will mitigate the risk of flooding by managing surface water issues.</p> <p>Assumptions: None identified.</p> <p>Uncertainties: None identified.</p>
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	<p>Likely sustainability effects: It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAS) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.</p> <p>Mitigation: None identified.</p> <p>Assumptions: None identified.</p> <p>Uncertainties: None identified.</p>

Land West of Beckingham		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	<p>Likely sustainability effects: It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.</p> <p>Mitigation: None identified.</p> <p>Assumptions: None identified.</p> <p>Uncertainties: None identified.</p>
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	0	<p>Likely sustainability effects: This site is situated outside a Minerals Safeguarding Area. Therefore, a negligible effect is likely.</p> <p>Mitigation: None identified.</p> <p>Assumptions: None identified.</p> <p>Uncertainties: None identified.</p>
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	-	<p>Likely sustainability effects: The site does not contain any designated heritage assets but archaeological finds in and around the site mean there is an increased possibility of evidence of pre-historic or Roman activity at the site. The site is within the setting of listed buildings approximately 500m north of the A361 and Beacon Hill, scheduled monument and the Gringley Conservation Area are 1km from the site. As such, a minor negative effect has been identified.</p> <p>Mitigation: Applications for substantial development at the site is likely to require a desk based archaeological assessment and Heritage Statement to assess the impact of development on the setting of built heritage and the scheduled monument.</p> <p>Assumptions: None identified</p> <p>Uncertainties: None identified</p>
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p>	--	<p>Likely sustainability effects: The site is located within Mid Nottinghamshire Farmlands Landscape Character Area. The Landscape Policy Zone (MN03) is for Conserve, as the zone is in 'very good condition' and of a 'high sensitivity'. Therefore, a significant negative effect is likely.</p>

Land West of Beckingham

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.		<p>Mitigation: Applications will be required to respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone which will help to mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character.</p> <p>Assumptions: None identified.</p> <p>Uncertainties: None identified.</p>

Table A7.3 Land East of Clarborough

Land East of Clarborough		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	--	<p>Likely sustainability effects: This assessment site contains a number of locally designated sites including, Gypsum Pit, (Local Wildlife Site and Regionally Important Geological site), Blue Stocking Lane (Local Wildlife Site) and broadleaved deciduous woodlands and priority habitats. In addition, the site is within 500m of Clarborough Tunnel SSSI. Because of these combined factors, a significant negative effect is likely.</p> <p>Mitigation: Encourage the incorporation of green infrastructure at the site in order to support the creation of new habitats and species and wider habitat connectivity.</p> <p>Assumptions: None identified.</p> <p>Uncertainties: None identified.</p>
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	++	<p>Likely sustainability effects: This site has an area of approximately 102 hectares. All new garden communities are expected to provide in excess of 1,000 dwellings. Therefore, a significant positive effect is likely.</p> <p>Mitigation: Not applicable as a positive effect has been identified.</p> <p>Assumptions: It is assumed that larger sites will be able to incorporate a mix of dwelling types and tenures as well as a level of affordable housing.</p> <p>Uncertainties: None identified.</p>
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	+	<p>Likely sustainability effects: This site is in excess of 800m of a major employment site. However, the new garden community is expected to offer small scale employment and job provision. Therefore a minor positive effect is likely.</p> <p>Mitigation: Not applicable as a positive effect has been identified.</p> <p>Assumptions: None identified.</p> <p>Uncertainties: It is uncertain what skill level and type of jobs would be provided through the any development at the site.</p>

Land East of Clarbrough		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p> <p>To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	+	<p>Likely sustainability effects: The new garden settlement is expected to provide a number of key services including a primary school, local centre and a GP surgery. In addition, this site is within 2km of Clarbrough and Retford where a number of existing key services are located including a GP, primary school and post office. Therefore, a minor positive effect is likely.</p> <p>Mitigation: Not applicable as a positive effect has been identified.</p> <p>Assumptions: It is assumed that resident will be able to walk to new key services within the site.</p> <p>Uncertainties: It is uncertain whether new key services provided would be sufficient to support new and existing development.</p>
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	++	<p>Likely sustainability effects: The new garden settlement is likely to provide high level open greenspace and a GP surgery. This site is within 100m of a number of outdoor recreation school sports facilities. Therefore, a significant positive effect is likely.</p> <p>Mitigation: Not applicable as a positive effect has been identified.</p> <p>Assumptions: None identified.</p> <p>Uncertainties: It is uncertain what type of green space provision would be made at the site.</p>
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	<p>Likely sustainability effects: The new garden settlement is expected to provide sustainable transport links such a bus stops and cycle routes. However, this site is further than 1km to a railway station. Therefore, a minor positive effect is likely.</p> <p>Mitigation: The provision of public transport links at the site may help to mitigate the issue of the distance to the railway station..</p> <p>Assumptions: None identified.</p> <p>Uncertainties: The use of public transport links will ultimately be dependent upon the decisions made by residents.</p>
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p>	--	<p>Likely sustainability effects: This site lies entirely within greenfield and Grade 3 agricultural land. Development at this site would lead to the loss of greenfield and the best and most versatile agricultural land. Therefore, a significant negative effect is likely.</p>

Land East of Clarbrough		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
TO encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.		<p>Mitigation: Encourage the reuse of building materials for development and provide adequate green open space provision to mitigate the loss of greenfield.</p> <p>Assumptions: None identified.</p> <p>Uncertainties: It is uncertain whether the Grade 3 agricultural land within the site is Grade 3a or 3b.</p>
<p>SA 8: Water</p> <p>To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	0	<p>Likely sustainability effects: This site is not within a source protection zone. As such a negligible effect is likely.</p> <p>Mitigation: Encouraging surface water management measures will help to mitigate the potential impacts which might otherwise result in terms of run off into waterways.</p> <p>Assumptions: None identified.</p> <p>Uncertainties: None identified.</p>
<p>SA 9: Flood Risk</p> <p>To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	0	<p>Likely sustainability effects: The site is situated within flood zone 1. Therefore, a negligible effect is likely.</p> <p>Mitigation: The use of SuDS will mitigate the risk of flooding by managing surface water issues.</p> <p>Assumptions: None identified.</p> <p>Uncertainties: None identified.</p>
<p>SA 10: Air Quality</p> <p>To improve air quality.</p>	N/A	<p>Likely sustainability effects: It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.</p> <p>Mitigation: None identified.</p> <p>Assumptions: None identified.</p> <p>Uncertainties: None identified.</p>

Land East of Clarbrough		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 11: Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.</p>	N/A	<p>Likely sustainability effects: It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6.</p> <p>Mitigation: None identified.</p> <p>Assumptions: None identified.</p> <p>Uncertainties: None identified.</p>
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	0	<p>Likely sustainability effects: This site is situated outside the Minerals Safeguarding Area. Therefore, a negligible effect is likely.</p> <p>Mitigation: None identified.</p> <p>Assumptions: None identified.</p> <p>Uncertainties: None identified.</p>
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	0?	<p>Likely sustainability effects: The site does not contain or lie adjacent to any heritage assets, other than elements of ridge and furrow earthworks, possible evidence of medieval or post medieval farming practice. Ordnance survey maps from the 19th century suggest that the site has been arable farmland since this time, although there is evidence of industrial activity in the form of clay/plaster pits. However, the potential for archaeological deposits at the site is likely to be low, with any deposits resulting from farming practices or activity relating to the clay/plaster pits. As such a negligible uncertain effect has been identified.</p> <p>Mitigation: Applications for substantial development is likely to require a desk based archaeological assessment and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of development on the setting of built heritage.</p> <p>Assumptions: None identified.</p> <p>Uncertainties: None identified.</p>
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p>	--	<p>Likely sustainability effects: This site lies within Mid Nottinghamshire farmlands landscape character area (MN04). The site is with landscape policy zone MN04 which is classified as Conserve. The landscape policy zone is made up of predominantly ancient woodland and is in 'very good condition' and is 'highly' sensitive. Therefore, a significant negative effect is likely.</p>

Land East of Clarborough

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.		Mitigation: Applications will be required to respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone which will help to mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character. Assumptions: None identified. Uncertainties: None identified.

Table A7. Land north of Darlton

Land north of Darlton		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
<p>SA 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the District's green and blue infrastructure network.</p>	-	<p>Likely sustainability effects: This site is within 100m of a number of locally designated sites including Beast Wood grassland and several priority habitats and woodland. Therefore, a minor negative effect is likely.</p> <p>Mitigation: Green infrastructure provision should be incorporated within the site to support the creation of new habitats for flora and fauna as well as wider habitat connectivity.</p> <p>Assumptions: None identified.</p> <p>Uncertainties: None identified.</p>
<p>SA 2: Housing</p> <p>To ensure the District's housing need are met.</p>	++	<p>Likely sustainability effects: The site is approximately 120 hectares in area and the new garden settlement is expected to provide more than 1,000 dwellings. Therefore, a significant positive effect is likely.</p> <p>Mitigation: Not applicable as a positive effect is identified.</p> <p>Assumptions: It is assumed that larger sites will be able to incorporate a mix of dwelling types and tenures as well as a level of affordable housing.</p> <p>Uncertainties: None identified.</p>
<p>SA 3: Economy and Skills</p> <p>To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	+	<p>Likely sustainability effects: The site is in excess of 800m to a major employment site. However, it is expected that the new garden settlement will provide small scale employment and job provision. Therefore a minor positive effect is likely.</p> <p>Mitigation: Public transport links could be provided to connect the site with the major employment sites which are located further than walking distance from its location.</p> <p>Assumptions: It is assumed that residents would prefer to seek work close to where they live.</p> <p>Uncertainties: It is uncertain the type and skill level of employment will be available on site.</p>
<p>SA 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion</p>	+	<p>Likely sustainability effects: The new garden settlement is expected to provide a number of key services including a primary school, GP surgery and a local centre. The nearest existing key services to the site are in excess of 2km. Therefore, a minor positive effect is likely.</p>

Land north of Darlton		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.		<p>Mitigation: Ensure development incorporates public transport links which could connect the site with local/town hubs where further key services are located.</p> <p>Assumptions: It is assumed that resident will be able to walk to key services provided at the site. It is assumed that key services outside of the site will be accessed by car and sustainable modes of transport.</p> <p>Uncertainties: It is uncertain if the new key services to be provided at the site would be adequate to support the new and existing development.</p>
<p>SA 5: Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	++	<p>Likely sustainability effects: The new garden settlement is expected to provide high level greenspace and a GP surgery. In addition, the site is within 800m of existing Drayton outdoor sports and recreation facility. As such, a significant positive effect is likely.</p> <p>Mitigation: Not applicable as a positive effect has been identified.</p> <p>Assumptions: None identified.</p> <p>Uncertainties: None identified.</p>
<p>SA 6: Transport</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	+	<p>Likely sustainability effects: The new garden settlement is expected to provide sustainable transport links including bus stops and cycle routes. In addition, the site is located in excess of 1km to the nearest railway station. Therefore, a minor positive effect is likely.</p> <p>Mitigation: The provision of public transport links at the site may help to mitigate the issue of the distance to the railway station..</p> <p>Assumptions: None identified.</p> <p>Uncertainties: The use of public transport links will ultimately be dependent upon the decisions made by residents.</p>
<p>SA 7: Land Use and Soils</p> <p>TO encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	--	<p>Likely sustainability effects: This site lies entirely within greenfield and Grade 3 agricultural land. Development at this site could lead to the loss of greenfield and the best and most versatile agricultural land. Therefore, a significant negative effect is likely.</p> <p>Mitigation: Encourage the reuse of building materials for development and provide adequate green open space provision to mitigate the loss of greenfield.</p> <p>Assumptions: None identified.</p>

Land north of Darlton		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
		Uncertainties: It is uncertain whether Grade 3 agricultural land within the site is Grade 3a or 3b.
SA 8: Water To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.	0	Likely sustainability effects: The site is situated outside the source protection zone. Therefore, a negligible effect is likely. Mitigation: None identified. Assumptions: It is assumed the sufficient surface water and wastewater management will be implemented to prevent the potential for high levels of pollutant run off into waterways. Uncertainties: None identified.
SA 9: Flood Risk To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.	0	Likely sustainability effects: The site is situated within flood zone 1. Therefore, a negligible effect is likely. Mitigation: The use of SuDS will help mitigate the risk of flooding by safely managing surface water issues. Assumptions: None identified. Uncertainties: None identified.
SA 10: Air Quality To improve air quality.	N/A	Likely sustainability effects: It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the District, and proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6. Mitigation: None identified. Assumptions: None identified. Uncertainties: None identified.
SA 11: Climate Change To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to effects of climate change.	N/A	Likely sustainability effects: It has not been possible to identify specific site level criteria for this SA objective as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. Proximity to sustainable transport links is considered separately under SA objective 6. Mitigation: None identified. Assumptions: None identified.

Land north of Darlton

SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
		Uncertainties: None identified.
<p>SA 12: Resource Use and Waste</p> <p>To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	0	<p>Likely sustainability effects: The site is located outside of a Minerals Safeguarding Area. Therefore, a negligible effect is likely.</p> <p>Mitigation: None identified.</p> <p>Assumptions: None identified.</p> <p>Uncertainties: None identified.</p>
<p>SA 13: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	-	<p>Likely sustainability effects: The site is within the setting of East Drayton Conservation Area and a number of Scheduled Monuments and Listed Buildings. The site itself does not contain any heritage assets but boundaries of the site appear to contain earthwork banks, possibly from the 19th century East Drayton Mill. The site appears to have been enclosed fields since the 19th century, however its proximity to medieval villages, including the deserted scheduled village complex at Whimpton Moor and the moated site at Kingshaugh. As a result a minor negative effect is likely.</p> <p>Mitigation: Development at the site has potential to affect the setting of heritage assets and listed buildings in a wider radius. Applications for substantial development at the site are likely to require a desk based archaeological assessment and a Heritage Statement to assess the impact of development on the setting of built heritage and the scheduled monuments.</p> <p>Assumptions: None identified.</p> <p>Uncertainties: None identified.</p>
<p>SA 14: Landscape and Townscape</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the District's landscape character and townscapes.</p>	--	<p>Likely sustainability effects: The site is located within Mid Nottinghamshire Farmlands Landscape Character Area. The site is located within Landscape Policy Zone MN08, which is for Conserve. The zone is in 'very good condition' and of a 'very high' sensitivity score due to presence of historic woodland and limited development. Therefore, a significant negative effect is likely.</p> <p>Mitigation: Applications will be required to respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone which will help to mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding landscape character.</p> <p>Assumptions: None identified.</p>

Land north of Darlton		
SA Objective	SA Score	Justification
		Uncertainties: None identified.

Appendix 8

Council's justification for selecting sites to take forward for allocation and discounting alternatives

The table in this appendix lists all of the reasonable alternative sites that have been considered by the Council for inclusion as site allocations in the Bassetlaw Local Plan to date. It summarises the Council's interpretation of the SA findings for each site and provides the Council's justification for either taking a site option forward into the Publication (Regulation 19) Bassetlaw Plan (August 2021) or discounting it.

Settlement profiles, opportunities, and constraints

The Bassetlaw Plan is seeking to identify suitable land to address the housing requirement within the upper levels of the settlement hierarchy (Main Towns and Large Rural Settlements). As mentioned earlier in this report, Harworth and Bircotes currently have sufficient land to meet their housing requirement. With the exception of Tuxford, the Large Rural Settlements (Carlton in Lindrick, Hodsock and Langold, Misterton, and Blyth) have identified and allocated sufficient land in their Neighbourhood Plans.

Bassetlaw District does not contain any areas of Green Belt land and, as such, in terms of planning policy, land adjoining the development boundaries of Worksop, Retford, Harworth and Bircotes, and Tuxford is designated as countryside by the adopted development plan for Bassetlaw (Bassetlaw Core Strategy 2010 to 2028).

Whilst there are no areas of Green Belt land in Bassetlaw, there are areas of high landscape quality. The Green Gap Study (2019) identifies areas of landscape quality adjoining some settlements as suitable for designation as a Green Gap. Policy ST38 of the Bassetlaw Plan states that, where it can be demonstrated that appropriate forms of development are able to sit comfortably within the open character, role and function of the Green Gaps, they will be supported. It is also important that sites adjoining the Green Gaps have regard to their landscape characteristics to ensure development is designed and situated appropriately to minimise negative impacts on the landscape qualities of that Green Gap.

In accordance with the NPPF paragraph 62 the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies (including, but not limited to, those who require affordable housing, families with children, older people, students, people with disabilities, service families, travellers, people who rent their homes and people wishing to commission or build their own homes).

NPPF Paragraph 73 states that the supply of large numbers of new homes can often be best achieved through planning for larger scale development, such as new settlements or significant extensions to existing villages and towns, provided they are well located and designed, and supported by the necessary infrastructure and facilities. Working with the support of their communities, and with other authorities if appropriate, strategic policy-making authorities should identify suitable locations for such development where this can help to meet identified needs in a sustainable way.

Larger urban extensions and new settlements provide the critical mass to make infrastructure viable; including but not limited to infrastructure such as education services and facilities, health services and facilities, open space, highway improvements both on site and in the wider area, a range of different types of home including affordable homes, accessible homes for older and disabled people, and self and custom built homes or plots. The Council has therefore opted to allocate land for two large urban extensions, one in Worksop and one in Retford, to deliver a minimum of 1970 new homes collectively. The Council is also proposing to allocate land for a new settlement with development to commence towards the end of the Plan, delivering 590 homes by 2038.

Worksop

Worksop is the principal town in the District, has a population of approximately 41,820 and enjoys relative ease of access to a range of higher order health, education, cultural, retail and employment opportunities. Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version Second Addendum 2022.

It is the most sustainable location for significant growth and provides the best opportunity to deliver the objectives of D2N2 Growth and Recovery Strategy the town and its catchment is expected to deliver substantial employment growth (see Policy ST7) reflecting its easy access to the A1 and A57 growth corridors and its ability to maximise sustainable transport choices. As such, it is the place where most new jobs will be created over the lifetime of the plan. Significant regeneration is expected to start in the town centre and its environs by 2038 (see Policy ST5).

Over the past three years, Worksop has experienced high levels of housing growth, with areas such as Gateford Park seeing over 250 housing completions. At the 23rd March 2022 over 1450 of the expected housing growth in Worksop has been delivered, or is on committed sites, with the remainder to come from new allocations. Consequently, there is a requirement to allocate land for a minimum of 1970 dwellings in Worksop. This includes 725 dwellings to be delivered through the Worksop Central Development Plan Document. Approximately 90 of the dwellings proposed for allocations in the draft Worksop Central DPD have either been delivered or gained planning permission and are included in the supply as completions or commitments.

Retford

Over the past three years, Retford has seen strong housing growth with about 350 dwellings completed (2018-2021). As at 23rd March 2022, 966 of the expected housing growth in Retford has already been delivered or is on committed sites with extant planning permission. The remainder of the growth will be delivered from new allocations in the Plan providing for about 1,332 additional dwellings.

This will largely come from the proposed Sustainable Urban Extension allocation at Ordsall South, Retford for 890 dwellings and the Trinity Farm site where planning permission has already been granted for Phase 1, with the proposed site forming a sustainable extension for a further 305 dwellings. The area to the north and east of Retford is constrained by larger areas of high flood risk. Site availability and suitability is also more constrained in terms of access to the public highway on sites in the north and east. As such, opportunities currently tend to be for small and medium scale development in these locations.

There is a large swathe of developable land to the south and west of Retford, in Ordsall, the majority is within the lowest flood risk zone, Floodzone 1. This area has good connections to the public highway and the size of the site provides an opportunity to deliver meaningful infrastructure and a better range of housing to meet the needs of the community. However, there are landscape impact constraints due to the openness of the area, as confirmed by the Bassetlaw Landscape Study and Green Gap Study. In response to the public consultation in January/February 2020, the site promoter put forward a proposal to address the landscape constraints. This involves a sensitively designed scheme which incorporates a significant amount of well-located Green Infrastructure. The Green Gap Addendum 2020 indicates that, on balance, a housing scheme could be accommodated in the Green Gap provided that it is well planned and landscaped and addresses the principles of the Green Gap Study 2019, and the Green Gap Addendum 2020 and emerging Local Plan policy. As up to date robust evidence these have been given appropriate weight in the site selection process.

Harworth & Bircotes

The town of Harworth and Bircotes has experienced significant growth in recent years since the closure of the Colliery. The former colliery site was granted outline planning consent for up to 996 dwellings in March 2011. This increased to 1,300 dwellings with the approval in September 2021 of a revised outline application. Focussed around the ongoing regeneration of the former Harworth Colliery and reflecting the aspirations of the Harworth & Bircotes Neighbourhood Plan the town has benefitted from significant investment and regeneration in recent years. It has a population of 7,948. Harworth & Bircotes has a good range of shops and services and benefits from easy access to the A1 (M) and South Yorkshire. Significant employment growth (see Policy ST7) is expected to capitalise on its strategically advantageous location. Given its growth to date, Policy ST14 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version Second Addendum promotes a small scale expansion of the town centre to meet the needs of the growing community.

Over the past three years (2018-2021), Harworth & Bircotes has seen additional housing growth with over 364 homes being delivered. A significant amount of land is also committed with planning permissions for over 2039 homes, and with 184 completions in 2020-2022. On that basis, no new allocations are proposed for Harworth & Bircotes as delivery will be largely met from existing commitments in this Plan which fulfils its role in the settlement hierarchy.

The Neighbourhood Plan for Harworth and Bircotes covers the period 2015 to 2028. Whilst this does not contain site allocations, a review of the Neighbourhood Plan can address further expansion of the town. Not allocating sites at this point will enable the community to work together to decide where further development will be appropriate.

Tuxford

Since the Bassetlaw Core Strategy was adopted in 2011, Tuxford has experienced very little growth, despite the fact that it is defined as a Large Rural Settlement within the identified Settlement Hierarchy under Policy ST1 of the pre-submission Local Plan. Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan was made (adopted) in October 2016 but it did not allocate land for development.

As of 1 April 2021 there are 108 commitment on sites with planning permission in Tuxford. Over the past 3 years there has been just 3 homes delivered in Tuxford.

There are no new allocations proposed in the Large Settlements except for the site proposed south of Ollerton Road, Tuxford for 75 dwellings which will meet the identified specific growth requirements of that large village. This will provide the opportunity for Tuxford to grow and thrive, and will support local services.

Land off Ollerton Road, Tuxford is situated on the western edge of Tuxford and is considered to be a suitable site which would extend the built up area up to a logical boundary. The Land Availability Assessment 2020 identified the site as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford. The site is identified as available and deliverable from 2027.

There are also various opportunities on sites which are potentially suitable and available. The Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan is currently in the process of being reviewed, sites can be considered for allocation through this process. The Neighbourhood Plan Group will be able to determine the most suitable sites for allocation through the review of Tuxford's Neighbourhood Plan within the first five years of the Bassetlaw Plan. However, the Council is proposing to allocate one site to ensure a sufficient amount of development is being delivered in the initial years of the Local Plan. The site is considered suitable for allocation and it has fewer constraints than other sites put forward for consideration.

Table A8.1 Council's justification for selecting or discounting sites for allocation in the Publication (Regulation 19) Bassetlaw Local Plan as amended by the Publication Version Second Addendum April 2022

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
Housing					
LAA002	Montagu House, London Road	Retford	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, there are no significant constraints to the allocation of the site for housing, provided that the building was retained and converted. The building is a locally listed heritage asset and forms a positive building within the Retford South Conservation Area. There are no other significant SA constraints.	No	The site has not been taken forward for allocation as it is not known if the site is available. At the time of writing, the site is for sale and is being marketed as one dwelling. Planning permission has previously been granted for conversion of the housing into flats. This has now expired. This site is within the settlement boundary and could come forward as windfall development if it becomes available within the Plan period.
LAA540/ GT006	Land at Elkesley	Elkesley	In terms of sustainability credentials, the site scores a minor negative for biodiversity and geodiversity. It is adjacent to Warsop Colliery Line Cutting RIGS and the site is within 5km of the Sherwood Forest ppSPA (the nearest part of the SPA is just over 500m from the site). Providing 9 gypsy pitches in a location with good access to services and facilities, the site scores a minor positive for Housing, Regeneration and Social Inclusion, Health and Wellbeing, and Transport. The site consists of Grade 3 agricultural land. However, this site would be used for provision of Gypsy and Traveller pitches, which may result in a reversible, rather than a permanent, loss of high quality agricultural land. As such,	No	The site has good access to services and facilities in Elkesley, including a primary school, open space, and a bus service. It is capable of providing 9 permanent pitches and will help to address the accommodation needs identified in the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment (2019). Access is constrained and taken from a single carriageway, On balance, it is considered the site should not be taken forward as a proposed allocation for gypsy accommodation.

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
			<p>a significant negative effect is recorded, but this is uncertain. It scores a minor negative for archaeology as the Council's archaeology officer notes that there are cropmarks including trackways and boundaries to the north-west and south of the site. Medieval earthwork to the east including a probable hollow way and ridge and furrow. While there are no archaeology assets recorded within the site boundary, this surrounding activity may extend into the site. It is recommended that any application is accompanied by a Heritage Impact Assessment to include the results of a desk-based assessment and further field evaluation is likely to be required post-consent. This site lies within the Sherwood Landscape Character Area which is within Landscape Policy Zone SH40. This is a 'conserve and create' Landscape Policy Zone, therefore a minor negative effect is expected.</p>		
LAA541/GT005	Land at North Blyth	Blyth	<p>In terms of sustainability credentials, the site scores a minor positive for housing as it can provide 4 gypsy pitches. Whilst the site scores a minor negative for Regeneration and social inclusion due to the distance from services, the SA acknowledges that it has good access to a bus service. Consequently, it scores a minor positive for Transport. The site consists of Grade 3 agricultural land.</p>	Yes	<p>The site has been taken forward as a site allocation for gypsy accommodation. It has good access to a bus service (on Bawtry Road) and reasonable access to other services and facilities, including employment. It is capable of providing 4 permanent pitches and will help to address the accommodation needs identified in the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment (2019).</p>

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
			<p>However, this site would be used for provision of Gypsy and Traveller pitches, which may result in a reversible, rather than a permanent, loss of high quality agricultural land. As such, a significant negative effect is recorded, but this is uncertain. A significant negative is scored for Water as the site is within SPZ3. The Council's archaeology officer notes that there is a multiphase, Bronze Age, Iron Age and Roman archaeology recording in the field to the south. There was also a Roman enclosure recorded during a recent excavation on a site to the north on the other side of Blyth Road and there is high potential for activity to extend onto the proposed site. It is recommended that any application is accompanied by a Heritage Impact Assessment. However, it is likely that the majority of accommodation will consist of caravans which would not affect archaeology.</p>		
LAA012	The Drive, Park Lane	Retford	<p>The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, the site scores a minor positive for housing, regeneration and social inclusion, and access to public transport and cycle routes. However, it scores negatively for loss of soils (Grade 3 Agricultural land), water quality (within Source Protection Zone 3) and landscape impact. It finds that the site is located within a landscape which is deemed 'very good' in the</p>	No	<p>The site has not been taken forward for allocation as there are other, more suitable sites available. Part of the site is within floodzone 2.</p>

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
			Landscape Character Assessment. Part of the site is located in Flood Zone 2.		
LAA012, LAA022, LAA539	Bigby Road and The Drive	Retford	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, the site scores a significant positive for housing, and minor positives for regeneration and social inclusion, and access to transport. However, it scores a significant negative for heritage - the site forms part of the setting of two Grade II Listed Buildings. It also finds that the site is located within a landscape which is deemed 'very good' in the Landscape Character Assessment. Negative effects are also identified in relation to 'loss of Grade 3 agricultural land, and Water Quality (the site is located within Source Protection Zone 3). Part of the site is located in floodzone 2.	No	The site has not been selected to be taken forward as an allocation because there are other, more suitable, sites available. The Landscape Site Allocations Study (2019) indicates that development would have an adverse effect on the quality of the landscape. This relates to important views and landscape features such as trees and hedgerows which add value to the character of the area. The open countryside, which the site forms an integral part of, is also an important feature, and development of this site would have an adverse impact on its landscape quality. Parts of the site are also within Floodzone 2. Residential development would be contrary to policy here.
LAA022	Bigby Road	Retford	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, the site scores a significant positive for housing, and minor positives for regeneration and social inclusion, and access to transport. However, it scores a significant negative for heritage - the site forms part of the setting of two Grade II Listed Buildings. It also finds that the site is located within a landscape which is deemed 'very good' in the Landscape Character Assessment. Negative effects are also identified in relation to 'loss of Grade 3 agricultural land, and Water Quality (the site is located within Source Protection Zone 3). Part of the site is located in floodzone 2.	No	The site has not been selected to be taken forward as an allocation because there are other, more suitable, sites available. The Landscape Site Allocations Study (2019) indicates that development would have an adverse effect on the quality of the landscape. This relates to important views and landscape features such as trees and hedgerows which add value to the character of the area. The open countryside, which the site forms an integral part of, is also an important feature, and development of this site would have an adverse impact on its landscape quality. Parts of the site are also within Floodzone 2.

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
					Residential development would be contrary to policy here.
LAA034	Kenilworth Nursery	Retford	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, the site scores a significant positive for housing and soil loss (brownfield site). It scores a minor positive for economy and skills, regeneration and social inclusion, and access to transport. However, it score a significant negative on water quality - a proportion of the site is located within Source Protection Zone 3. Part of the site to the west is located in Retford South Conservation Area. The SA identifies a significant negative effect with regard to heritage and landscape impact (the landscape is deemed 'very good' in the LCA.	The majority of the site has been granted planning permission for housing. The Council is not proposing to allocate the smaller parcel of land to the east.	The majority of this site has planning consent for residential development, which has commenced. A small part of the site does not have planning consent for development but is available and has been assessed as potentially suitable through the LAA process. This area forms part of a Green Gap that has been identified in the Green Gap Study (2019) as having important landscape quality which should be retained. This supports the outcome of the Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment which indicates the site is within a 'conserve' policy zone. The Council is not proposing to take the remaining area forward as a site allocation.
LAA097	Grove Road	Retford	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, the site scores a minor positive for housing as it will deliver 15 dwellings. It scores a minor positive for Health and Wellbeing and Transport as it has good access to a range of services and public transport. As a greenfield site it scores a minor negative for land use and soils. It also scores a minor negative for heritage due to the impact it could have on the setting of Montagu House. In addition, The Hardmoors and Montagu Cottage are regarded	No	The site has not been selected to be taken forward as an allocation because there are other, more suitable, sites available. For the site to be considered suitable for allocation, it would need to be demonstrated that development would not adversely harm nearby heritage assets. There are also highway constraints which would need to be addressed. A suitable access would need to be demonstrated.

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
			as positive buildings within the Conservation Area. There is also potential for archaeology on the site. A major negative is scored for water as the site is within SPZ 3.		
LAA034, LAA165, LAA539	Combination of the smaller area of Kenilworth Nurseries (LAA034) and sites off Grove Coach Road	Retford	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, the site scores a major positive for housing, and a minor positive for economy and skills, regeneration and social inclusion, landscape impact, and access to transport. However, there is likely to be a significant negative effect on water quality but this is uncertain. Part of the site is located within Source Protection Zone 3. The SA also identifies a significant negative effect with regard to heritage. The western part of the site is in Retford South Conservation Area. In terms of archaeology, part of the site has already undergone evaluation and excavation with Late Iron Age and Romano-British features identified including enclosure ditches and a probable LIA round house structure. Therefore, further work will be required in the form of a desk based heritage assessment and possible evaluation to formulate an appropriate mitigation strategy. As such, a significant negative effect is likely in relation to archaeology.	No	The combined sites are not being taken forward as a larger site allocation as there are other, more suitable, sites which can meet the housing needs of Retford. Whilst the Site Allocations Landscape Assessment (2019) indicates that the site may be suitable for low-key development, it also concludes that the landscape could be harmed. It states: "the site forms part of an extensive tract of land to the east and south of Retford that displays a particularly distinct and handsome rural character, which could be harmed by the development of this site." The Green Gap Study (2019) concludes, this green gap includes some important landscape features such as important views, trees, and hedgerow to the east of Retford. The area forms an important part of the character to this part of the town and this green gap accords with the recommendations of the Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment (2009) which identifies the area as a 'conserve' policy zone. There are also highway constraints. The Highway Authority has indicated the need for significant improvements due to the narrow width of the road (which doesn't meet highway standards) and the lack of footways. This creates uncertainty with regard to the delivery of

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
					development and it has not been demonstrated that this could be mitigated. To the south of the site, archaeological findings have been identified. This would require further investigation if the site was taken forward.
LAA035	South of Railway, London Road	Retford	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, the site scores a minor positive for housing, economy and skills, regeneration and social inclusion, landscape impact, and access to transport. However, there is likely to be a significant negative effect on water quality but this is uncertain. A proportion of the site is located within Source Protection Zone 3. The SA also identifies a significant negative effect with regard to heritage. Development of the site, located in a conservation area, requires careful consideration due to the views from the London Road over the Idle Valley and Whitehouses Road.	No	The site has not been selected to be taken forward as an allocation because there are other, more suitable, sites available. The site, located in Retford South Conservation Area, is quite open in character and has no access to the public highway. It has not been demonstrated how any potential harm to heritage assets could be addressed or access constraints can be mitigated and this creates uncertainty regarding the deliverability of development.
LAA071	Tiln Lane	Retford	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, the site scores significant positive for housing and regeneration and social inclusion. It also scores minor positive for economy and skills and health and wellbeing. However, there is likely to be a significant negative effect on land use and soils, water quality (located within a Source Protection Zone, cultural heritage and landscape and townscape. Additionally, minor negative effects	The north of the site has not been allocated. The southern half of the site has planning consent.	The site has not been selected to be taken forward as a housing allocation as there are other more suitable sites available. In comparison with sites taken forward for housing, it performs poorly with regard to access to public transport. Given the size of the site, there is no certainty that the nearest bus service (approximately 700 metres from the centre of the site) would be extended. The sites taken forward in Retford have much better access to a bus service and will meet the objectives of the Bassetlaw Plan and

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
			were identified in relation to biodiversity and transport.		NPPF by providing opportunities to promote public transport use (NPPF, paragraph 102). In landscape terms, the Landscape Character Assessment (2009) identifies this as a 'conserve' landscape policy area. The Councils' heritage officer identifies that development to the south that is already approved would encroach into the countryside setting of heritage assets already, and that further development in the north would exacerbate this.
LAA127	Fairy Grove Nursery	Retford	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, the site scores a minor positive for housing, regeneration and social inclusion, and access to transport. However, there is likely to be a significant negative effect on Land use and soils (site is Grade 3 Agricultural Land), water quality (located within Source Protection Zone 3), heritage (located within Retford South Conservation Area), and landscape quality (located within an area where the landscape is deemed to be 'very good').	Yes	The site has been taken forward as a proposed housing allocation in the Bassetlaw Local Plan. It forms a logical extension/infill to the settlement and adjoins residential development to three sides and the East Coast Main Line to the west. No significant physical or environmental constraints have been identified.
LAA133 & LAA134	Trinity Farm land North Road	Retford	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, the site scores a significant positive for housing and economy and skills due to the fact that it is proposed to deliver housing and employment. It scores a minor positive for access to transport. However, there is likely to be a significant negative effect on Land use and soils (site is Grade 2 Agricultural Land), water quality (located within Source Protection	Yes	The Council is proposing to take this site forward as an allocation in the Local Plan. The proposed allocation is an extension to a site with planning permission for housing and employment. It has good access to employment and to services and facilities in Retford, and is located on a strategic transport route (North Road) with a regular bus service to Retford Town Centre and Doncaster Town Centre. The Site Allocations Landscape Study

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
			Zone 3), flood risk (approximately 4% of the site is in Floodzone 3).		(2019) indicates that the landscape is unexceptional, being flat and low-lying. In terms of any adverse impact on the landscape, results from the assessment have led to the conclusion that development is more suitable in this location. Approximately 1.2 hectares on the northern boundary is located in floodzone 3. This has been excluded from the developable area.
LAA141	Land south of the common, Ordsall	Retford	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, the site scores a significant positive for housing. It scores a minor positive for regeneration and social inclusion and access to transport. However, there is likely to be a significant negative effect on Land use and soils (site is Grade 2 Agricultural Land), water quality (located within Source Protection Zone 3), and Mineral Safeguarding (Sneiton Gunthorpe Clay). Whilst it only identifies a minor negative effect on the landscape, the LCA study is strategic and does not provide detail on specific sites. The Council has commissioned a detailed landscape assessment study and Green Gap Study to assess landscape quality in more detail.	No (as an individual site)	The site is being taken forward as part of a larger urban extension. See LAA141, LAA270, and LAA276 for the reasoned justification.
LAA141, LAA270, LAA276, LAA246, LAA247, and part of LAA508	Ollerton Road, South Ordsall	Retford	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, the site scores a significant positive for housing. It scores a minor positive for regeneration and social inclusion and access to transport. However, there is likely to be a significant negative effect on Land use and soils (site is Grade 2 Agricultural Land), water	Yes	The site is proposed to be allocated as a large urban extension with LAA246 and LAA247. Whilst there are constraints regarding the impact development would have on the landscape, confirmed by the Bassetlaw Landscape Study and Green Gap Study, this needs to be balanced with the benefits a site of

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
			<p>quality (located within Source Protection Zone 3), and Mineral Safeguarding (Sneiton Gunthorpe Clay). Whilst it only identifies a minor negative effect on the landscape, the LCA study is strategic and does not provide detail on specific sites. The site scores a significant negative for archaeology. The Council's archaeology officer notes that there are undated cropmarks contained within part of the site. Further information is also required to evaluate the archaeological potential of the site in order to determine an appropriate mitigation strategy.</p>		<p>this size with no significant physical constraints can deliver. Development of the site would provide an opportunity to create a softer landscape edge to the south of Ordsall. The site promoter has submitted a proposal which seeks to address the impact development would have on the landscape. Taking this new evidence into consideration, the Council recognises the potential to deliver a sensitively designed scheme which incorporates a significant amount of Green Infrastructure.</p> <p>Most of the site is located with the lowest flood risk zone (Floodzone 1) and it has good access to the public highway. A site of this size can deliver a significant amount of housing to meet the needs of the community. It provides an opportunity to deliver more affordable homes, more accessible homes, including extra care and self-build plots. It also provides an opportunity to deliver a significant amount of new open space, new primary school, local centre and health hub, which is currently more limited in this area in comparison with other parts of Retford, and improved green infrastructure routes for walkers and cyclists.</p> <p>The site has good access to public transport and the public highway, and there are opportunities to improve access and provide highway improvements.</p>
LAA142	Bassetlaw Pupil Referral Centre	Worksop	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, development is likely to have a significant negative effect on water quality	Yes	The site is located within the settlement boundary in a predominantly residential area. The site is brownfield land with no major

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
			(located in Source Protection Zone 3). There are mostly positive effects with regard to the findings of the SA.		physical or environmental constraints. As such, it is suitable for allocation.
LAA147	Former Manton Primary School site	Worksop	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, development is likely to have a significant negative effect on water quality (located in Source Protection Zone 3). There are mostly positive effects with regard to the findings of the SA although there could be mixed effects on health due to the potential loss of play space on site.	Yes	The site is located within the settlement boundary in a predominantly residential area. The site is brownfield land with no major physical or environmental constraints. As such, it is suitable for allocation.
LAA149	Talbot Road	Worksop	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, development is likely to have a significant negative effect on water quality (located in Source Protection Zone 3). There are mostly positive effects with regard to the findings of the SA.	Yes	The site is located within the settlement boundary in a predominantly residential area. It forms an open space of poor quality but high value. A small part of the site is being taken forward as a housing allocation. This will enable the remainder of the site to be improved as a recreational space for community use.
LAA165	South of Grove Coach Road	Retford	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, there are no significant positive effects. The site scores a minor positive for housing, regeneration and social inclusion, and access to transport. However, there is likely to be a significant negative effect on Land use and soils (site is Grade 3 Agricultural Land) and on the landscape (located within an area where the landscape is deemed to be 'very good').	No	The site is not being taken forward as an allocation as there are other, more suitable, sites which can meet the housing needs of Retford. Whilst the Site Allocations Landscape Assessment (2019) indicates that the site may be suitable for low-key development, it also concludes that the landscape could be harmed. It states: "the site forms part of an extensive tract of land to the east and south of Retford that displays a particularly distinct and handsome rural character, which could be harmed by the development of this site." The

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
					Green Gap Study (2019) also concludes, this green gap includes some important landscape features such as important views, trees, and hedgerow to the east of Retford. The area forms an important part of the character to this part of the town and this green gap accords with the recommendations of the Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment (2009) which identifies the area as a 'conserve' policy zone. There are also highway constraints. The Highway Authority has indicated the need for significant improvements due to the narrow width of the road (which doesn't meet highway standards) and the lack of footways.
LAA194	Whitehouse Road	Harworth & Bircotes	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, there are no significant positive effects. The site scores minor positive for housing, economy and skills, regeneration and social inclusion, landscape impact, and access to transport. However, there is likely to be a significant negative effect on Land use and soils (site is Grade 3 Agricultural Land) and on water quality (the site is located within Source Protection Zone 3).	No	The current housing land supply in Harworth & Bircotes is well in excess of the identified need in the draft Bassetlaw Plan. As such, there is no requirement for the Council to allocate additional land. It should be noted that Harworth & Bircotes has a made Neighbourhood Plan which identifies the regeneration of the former Harworth Colliery as a priority. This site has planning permission and development has commenced.
LAA206	North of Mansfield Road	Worksop	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, there is likely to be a significant positive effect on housing delivery. There are minor positive effects for the economy and skills, regeneration and social inclusion, and access to transport. A significant negative effect is likely on Land use and soils (site is Grade 2 Agricultural Land), on water quality	No	The site is not being taken forward as an allocation as there are other, more suitable available in Worksop. This site forms part of the setting of a Grade I Listed Building (Manor Lodge) and Grade II Listed Building. A planning application for housing has previously been refused on heritage grounds. The Site Allocation Landscape Assessment (2019)

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
			(the site is located within Source Protection Zone 3), on Minerals (located within a minerals safeguarding area), and on heritage (the site is located within the setting of a Grade I Listed Building and Grade II listed Building).		identifies that there are significant constraints to development of the site. Part of the site is also located within an area identified as an important green gap in the Green Gap Study (2019).
LAA458,LAA462, LAA469	Peaks Hill Farm - medium urban extension to the west of Carlton Road and East of Blyth Road	Worksop (Carlton in Lindrick ward)	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, there is likely to be a significant positive effect on housing delivery. There is likely to be a minor positive effect on regeneration and social inclusion and access to transport. negative effect on Land use and soils (site is Grade 3 Agricultural Land), on water quality (the site is located within Source Protection Zone 3), and on Minerals (located within a minerals safeguarding area).	Yes	<p>The Council is proposing to take this site forward as a site allocation in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Whilst the SA identifies negative effects on soils, water quality, and safeguarding minerals, these are issues affecting all available greenfield sites in countryside in Worksop. The impact on heritage assets is far less significant on this site than the other sites taken forward for consideration in Worksop. In terms of landscape, the Site Allocations Landscape Assessment (2019) indicates that the site could be developed provided that the woodland is retained and care is taken (i.e. in terms of design) with regard to the topography of the site. Also, the site provides more opportunities to improve infrastructure in Worksop than other available sites, both on a local and strategic level. The Bassetlaw Transport Assessment (2021) identifies a need for the development to provide contributions to the improvement of Blyth Road/ Kilton Hill and to provide a new link road from the A60 to the B6045 (Blyth Road) at distribution road standard.</p> <p>Given the size of the site, it also provides the scope to deliver a significant amount of new housing of the right type and mix, including</p>

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
					<p>affordable housing, specialist housing for older and disabled people, and self-build plots. It will also provide good access to services and facilities. The site is expected to deliver a new secondary school satellite, new sports facilities, and a local centre providing convenience goods.</p> <p>Green infrastructure will also be improved, including new cycle paths and footpaths improving connectivity in the wider area. With regard to trees and woodland on site, the Tree Survey indicates that there is a route possible without the loss of significant trees. Some hedgerow loss would be unavoidable, and mitigation will be sought to retain as much as possible.</p>
LAA210 (smaller part west of Carlton Road) + LAA462 + LAA470 + LAA458	Peaks Hill Farm - large urban extension to the west and east of Carlton Road (100 dwellings to the west of Carlton Road and 700 dwellings to the East of Carlton Road), and west of Blyth Road to link the site to Gateford Park	Worksop (Carlton in Lindrick ward)	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, there is likely to be a significant positive impact in terms of housing delivery. There are likely to be minor positives in terms of regeneration and social inclusion and access to transport. There are likely to be significant negative effects on Land use and soils (site is Grade 3 Agricultural Land), on water quality (the site is located within Source Protection Zone 3), on Minerals (located within a minerals safeguarding area), and on heritage assets.	No	<p>This option includes the site which is being taken forward at Peaks Hill Farm and the site to the west of Carlton Road which adjoins Gateford Estate.</p> <p>Part of the site to the west of Carlton Road forms part of the setting of a Grade II Listed Building and is considered unsuitable for allocation. Development is likely to have an adverse effect on the setting of the Listed Building. In addition to this, the Site Allocations Landscape Assessment (2019) for the site indicates that extensive development is not desirable due to the character and quality of the landscape. The Green Gap Study (2019) identifies this area as having important landscape quality and seeks the protection of</p>

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
					the open character of the area between Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick and is in accordance with the Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment (2009) 'conserve and reinforce' policy zones for the Idle Lowlands and Magnesium Limestone areas. As such, the area to the west of Carlton Road is not being taken forward as a housing allocation.
LAA219	Radford Street	Worksop	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, there is likely to be a major positive impact in terms of housing delivery, regeneration and access to transport. It scores a minor negative for biodiversity due to the site being within 5Km of Sherwood Forest ppSPA. The SA finds that there are likely to be significant negative effects on water quality (the site is located within Source Protection Zone 3). There are mixed effects with regard to Health and Wellbeing due to the loss of former allotments which is balanced with the provision of affordable housing.	Yes	The site has been vacant for many years. It is located within a residential setting and there are no significant constraints.
LAA222	Blyth Road	Harworth & Bircotes	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, there is likely to be a significant positive impact in terms of housing delivery. There are likely to be minor positive effects with regard to economy and skills, regeneration and social inclusion, and access to transport. There are likely to be significant negative effects on Land use and soils (site is Grade 3 Agricultural Land) and on water quality (the site is located within Source Protection Zone 3).	No	The current housing land supply in Harworth & Bircotes is well in excess of the identified need in the draft Bassetlaw Plan. As such, there is no requirement for the Council to allocate additional land. It should be noted that Harworth & Bircotes has a made Neighbourhood Plan which identifies the regeneration of the former Harworth Colliery as a priority. This site has planning permission and development has commenced.

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
LAA225	East of Styrrup Road	Harworth & Bircotes	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, there is likely to be a minor positive impact in terms of housing delivery, economy and skills, regeneration and social inclusion, and access to transport. There are likely to be significant negative effects on Land use and soils (site is Grade 3 Agricultural Land) and on water quality (the site is located within Source Protection Zone 3).	No	The current housing land supply in Harworth & Bircotes is well in excess of the identified need in the draft Bassetlaw Plan. As such, there is no requirement for the Council to allocate additional land. It should be noted that Harworth & Bircotes has a made Neighbourhood Plan which identifies the regeneration of the former Harworth Colliery as a priority. This site has planning permission and development has commenced.
LAA226	South of Common Lane	Harworth & Bircotes	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, there is likely to be a minor positive impact in terms of housing delivery, economy and skills, regeneration and social inclusion, landscape impact, and access to transport. There are likely to be significant negative effects on Land use and soils (site is Grade 3 Agricultural Land) and on water quality (the site is located within Source Protection Zone 3).	No	The current housing land supply in Harworth & Bircotes is well in excess of the identified need in the draft Bassetlaw Plan. As such, there is no requirement for the Council to allocate additional land. It should be noted that Harworth & Bircotes has a made Neighbourhood Plan which identifies the regeneration of the former Harworth Colliery as a priority. This site has planning permission and development has commenced.
LAA227	Corner Farm, Tickhill Road	Harworth & Bircotes	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, there is likely to be a minor positive impact in terms of housing delivery, economy and skills, regeneration and social inclusion, landscape impact, and access to transport. There are likely to be significant negative effects on Land use and soils (site is Grade 3 Agricultural Land) and on water quality (the site is located within Source Protection Zone 3).	No	The current housing land supply in Harworth & Bircotes is well in excess of the identified need in the draft Bassetlaw Plan. As such, there is no requirement for the Council to allocate additional land. It should be noted that Harworth & Bircotes has a made Neighbourhood Plan which identifies the regeneration of the former Harworth Colliery as a priority. This site has planning permission and development has commenced.

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
LAA242	Brookside Walk, Thoresby Close & Dorchester Road	Harworth & Bircotes	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, there is likely to be a significant positive impact in terms of housing delivery, and a minor positive in terms of economy and skills, regeneration and social inclusion, and access to transport. There are likely to be significant negative effects on Biodiversity, Land use and soils (site is Grade 3 Agricultural Land) and on water quality (the site is located within Source Protection Zone 3).	No	The current housing land supply in Harworth & Bircotes is well in excess of the identified need in the draft Bassetlaw Plan. As such, there is no requirement for the Council to allocate additional land. It should be noted that Harworth & Bircotes has a made Neighbourhood Plan which identifies the regeneration of the former Harworth Colliery as a priority. This site has planning permission and development has commenced.
LAA246 + LAA247	South east of Ollerton Road	Retford	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, there is likely to be a significant positive impact in terms of housing delivery, and a minor positive impact with regard to economy and skills, regeneration and social inclusion, and access to transport. There are likely to be significant negative effects on Land use and soils (site is Grade 3 Agricultural Land), minerals safeguarding, and on water quality (the site is located within Source Protection Zone 3).	No (as an individual site)	The site has been selected to be taken forward as part of a large urban extension allocation with LAA141, LAA270, and LAA276. Please see the Reasoned Justification for LAA141, LA270, and LAA276.
LAA246, LAA247 and LAA067	South east of Ollerton Road	Retford	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, there is likely to be a significant positive impact in terms of housing delivery, and a minor positive impact with regard to economy and skills, regeneration and social inclusion, and access to transport. There are likely to be significant negative effects on Land use and soils (site is Grade 3 Agricultural Land), minerals safeguarding, and on water quality (the	No	Part of this site is being taken forward (LAA246 and LAA247). However, LAA067 is not being taken forward as an allocation as there are other, more suitable, sites which can meet the housing needs of Retford. The Site Allocations Landscape Study (2019) finds that, in landscape terms, development of the whole site, including the southern fields would extend into open countryside and detract from the quality

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
			site is located within Source Protection Zone 3).		and character of the area. A partial development (LAA246 and LAA 247) connected to the existing housing to the north and including planting/landscaping to the south alongside the footpath/track could be accommodated without an unacceptably adverse impact on the wider area.
LAA275	Grove Coach Road	Retford	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, there is likely to be a significant positive impact in terms of housing delivery, and a minor positive impact with regard to economy and skills, regeneration and social inclusion, and access to transport. There are likely to be significant negative effects on Land use and soils (site is Grade 3 Agricultural Land) and landscape impact.	No	The site is not being taken forward as an allocation as there are other, more suitable, sites which can meet the housing needs of Retford. Whilst the Site Allocations Landscape Assessment (2019) indicates that the site may be suitable for low-key development, it also concludes that the landscape could be harmed. It states: "the site forms part of an extensive tract of land to the east and south of Retford that displays a particularly distinct and handsome rural character, which could be harmed by the development of this site." The Green Gap Study (2019) also concludes, this green gap includes some important landscape features such as important views, trees, and hedgerow to the east of Retford. The area forms an important part of the character to this part of the town and this green gap accords with the recommendations of the Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment (2009) which identifies the area as a 'conserve' policy zone. There are also significant highway constraints. Both Bracken Lane and Grove Coach Road (Restricted byway) will require improvement including road widening and the

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
					provision of footways fronting the site. It has not been demonstrated how this can be mitigated and this creates uncertainty with regard to deliverability of development.
LAA288	North of Thornhill Road	Harworth & Bircotes	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, there is likely to be a significant positive impact in terms of housing delivery, and a minor positive impact with regard to regeneration and social inclusion, and access to transport. There are likely to be significant negative effects on Land use and soils (site is Grade 3 Agricultural Land) and water quality (Source Protection Zone 3).	No	The current housing land supply in Harworth & Bircotes is well in excess of the identified need in the draft Bassetlaw Plan. As such, there is no requirement for the Council to allocate additional land. It should be noted that Harworth & Bircotes has a made Neighbourhood Plan which identifies the regeneration of the former Harworth Colliery as a priority. This site has planning permission and development has commenced.
LAA346	North View Farm, Bawtry Road	Harworth & Bircotes	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, there is likely to be a minor positive impact in terms of housing delivery, economy and skills, and access to transport. There are likely to be significant negative effects on Land use and soils (site is Grade 3 Agricultural Land) and water quality (Source Protection Zone 3).	No	The current housing land supply in Harworth & Bircotes is well in excess of the identified need in the draft Bassetlaw Plan. As such, there is no requirement for the Council to allocate additional land. It should be noted that Harworth & Bircotes has a made Neighbourhood Plan which identifies the regeneration of the former Harworth Colliery as a priority. This site has planning permission and development has commenced.
LAA365	Land to the north of Gateford Toll Bar and east of A57	Worksop	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, the site scores a significant positive in terms of access to transport and a minor positive in terms of housing delivery, economy and skills, regeneration and social inclusion, and access to transport. There are likely to be significant negative effects on Land use and	No	The site is not being taken forward as a housing allocation as there are other, more suitable sites available. The sites being taken forward will deliver well in excess of the number of dwellings required to meet the need identified in the draft Bassetlaw Plan. Peaks Hill Farm also provides more opportunities to

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
			soils (site is Grade 3 Agricultural Land) and water quality (Source Protection Zone 3).		deliver infrastructure (highways improvements and new services and facilities).
LAA413	Former Elizabethan School, Leafield	Retford	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credential, the site scores a positive for housing, access to employment, regeneration, and land use and soils. It scores a significant positive for health and wellbeing. The only negative score relates to water quality, which is the same for the majority of sites.	Yes	This is a vacant brownfield site located within a residential area. It has good access to services and facilities.
LAA465 ⁸⁷	Car Park & builders Yard, Gateford Road	Worksop	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, the site scores a significant positive in terms of economy and skills, regeneration and social inclusion, health and wellbeing, land use and soils, landscape impact, and access to transport. There are likely to be significant negative effects on water quality (Source Protection Zone 3) and heritage (potential loss of positive building in conservation area).	No	Due to this site being located within the Worksop Central DPD area, it is being considered as a mixed use allocation through that document and not the Local Plan.
LAA472	Station Road	Retford	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, the site scores a significant positive with regard to its impact on soils (no loss) and regeneration and social inclusion. It scores a minor positive with regard to housing delivery, economy and skills, health and wellbeing, landscape impact, and access to transport. There are likely to be significant negative effects on water quality (Source Protection	Yes	The site is located within the settlement boundary in a predominantly residential area. The site is brownfield land with no major physical or environmental constraints. As such, it is suitable for allocation.

⁸⁷ Note that this site is also being considered through the Worksop DPD as sites DPD003 and DPD004

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
			Zone 3) and heritage (potential impact on conservation area character).		
LAA485	Milnercroft/ Trinity Road	Retford	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, the site scores positively with regard to housing, employment, health and wellbeing, regeneration, and transport. It is neutral on the remaining categories with the exception of water and land use/soils which have a negative score. The site is located within Water Source Protection Zone 3 and development would result in the loss of a greenfield site.	Yes	The site is vacant and is located within a residential setting. It provides an opportunity to deliver a small residential development and a community garden.
LAA490	St Michael's, Hallcroft Road	Retford	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, the site scores positively with regard to housing, employment, health and wellbeing, regeneration, land use and soils, and transport. It is neutral on the remaining categories with the exception of water and cultural heritage, which have a negative score. The site is located within Water Source Protection Zone 3.	Yes	This is a vacant former care home/brownfield site located within walking distance of Retford Town Centre. It provides an opportunity to deliver a well-designed small residential scheme. The site is located within the setting of several listed buildings and adjacent to a Conservation Area. Any future development should preserve the setting of the nearby Conservation Area and Listed Buildings.
NP03, LAA089	Land North of Bevercotes Lane	Tuxford	The site scores a minor positive for housing (capacity 21 dwellings), economy (within 800m of a major employment site, and Regeneration and Social Inclusion (being within 800m of a primary school, a GP surgery, a post office and the Local Centre). It scores a major positive for Health and Wellbeing due to good access to a range of services and facilities, including open space. The	No	The Council is not proposing to take the site forward as an allocation in the Local Plan. There are other, more suitable sites available. Highway constraints would need to be resolved prior to the site being considered suitable for allocation. Southern part of the site is potentially suitable subject to a satisfactory access arrangement from the public highway.

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
			site is within 400m of a bus stop and scores a minor positive for Transport. A major negative is scored for Land Use and Soils due to the site being greenfield land. A major negative is also scored for heritage as BDC Conservation has indicated that part of the site (to the north) is considered unsuitable due to the impact it would have on heritage assets.		
LAA476A	Land south of Ollerton Road	Tuxford	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, the site scores a significant positive with regard to its impact on health and wellbeing. It scores a minor positive with regard to housing delivery, economy and skills, regeneration and social inclusion and access to transport. There are likely to be significant negative effects on land use and soils (site consists of Grade 2 agricultural land).	Part Yes	Evidence indicates that the site has good access to services and facilities in Tuxford. There is direct access to the public highway and it is located within floodzone 1 (lowest flood risk area), as such, there are no significant physical constraints. Whilst it is acknowledged that the site would be within the setting of the Conservation Area and the setting of several Listed Buildings, development here is likely to be seen more in the context of the existing modern developments on the south side of Ollerton Road, especially given the topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here. With this in mind, BDC Conservation has no concerns in principle with the allocation of the site, subject to details. With regarding to loss of soils, this should be balanced against the benefits of delivering quality housing, thereby meeting the housing needs of this area which has experienced

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
					more limited development in recent years when compared to other areas of Bassetlaw.
NP05, LAA477	Land west of Newcastle Street	Tuxford	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, the site scores a significant positive with regard to its impact on health and wellbeing. It scores a minor positive with regard to housing delivery, economy and skills, regeneration and social inclusion and access to transport. There are likely to be significant negative effects on land use and soils (site consists of Grade 2 agricultural land).	No	The Council is not proposing to take the site forward as an allocation in the Local Plan. There are other, more suitable sites available. Highway constraints would need to be resolved prior to the site being considered suitable for allocation. This site is in the setting of the Conservation Area, being open countryside to the rear of properties on the west site of Newcastle Street. However, there are no Listed Buildings on that part of Newcastle Street, and a large number are in fact 20th century buildings considered to have a neutral impact on the Conservation Area's character and appearance. As an area of open space, the site does contribute to the countryside character of the Conservation Area. However, most of the site is not visible from Newcastle Street. The only important view in the vicinity is that from Long Lane towards the church, which would not be directly affected. With the above in mind, Conservation has no concerns in principle with the allocation of this site, subject to a scale, layout, design, materials and landscaping which preserves the setting of the Conservation Area and the setting of nearby Listed Buildings (especially the church). It must

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
					be proven that adequate visibility splays would be available from any potential site access commensurate with the speed of traffic due to the proximity to the bend prior to allocation. A development in excess of 50 dwellings would require supporting by a Transport Statement. A development in excess of 80 dwellings would require supporting by a Transport Assessment. A contribution would likely be sought towards public transport and public transport facilities.
NP06, LAA478	Triangular site north of railway line and south of St John's College Farm NP16 site	Tuxford	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, the site scores a significant positive with regard to its impact on health and wellbeing. It scores a minor positive with regard to housing delivery, economy and skills, regeneration and social inclusion and access to transport. There are likely to be significant negative effects on land use and soils (site consists of Grade 2 agricultural land).	No	<p>The Council is not proposing to take the site forward as an allocation in the Local Plan. There are other, more suitable sites available. Highway constraints would need to be resolved prior to the site being considered suitable for allocation.</p> <p>This site is within the Conservation Area, but the issues would appear to be the same as those for NP16, although no application has ever been received regarding this particular small area of land. Given that Conservation did not object to NP16 (and the previous planning application), and as this site is beyond the higher ground to the west which shields it from views eastwards from Egmonton Road, Conservation has no concerns in principle with the allocation of this site, subject to details. The site would have to form part of site NP16 as there would be no other possible connection to the highway.</p>

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
NP09, LAA038	Eastfield Nurseries, Darlton Road	Tuxford	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, the site scores a significant positive with regard to its impact on regeneration and social inclusion. It scores a minor positive with regard to housing delivery, economy and skills, health and wellbeing and access to transport. There are likely to be significant negative effects on land use and soils (site consists of Grade 3 agricultural land) and landscape character (it is within a landscape policy zone for 'conserve and reinforce').	No	<p>The Council is not proposing to take the site forward as an allocation in the Local Plan. There are other, more suitable sites available. Highway constraints would need to be resolved prior to the site being considered suitable for allocation.</p> <p>No heritage assets would be affected by the allocation of this site. Therefore, Conservation has no concerns. The site does not extend as far as the public highway. It is therefore not clear how the development would be accessed. It is likely that the existing accesses would have to be combined or split if between Eastfield Park and Greenacres to avoid the increased potential for vehicle conflict. The site area should extend to the highway boundary.</p>
NP11, LAA087	Land off Lodge Lane	Tuxford	<p>The SA assesses the combined NP11/18 site, which has been allocated by the Council, therefore this commentary relates to the combined site.</p> <p>The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, the site scores a significant positive with regard to its impact on regeneration and social inclusion. It scores a minor positive with regard to housing delivery, economy and skills, health and wellbeing and access to transport. There are likely to be significant negative effects on land use and soils (site consists of Grade 2 agricultural land).</p>	No	<p>The Council is not proposing to take the site forward as an allocation in the Local Plan. There are other, more suitable sites available. Highway constraints would need to be resolved prior to the site being considered suitable for allocation.</p> <p>No heritage assets would be affected by the allocation of this site. Therefore, Conservation has no concerns. Lodge Lane is a private road which lacks footways. The Highway Authority is likely to seek access to a residential development via the adjacent residential site granted under</p>

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
					<p>application reference 15/00690/OUT from Ashvale Road if taken forward.</p> <p>The size of the site is significant. A development in excess of 50 dwellings would require supporting by a Transport Statement. A development in excess of 80 dwellings would require supporting by a Transport Assessment. In this case, a Transport Assessment would likely require supporting by a strategic transport model as the traffic impact would likely be wide spread if the whole site is developed. Several off-site junctions may require capacity improvements. The internal layout would need to be suitable to serve a bus service and a contribution would likely be sought towards public transport and public transport facilities. Multiple points of access are likely to be required to distribute traffic and to facilitate a bus route. The most obvious points are Gilbert Avenue (NP11) and the roundabout serving Tuxford Academy. Both would require additional land, and in the case of the latter, the relocation of the Academy car park. A footway and cycleway will be required on Ashvale Road unless previously delivered under application reference 15/00690/OUT</p>
NP16, LAA202	Land at St John's College Farm, off Newcastle Street	Tuxford	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, the site scores a significant positive with regard to its impact on housing delivery and health and wellbeing. It scores a minor positive with regard to economy and skills, regeneration and social inclusion and access to transport. There are likely to be significant	No	<p>The Council is not proposing to take the site forward as an allocation in the Local Plan. There are other, more suitable sites available. Development is likely to result in the loss of heritage assets (archaeology).</p> <p>Entire site contains medieval ridge and furrow earthworks recorded on the NMP and visible</p>

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
			negative effects on land use and soils (site consists of Grade 2 agricultural land) and cultural heritage (development could negatively affect the conservation area and historic buildings on site and nearby).		<p>on recent LIDAR imagery. The last large area of surviving ridge and furrow in the settlement and significant part of the conservation area. Archaeology Officer would likely recommend refusal of an application subject to the results of Detailed earthwork survey.</p> <p>This site is within the Conservation Area and forms an area of open space considered to have a positive impact on the Conservation Area. The site was, however, subject to a recent application for residential development, 17/00285/FUL, to which Conservation had no concerns subject to details. Although that application was refused and the appeal dismissed, the inspector agreed with Conservation's views regarding heritage. The site also includes a historic agricultural building range, regarded as buildings that contribute positively to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. These should be retained as part of any scheme. 91 Newcastle Street, a grade II Listed Building, is also adjacent to the site. Any development nearby should preserve the Listed Building's setting. With the above in mind, Conservation has no concerns in principle, subject to a) the retention of the agricultural buildings; and b) development of a scale, layout, design, materials and landscaping which preserves the character of the Conservation Area and setting of the nearby Listed Building. The development should provide a road link with both ends of Lexington Gardens as a circular</p>

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
					route. Assess to the land to the east should be safeguarded to allow access to potential future development and a road link to the A6075 Newark Road in order to provide the opportunity to improve the dispersal of traffic. A development in excess of 50 dwellings would require supporting by a Transport Statement. A development in excess of 80 dwellings would require supporting by a Transport Assessment. A contribution would likely be sought towards public transport and public transport facilities.
NP17, LAA158	Land at 56 Lincoln Road	Tuxford	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, the site scores a significant positive with regard to its impact on regeneration and social inclusion and health and wellbeing. It scores a minor positive with regard to housing delivery, economy and skills and access to transport. There are likely to be significant negative effects on land use and soils (site consists of Grade 2 agricultural land) and cultural heritage (development could have negative effects on the conservation area and historic buildings within and near to the site).	No	<p>The Council is not proposing to take the site forward as an allocation in the Local Plan. There are other, more suitable sites available.</p> <p>Part of the site is within the Conservation Area and contains no. 56, a building range regarded as having a positive impact on the Conservation Area's character and appearance, as identified in the Tuxford Conservation Area Appraisal & Management Plan. As such, Conservation would not support the loss of this historic building range and would suggest that part of the site is removed from the boundary. In addition, the site is in the immediate setting of 42 Lincoln Road, a grade II Listed Building. With regard to the land east and south east of No.56, Conservation would have no concerns with the principle of development, although this would be subject to a design, scale, layout and materials which</p>

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
					<p>help to preserve the character and setting of the Conservation Area and the setting of the nearby Listed Building. No objection subject to satisfactory details of access which should be taken from Faraday Avenue.</p> <p>There is potential for the site to support wildlife due to the number of trees on site. A tree survey and ecology assessment would be required to demonstrate that the site is suitable.</p>
New Settlements					
LAA369	High Marnham Former Power Station	Marnham	<p>The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, the site scores a significant positive with regard to housing delivery, and significant positive/uncertainty with health and wellbeing. The site contains CROW open access land, although this appears to be restricted to a footpath, which could be lost by the development of the site resulting in a minor negative effect. However, this is uncertain as existing footpaths could be retained and improved as part of any new settlement. New settlements would be expected to provide a high level of open greenspace and a GP surgery. Therefore, a mixed significant positive and uncertain minor negative effect is likely.</p> <p>It scores a minor positive on economy and skills, regeneration and social inclusion, and access to transport. There are likely to be significant negative effects on biodiversity, flood risk, minerals safeguarding, and heritage.</p>	No	<p>High Marnham is a large brownfield site with a legacy of contamination due to its previous uses as a coal fired power station. It ceased operation in 2008 and was demolished in 2011. Due to its close proximity to the existing electricity grid network, the site provides the opportunity to take advantage of its location to become a focus for zero carbon renewable energy generation within the District and contribute towards the Local Plan objectives of promoting low and zero carbon energy and tackling climate change. Due to this potential for zero carbon energy generation, the site is now less of a focus for employment uses and has been identified as an 'area of best fit' for zero carbon energy generation within Policy ST51.</p>

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
LAA432	Gamston Airport	Gamston	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, the site scores a significant positive with regard to housing delivery and health and wellbeing. It scores a mixed on economy and skills due to the loss of employment at the airport, but minor positive effects are likely on regeneration and social inclusion, and access to transport. There are likely to be negative effects on biodiversity, soils, water (SPZ3), and heritage in relation to archaeology.	No	The site has been assessed in terms of its ability to deliver a sustainable new garden settlement. The responses to the Bassetlaw Plan Consultation from January to March 10th 2019, and subsequent correspondence from the Department for Transport, indicated that it is not appropriate to take the site forward as a new settlement due to the Government's Aviation Strategy and provisions of the NPPF relating to general aviation airfields.
LAA431	Bevercotes	Bevercotes	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, the site scores a significant positive with regard to housing delivery and health and wellbeing. It scores a minor positive on economy and skills, regeneration and social inclusion, and access to transport. There are likely to be significant negative effects on biodiversity and water (SPZ3) and a minor negative effect on flood risk.	No	Following the removal of Gamston as a new settlement, the suitability of Bevercotes as a new settlement has been reviewed. Given the environmental constraints (ppSPA/HRA recommendations/Local Wildlife Site status/Tree Preservation Orders), and subsequent impacts on the size of the developable area, which is constrained in comparison to other sites considered, physical constraints (highway improvements/Twyford Bridge improvements), and its location, the Council has concluded that the site is not suitable for a new settlement. Therefore, it is not appropriate to take the site forward as a new settlement. The area is a designated Local Wildlife Site and it has a Tree Protection Order which seeks to prevent the loss of trees. These are a significant constraints to development.
n/a	Cottam Power Station (Cottam Priority Regeneration Area)	Cottam	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, the site scores a significant positive with regards to housing delivery and health and	No	Proposed as a broad location for regeneration in the Local Plan.

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
			<p>wellbeing. It scores a minor positive on economy and skills, regeneration and social inclusion, and access to transport. There are likely to be significant negative effects on biodiversity and water (SPZ3), minerals and flooding.</p>		<p>The closure of Cottam Power Station has resulted in the site becoming available for consideration as a new settlement. This has resulted in the loss of approximately 300 jobs and there is a need to regenerate the site to address the subsequent effects on local businesses and communities.</p> <p>Following the consultation in January/February 2020 which proposed to allocate the site as a new settlement, the Council has reviewed the evidence base. Given the complexities of regeneration on this site, the Council considers that more evidence is needed to demonstrate the suitability and deliverability of the site as a new settlement. The Local Plan will be reviewed within five years from adoption and this time will enable more detailed work to be undertaken.</p> <p>There are environmental constraints, large parts of the site are in the highest flood risk zone (Floodzone 3) and part of the site is designated as a Local Wildlife Site.</p> <p>As identified by the SA, existing services are located over 2 kilometres away, and are inaccessible to most people unless travelling by private vehicle. There are existing opportunities to connect the site to neighbouring settlements, such as Rampton, via Green Infrastructure routes.</p> <p>There is potential for a rail connection to Retford due to the existing minerals line being safeguarded in the Local Plan. With regard to</p>

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
					deliverability, there is developer interest from regeneration specialists.
Employment					
LAA133 & LAA134	Trinity Farm land North Road	Retford	The SA finds that, in terms of its sustainability credentials, the site scores a significant positive for housing and economy and skills due to the fact that it is proposed to deliver housing and employment. It scores a minor positive for access to transport. However, there is likely to be a significant negative effect on Land use and soils (site is Grade 2 Agricultural Land), water quality (located within Source Protection Zone 3), flood risk (approximately 4% of the site is in Floodzone 3).	Yes	The site (LAA454) has planning permission for housing and employment. LAA133 and LAA134 have good access to employment and to services and facilities in Retford, and is located on a strategic transport route (North Road) with a regular bus service to Retford Town Centre and Doncaster Town Centre. The Site Allocations Landscape Study (2019) indicates that the landscape is unexceptional, being flat and low-lying. In terms of any adverse impact on the landscape, results from the assessment have led to the conclusion that development is more suitable in this location.
HB001/LAA 538 (note this site is for town centre uses)	Harworth and Bircotes Town Centre extension, Scrooby Road	Harworth and Bircotes	The site has good access to services, including public transport. It scores a minor positive for Health and Wellbeing, Regeneration and Social Inclusion, and Transport. This is a greenfield site , as such a significant negative effect is likely for Land Use and Soils. It is within SPZ 3 and scores a significant negative for water. The Council's heritage officer confirmed that there are no above-ground heritage constraints. The Council's archaeology officer noted that this site lies close to areas of cropmarks relating to pre-historic and Romano-British settlement and agricultural	Yes	The site has been taken forward as an allocation for Main Town Centre uses. It provides an opportunity to extend and enhance the town centre offer of Harworth and Bircotes, is highly accessible, by being well located on the edge of the town centre.

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
			activity, however, the officer considered that archaeological potential is low to moderate. A minor negative is likely for Heritage. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'very poor' and it received a sensitivity score of 'low'. As such, a minor positive effect is likely.		
LAA091	Bawtry Road,	Harworth and Bircotes	The site scores a major negative for biodiversity due to a small portion of the north east being within 100m of Ancient Woodland. A major positive is likely for economy and skills as it could provide 33.5Ha of land for employment. A minor positive is scored for Health and Wellbeing as it has reasonable access to open space and other services. It has poor access to public transport so scores a minor negative for Transport. As a greenfield site it scores a major negative for Land Use and Soils. It also scores a major negative for water being situated within Source Protection Zone 3. The Council's archaeology officer noted that there are extensive crop marks around the site and that there is a potential for late Iron Age/Romano-British activity in the surrounding area to extend onto the site. The archaeology officer noted that the site will need to be subject to archaeological investigation prior to development. The Council's heritage officer recommended that Doncaster MBC are consulted given the site fronts one of	No	The site has not been taken forward as an employment allocation because there are other, more suitable sites available with planning permission which can meet the general employment need of Bassetlaw District. Whilst this greenfield site provides an opportunity to deliver employment, there is considerable development underway at the more established employment area to the south east of Harworth. Therefore it is not considered that either of these sites should be allocated for employment uses at the present time.

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
			the main approaches into the Bawtry Conservation Area. The site scores a minor negative for Heritage.		
LAA320	Snape Lane	Harworth and Bircotes	The site scores a significant negative for biodiversity. The site is within 100m of a Local Wildlife Site (Coronation Clump Sandpit) and a Regionally Important Geological Site (Serlby Quarry. It scores a significant positive for economy and skills as it can provide 41.3 hectares of employment land. As a greenfield site within SPZ 3, it score a significant negative for land use and soils and water. As a minerals safeguarded area it scores a significant negative for Resource Use and Waste. In terms of Heritage, The Council's heritage officer noted that the site highly contributes to the rural setting of all 3 heritage assets mentioned and, therefore, raised concern that development on this site would fail to preserve that rural and open countryside setting. There are also archaeological remains across the site which would need investigation .	No	The site has not been taken forward as an employment allocation because there are other, more suitable sites available with planning permission which can meet the general employment need of Bassetlaw District. Development is considered harmful to designated heritage assets. From a Planning perspective, there are other sites available within Bassetlaw which can meet the identified employment need. As such, it is considered that the benefits can be delivered elsewhere in the district without causing harm to the setting of the heritage assets identified.
LAA527	South of Markham Moor pt 2	West Markham	A portion of this assessment site is located within a 5km buffer around the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. As such, a minor negative effect is likely. This site could provide 15.9ha of employment land. As such, a significant positive effect is likely. The site has reasonable access	No	The site has not been taken forward as an employment allocation because there are other, more suitable sites available with planning permission which can meet the general employment need of Bassetlaw District.

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
			<p>to services, including public transport. It scores a minor positive for Health and Wellbeing and Transport. This is a greenfield site, and is situated on Grade 2 and 3 agricultural land. As such a significant negative effect is likely. It is within SPZ 3 and scores a significant negative for water. This site is within a Mineral Safeguarding Area (Sneinton Gunthorpe Clay). As such, a significant negative effect is likely. The site is located in the setting of various designated heritage assets and archaeological assessment would be required. As such, a significant negative effect is scored for Heritage. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'very good' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. As such, a minor negative effect is likely for Landscape.</p>		<p>Development is considered harmful to designated heritage assets, primarily the scheduled monument at West Markham, the Grade I listed All Saint's Church, West Markham and the Grade I listed All Saint's Church/Mausoleum at Milton. Harm shall result from the proximity and scale of the site, the likely scale of built development and the impact of views towards, from, and between the designated heritage assets. The proposals are not considered to preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution. The lack of full details at this stage does not allow for a true assessment of the level of harm to be able to state whether the harm would be substantial or less than substantial in NPPF terms, nonetheless, in considering any public benefits that could be delivered, it is unlikely that there would be any heritage benefits. The local planning authority, when considering benefits in the context of sustainable development[1] would need to consider whether the benefits delivered at this site could be delivered elsewhere, i.e. the benefits in this case are unlikely to be site specific. In addition, sustainable development does include an environmental role, as stated in NPPF paragraph 8. The Government's view of sustainable development includes protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment. The</p>

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
					<p>proposals are therefore unlikely to comply with this aim of sustainable development.</p> <p>In coming to this view section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Bassetlaw Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD policy DM8 and policies contained in section 16 of the NPPF.</p> <p>From a Planning perspective, there are other sites available within Bassetlaw which can meet the identified employment need. As such, it is considered that the benefits can be delivered elsewhere in the district without causing harm to the setting of the heritage assets identified.</p>
LAA528	South of Markham Moor pt 3	West Markham	A portion of this assessment site is located within a 5km buffer around the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. As such, a minor negative effect is likely. This site could provide 15.9ha of employment land. As such, a significant positive effect is likely. The site has reasonable access to services, including public transport. It scores a minor positive for Health and Wellbeing and Transport. This is a greenfield site, and is situated on Grade 2 and 3 agricultural land. As such a significant negative effect is likely. It is within SPZ 3 and scores a significant	No	<p>The site has not been taken forward as an employment allocation because there are other, more suitable sites available with planning permission which can meet the general employment need of Bassetlaw District.</p> <p>Development is considered harmful to designated heritage assets, primarily the scheduled monument at West Markham, the Grade I listed All Saint's Church, West Markham and the Grade I listed All Saint's Church/Mausoleum at Milton. Harm shall result from the proximity and scale of the site, the likely scale of built</p>

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
			<p>negative for water. This site is within a Mineral Safeguarding Area (Sneinton Gunthorpe Clay). As such, a significant negative effect is likely. The site is located in the setting of various designated heritage assets and archaeological assessment would be required. As such, a significant negative effect is scored for Heritage. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'very good' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. As such, a minor negative effect is likely for Landscape.</p>		<p>development and the impact of views towards, from, and between the designated heritage assets. The proposals are not considered to preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution. The lack of full details at this stage does not allow for a true assessment of the level of harm to be able to state whether the harm would be substantial or less than substantial in NPPF terms, nonetheless, in considering any public benefits that could be delivered, it is unlikely that there would be any heritage benefits. The local planning authority, when considering benefits in the context of sustainable development[1] would need to consider whether the benefits delivered at this site could be delivered elsewhere, i.e. the benefits in this case are unlikely to be site specific. In addition, sustainable development does include an environmental role, as stated in NPPF paragraph 8. The Government's view of sustainable development includes protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment. The proposals are therefore unlikely to comply with this aim of sustainable development.</p> <p>In coming to this view section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Bassetlaw Core Strategy and Development</p>

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
					<p>Management Policies DPD policy DM8 and policies contained in section 16 of the NPPF.</p> <p>From a Planning perspective, there are other sites available within Bassetlaw which can meet the identified employment need. As such, it is considered that the benefits can be delivered elsewhere in the district without causing harm to the setting of the heritage assets identified.</p>
LAA532	Land North of Plumtree, Harworth and Bircotes	Harworth and Bircotes	The northern edge of the site is within 100m of Ancient Woodland. As such, a significant negative effect is likely. This site could provide 5.5ha of employment land. As such, a significant positive effect is likely. It has reasonable access to a range of services and facilities, including public transport. As such, it scores a minor positive for Health and Wellbeing and Transport. As a greenfield site within SPZ 3 it scores a significant negative for Land Use and Soils and Water. This site is in the setting of non-designated assets, both Plumtree Lodge and Plumtree Farm. The Council's heritage officer noted that future development should not physically affect these heritage assets. It scores a minor negative for Heritage. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'very poor' and it scores a minor positive for Landscape.	No	<p>The site has not been taken forward as an employment allocation because there are other, more suitable sites available with planning permission which can meet the general employment need of Bassetlaw District.</p> <p>Whilst this greenfield site provides an opportunity to expand Plumtree Farm Industrial Estate there is considerable development underway at the more established employment area to the south east of Harworth. Therefore it is not considered that either of these sites should be allocated for employment uses at the present time.</p>

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
LAA535	Carlton Forest Quarry, Carlton in Lindrick	Worksop	<p>The site coincides with a Regionally Important Geological Site (Carlton Forest Quarry). This assessment site is located entirely within a 5km buffer around the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. As such, a significant negative effect is likely for biodiversity. This site could provide 7.8ha of employment land. As such, a significant positive effect is likely. It has reasonable access to a range of services and facilities, including public transport. As such, it scores a minor positive for Health and Wellbeing and Transport. As a greenfield site within SPZ 3 it scores a significant negative for Land Use and Soils and Water. This site is within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. As such, a significant negative effect is likely. The Council's heritage officer notes that there is only one nearby heritage asset at Carton Forest Farm, a non-designated heritage asset. However, it is on the opposite side of the Blyth Road and is a considerable distance from the two quarried areas. As such, no concerns with the principle of development were noted. There is potential for archaeological remains which would need further investigation. As such, a minor negative effect is likely in relation to archaeology, and a negligible effect in relation to heritage. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'very poor' and it scores a minor positive for Landscape.</p>	No	<p>The site has not been taken forward as an employment allocation because there are other, more suitable sites available with planning permission which can meet the general employment need of Bassetlaw District.</p> <p>The Highway Authority has strong reservations with respect the suitability of this site for further development. Whilst the site has previously received consent for 3,125sq.m of employment uses, the quarrying activity that was ongoing at the time and the associated lorry movements were expected to finish prior to the commencement of the proposed development and the site access arrangements were to be improved. However, the site access arrangements would remain substandard due to the available width from Blyth Road along the existing driveway. Blyth Road lacks footways, segregated cycling facilities, and lacks street lighting at a point where the speed-limited is derestricted (60mph).</p> <p>For the Highway Authority to be able to support such a proposal, a Transport Assessment would be required that demonstrates that safe and suitable access arrangements can be provided from Blyth Road and that appropriate pedestrian and cycling links can be provided to the main Worksop</p>

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
					conurbation and to high quality public transport. It would be most appropriate for the site to be integrated with Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan allocation reference EES07 and or HS1 and EM005, and for the site to share associated infrastructure so the site does not become an isolated enclave that would likely encourage movement by private car.
LAA537	South of Gamston Airport	Gamston	This site could provide 3.8ha of employment land. As such, a minor positive effect is likely. It has reasonable access to a range of services and facilities, including public transport. As such, it scores a minor positive for Health and Wellbeing and Transport. This is a brownfield site, as such a significant positive effect is likely. Being within SPZ3 it scores a significant negative for Water. The condition of the landscape is deemed 'moderate' and it received a sensitivity score of 'moderate'. As such, a minor negative effect is likely.	No	<p>The site has not been taken forward as an employment allocation because there are other, more suitable sites available with planning permission which can meet the general employment need of Bassetlaw District.</p> <p>The site adjoins an established employment area, which is in mixed condition with vacancies which indicate that there may not be the demand for employment uses in this location.</p>
LAA263	East of Markham Moor	Markham Moor	Significant negative for biodiversity. Cliff Gate Grassland Local Wildlife Site is within the site option and Beacon Hill Grassland is adjacent to the site. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.	No	<p>The site has not been taken forward as an employment allocation because there are other, more suitable sites available with planning permission which can meet the general employment need of Bassetlaw District.</p> <p>The site is located adjacent to the A1 and is adjacent to an existing service station area.</p>

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
			<p>Minor positive for health and wellbeing (creates new jobs).</p> <p>Significant negative for land and soil (loss of Grade 2 and 3 agricultural land).</p> <p>Significant negative for water (SPZ 3).</p> <p>Significant negative for heritage: The Council's heritage officer notes that the site is located within the setting of several listed buildings, including Markham Moor Hotel, Markham Moor House and the Milestone (all Grade II) and development could harm the settings of these. The Council's archaeology officer notes that there is no specific site information, but that the site lies close to shrunken medieval settlement of West Markham, a Scheduled Monument. Further information is required to evaluate impact.</p>		<p>Although the site is located close to the A1, the Bassetlaw EDNA identifies it as having good accessibility but is poor in its relation to the local labour supply. The EDNA (2019) suggests that sites to the south of the District are not as attractive to the market for employment which therefore reduces their deliverability. The Bassetlaw Site Allocations Landscape Assessment identifies that due to the sites rise in topography, development here could negatively impact the local landscape character of the area.</p> <p>There are significant heritage constraints due to the site being within the setting of heritage assets. From a Planning perspective, there are other sites available within Bassetlaw which can meet the identified employment need. As such, it is considered that the benefits can be delivered elsewhere in the district without causing harm to the setting of the heritage assets identified.</p>
LAA338	Land off A57	Worksop	<p>The site is approximately 500m from a SSSI and a local wildlife site is located within the site option (Top Wood/Great Whin Covert). This assessment site is located entirely within a 5km buffer around the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. The HRA identifies that this site could support ppSPA birds. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.</p> <p>Significant positive for employment.</p>	Yes	<p>The policy addresses any potential for an impact on biodiversity by requiring future planning applications to be supported by a project level Habitats Regulations Assessment, including winter bird surveys to ensure there are no adverse impacts upon Clumber Park SSSI and Sherwood Forest ppSPA. The policy addresses any potential for impact on air quality by requiring an air quality management strategy to ensure there are no adverse impacts upon the Clumber Park SSSI and Sherwood Forest ppSPA or on local wildlife on site. The Council is working with Natural England and will seek to agree any mitigation measures accordingly.</p>

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
			<p>Significant negative for land and soils (loss of grade 3 agricultural land).</p> <p>Significant negative for water (SPZ3).</p> <p>Significant negative effect in relation to archaeology. Further desk base assessments required.</p> <p>Minor negative in relation to heritage.</p>		<p>The site is located on an important transport infrastructure node for the A1/57 and A614. The site is also close to existing large scale employment sites at Manton Wood and the town of Worksop. The frontage of the site is constrained by mature woodland but there is opportunities for this to be largely retained and act as a "screen". Land within this part of the District has significant commercial interest with a recent large employment land completion. There is also strong market interest in the site and the site is being actively promoted, therefore there is confidence that it will be deliverable over the plan period.</p> <p>The size of the site means that an array of large scale logistics formats can be provided, supporting a wide range of job opportunities for local people as well as education and training opportunities.</p>
LAA368	South of Markham Moor	West Markham	<p>Minor negative for biodiversity – within 5Km of Sherwood ppSPA.</p> <p>Significant positive for economy.</p> <p>Significant negative for land use/soils and water (loss of agricultural land and within SPZ3).</p> <p>Significant negative for resource use and waste:</p> <p>This site is within a Mineral Safeguarding Area (Sneinton Gunthorpe Clay). As such, a significant negative effect is likely.</p> <p>Significant negative for heritage:</p> <p>The Council's heritage officer notes that the site is located in the setting of various designated heritage assets, such as Milton</p>	No	<p>Although the site is located close to the A1 the Bassetlaw EDNA identifies it as having good accessibility but is poor in its relation to the local labour supply. The EDNA (2019) suggests that sites to the south of the District are not as attractive to the market for employment which therefore reduces their deliverability.</p> <p>Development is also considered harmful to designated heritage assets, primarily the scheduled monument at West Markham, the Grade I listed All Saint's Church, West Markham and the Grade I listed All Saint's Church/Mausoleum at Milton. Harm shall result from the proximity and scale of the site, the likely scale of built development and the impact of views towards, from, and between</p>

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
			<p>Mausoleum (Grade I) and West Markham DMV (scheduled Ancient Monument). The Council's archaeology officer notes that there is no specific site information, but that the site lies close to shrunken medieval settlement of West Markham, a Scheduled Monument. Further information is required to evaluate the archaeological potential of the site in order to determine an appropriate mitigation strategy. As such, a significant negative effect is likely in relation to heritage and archaeology.</p>		<p>the designated heritage assets. The proposals are not considered to preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution. The lack of full details at this stage does not allow for a true assessment of the level of harm to be able to state whether the harm would be substantial or less than substantial in NPPF terms, nonetheless, in considering any public benefits that could be delivered, it is unlikely that there would be any heritage benefits. The local planning authority, when considering benefits in the context of sustainable development⁸⁸ would need to consider whether the benefits delivered at this site could be delivered elsewhere, i.e. the benefits in this case are unlikely to be site specific. In addition, sustainable development does include an environmental role, as stated in NPPF paragraph 8. The Government's view of sustainable development includes protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment. The proposals are therefore unlikely to comply with this aim of sustainable development.</p> <p>In coming to this view section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Bassetlaw Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD policy DM8 and policies contained in section 16 of the NPPF.</p>

⁸⁸ See definition of Public Benefit in the id18a of the NPPG.

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
					From a Planning perspective, there are other sites available within Bassetlaw which can meet the identified employment need. As such, it is considered that the benefits can be delivered elsewhere in the district without causing harm to the setting of the heritage assets identified.
LAA369	High Marnham Power Station	Marnham	<p>There are local wildlife sites within the site option and within 100m of the site, including Marnham Railway Yard and Fledborough to Harby Dismantled Railway, respectively. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.</p> <p>The eastern side of the site is within Flood Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.</p> <p>A significant portion of this site is within a Mineral Safeguarding Area (Sand and Gravel Resource). As such, a significant negative effect is likely.</p> <p>Significant negative for heritage. With the setting of several listed buildings.</p> <p>Minor negative for archaeology: Undated cropmarks are located close to the site. In addition, there is no specific site information and further information is required to evaluate the archaeological potential of the site in order to determine an appropriate mitigation strategy.</p>	No	High Marnham is a large brownfield site with a legacy of contamination due to its previous uses as a coal fired power station. It ceased operation in 2008 and was demolished in 2011. Due to its close proximity to the existing electricity grid network, the site provides the opportunity to take advantage of its location to become a focus for zero carbon renewable energy generation within the District and contribute towards the Local Plan objectives of promoting low and zero carbon energy and tackling climate change. Due to this potential for zero carbon energy generation, the site is now less of a focus for employment uses and has been identified as an 'area of best fit' for zero carbon energy generation within Policy ST51.
LAA432A	South of Gamston Airfield – Bunker's Hill part only	Elkesley	Minor negative for biodiversity: within 5Km of Sherwood ppSPA.	No	The site is located adjacent to the A1 and just to the north of Elkesley village and is partly developed for existing employment uses, but is

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
			<p>Significant positive for employment.</p> <p>Minor positive for health and wellbeing and transport (within 400m of a bus stop) and creation of new jobs.</p> <p>Significant negative for water (SPZ3)</p> <p>Significant negative for heritage:</p> <p>The archaeology officer notes that the site is located in an area of Roman settlement activity. Further information is required in the form of initial desk based heritage assessment with possible further requirements for evaluation in order to determine an appropriate mitigation strategy.</p>		<p>of low quality with a lack of reliable infrastructure to access the site . Although the site is located close to the A1 the Bassetlaw EDNA identifies it as having good accessibility but is poor in its relation to the local labour supply. The Sheffield City Region Strategic Employment Land Assessment suggest that sites to the south of the District and away from the A1M have not been tested in terms of their commercial attractiveness and therefore reduces their deliverability.</p>
LAA456	Coalpit Lane	Elkesley	<p>Minor negative for biodiversity: within 5Km of Sherwood ppSPA.</p> <p>Significant positive for employment.</p> <p>Minor positive for health and wellbeing and transport (within 400m of a bus stop) and creation of new jobs.</p> <p>Significant negative for water (SPZ3)</p> <p>Significant negative for heritage:</p> <p>The archaeology officer notes that the site is located in an area of Roman settlement activity. Further information is required in the form of initial desk based heritage assessment with possible further requirements for evaluation in order to determine an appropriate mitigation strategy.</p>	No	<p>The site has not been taken forward for employment. It is located adjacent to the A1 and just to the west of Elkesley village and is partly developed for existing employment uses. Although the site is located close to the A1, the Bassetlaw EDNA study identifies it as having good accessibility but is poor in its relation to the local labour supply. The EDNA (2019) suggests that sites to the south of the District are not as attractive to the market for employment which therefore reduces their deliverability.</p>

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
LAA468	Carlton Forest	Carlton in Lindrick	A Local wildlife sites and a Regionally Important Geological Site are located within the site option. This assessment site is located entirely within a 5km buffer around the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.	No	Carlton Forest is identified as an existing employment site and part of it has recently been granted planning permission.
LAA580	Land to the North of Serlby Road	Harworth and Bircotes	<p>Minor negative for Biodiversity and Geodiversity due to the likely impact on the SSSI and the LWS. Potential impact on protected species/ wider ecology on the site.</p> <p>Minor positive for Transport and Wellbeing</p> <p>Major negative land use, soil and water due to the likely impact on water course within 150m of the site.</p> <p>Major negative for cultural heritage due to the impact on local heritage assets</p> <p>Minor positive for landscape and townscape.</p>	No	The site has not been taken forward as an employment allocation because there are other, more suitable and less constrained sites available with planning permission which can meet the general employment need of Bassetlaw District. Whilst this greenfield site provides an

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
					opportunity to deliver employment, there is considerable development underway at the more established employment area to the south east of Harworth. Therefore it is not considered that the site should be allocated for employment uses at the present time.
LAA581	Land to the North of Old Coach Road – Manton Wood	Worksop	<p>Major negative for biodiversity and geodiversity directly adjacent to the Sherwood for PPSPA and has suitable habitat for Woodlark and other species. Development would likely negatively impact the wider environment and on the wider woodland.</p> <p>Minor positive for economy and skills</p> <p>Minor positive for Transport and Heath and Wellbeing</p>	No	Although the site is located close to the A1/A57 the development is also considered harmful to designated heritage assets,

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
			<p>Major negative for land use, soils and water due to the likely impact on the fowl sewer and impacts to the existing capacity. Water courses likely to be within 250m of the site.</p> <p>Major negative for cultural heritage and landscape due to its impact on the Grade I registered Historic Park and Gardens and Manton Lodge which is a Non-designated heritage asset.</p>		<p>primarily the Grade I registered Historic park and Garden and Manton Lodge. Harm shall result from the proximity and scale of the site, the likely scale of built development and the impact of views towards, from, and between the designated heritage assets. The lack of full details at this stage does not allow for a true assessment of the level of harm to be able to state whether the harm would be</p>

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
					substantial or less than substantial in NPPF terms, nonetheless, in considering any public benefits that could be delivered, it is unlikely that there would be any heritage benefits. The local planning authority, when considering benefits in the context of sustainable development would need to consider whether the benefits delivered at this site could be delivered elsewhere, i.e. the benefits in

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
					<p>this case are unlikely to be site specific. In addition, sustainable development does include an environmental role, as stated in NPPF paragraph 8.</p> <p>In coming to this view section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Bassetlaw Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD policy DM8 and policies contained in section 16 of the NPPF.</p>

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
					<p>In addition, the site is directly adjacent to the proposed Sherwood PPSPA and has a suitable habitat for the protected Woodlark and other species. The lack of full details at this stage does not allow for a true assessment of the level of harm to be able to state whether the harm would be substantial or less than substantial in NPPF terms and there are more suitable sites that can satisfactorily accommodat</p>

Reference	Site Address	Settlement	SA results as summarised by the Council	Selected for allocation Y/N?	Council's reasoned justification for taking site forward for allocation or not
					<p>e the Districts employment needs.</p>

Appendix 9

Council's Justification for Selecting Garden Settlement Options in Part 1

To build on the initial idea to introduce a new settlement into the District, work was undertaken to explore areas of the District that could be potentially suitable to accommodate new settlement. In 2017, Bassetlaw District Council commissions independent ADAS Consultants to produce a non-technical desktop study which aimed to review the availability of land in Bassetlaw, with the objective of identifying suitable sites available for development and restricted areas that should be avoided.

The desktop assessment was conducted using various tools detailed within this methodology. The work draws on methodology from The Bassetlaw Plan Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (March 2016). The Area of Search methodology categorised areas of land into three categories as identified below:

- Category 1: An area with good potential to accommodate a new settlement, with little or no limitations affecting the area. Parishes with areas that fell within this category were taken forward to stage 2 of the study. A high-level SA was undertaken for each of the sites.
- Category 2: An area with potential to accommodate a new settlement with a few constraints directly affecting any potential site. Parishes which have sites which fell into this category were not taken through to stage 2 as more appropriate locations exist elsewhere in the District.
- Category 3: An area with significant constraints which would potentially impact on the development of a new settlement. Parishes categorised as red are considered the least suitable areas for a new settlement due to the number of designations and constraints. Parishes in category 3 were not taken forward for further consideration.

The site selection process looked at any known the physical, environmental, landscape and technical constraints within each parish boundary. Any existing land uses and developments in the nearby area that also had the potential to result in significantly harmful impacts on the future residents, were also taken into account when determining the individual site areas. In addition to sites identified through this process, two sites were also put forward to the Council as part of the Local Plan consultation process, therefore these were considered as options in the assessment – the former Bevercotes Colliery and Gamston Airport.

The aim of the study was to find an area of land, outside of the three main settlements, which would help meet the Council's housing needs by being able to accommodate at least 1500 homes on a site size ranging from 50ha -150ha. The initial study identified six potential locations:

- a) Gamston Airport
- b) Former Bevercotes Colliery
- c) Land East of Carlton-in-Lindrick
- d) Land East of Clarborough
- e) Land West of Beckingham
- f) Land North of Darlton

The land for housing and economic purposes could form an independent settlement without the drawback of coalescence with existing settlements or economically impacting upon existing markets.

The early site assessments undertaken identified that, in line with the Governments Garden City principles, three locations; 1) Gamston Airport and 2) the former Bevercotes Colliery, and 3) land to the east of Carlton in Lindrick were most likely to be suitable for a newly planned settlement.

All these locations could potentially provide community and infrastructure benefit if they were planned and delivered collectively as broader sites for rural development and regeneration.

These sites were then subject to further investigation and consultation through the Council's Sustainability Appraisal and the draft Local Plan consultation process during 2019.

A Review of the Proposed Garden Village

Following the feedback from the 2019 draft Plan on the proposed Garden Village locations, this revised spatial strategy included a review of the potential size and location of the Garden Village. Additional sites were made available during the consultation in 2019 and these have been assessed through the Sustainability Appraisal as reasonable alternatives for the location of a Garden Village along with those identified previously. These sites included the former Power Station sites at Cottam and High Marnham and land between Worksop and Retford at Morton.

The outcome of further assessment of all sites, along with feedback from statutory consultees and updated evidence on the suitability of the proposed locations, led to a change in the spatial strategy. The focus for the Garden Village was for a larger more longer-term site capable of accommodating around 4000 new homes and sustainable travel infrastructure such as a new train station over a 30 year period.

Appendix 10

Council's Justification for selecting policies in light of reasonable alternatives

Table A10.1 Audit trail of policy development for the Bassetlaw Local Plan for the Part 1 Bassetlaw Draft Plan (2019)

Proposed policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach
<p>Policy 1 Spatial Strategy</p> <p>The Bassetlaw Spatial Strategy is encapsulated in five Spatial Strategy Strands. Each strand outlines the spatial priorities and role of their respective settlement, settlements or area. Drawn together as a collective whole, these strands set out the comprehensive strategy that covers the whole of the District of Bassetlaw.</p> <p>The distribution of development within Bassetlaw, over the period specified in this plan will accord with the aims of one or more of the following Strategy Strands. This will ensure the pattern, scale and quality of new development supports the strategic aims of policies 2 to 9 contributing to the overall sustainable pattern of growth sought in the vision of this plan and ensure the identified housing and economic development needs for Bassetlaw are met within the plan period.</p> <p>Planning permission will be granted for sites that comply with the relevant strategic allocations, specific sites allocations or the strategic and detailed policies governing the organic growth of settlements through market led windfall applications.</p> <p>Over the plan period, additional permissions will be granted where it can be demonstrated that the benefits of the development will support the regeneration of the District and provide identifiable social, economic and environmental improvements above and beyond the current aims of this plan. This may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unforeseen major redevelopment opportunities on largescale brownfield sites; or • Development in line with the presumption in favour of sustainable development if there is an identified shortfall in housing supply or past delivery as established by the most up to date five year housing supply statement or housing delivery test; or • The delivery of town centre regeneration opportunities driven by the changing nature of the retail sector and the evolving role and function of town centres. <p>The Spatial Strategy Stands for Bassetlaw are:</p> <p>1 Rural Bassetlaw</p>	<p><u>Alternative: Maintain the current strategy (Bassetlaw District Council's Core Strategy)</u></p> <p>Retain 80% of planned development being directed to Worksop, Retford and Harworth Bircotes, with sites being allocated to accommodate this. The remaining 20% of growth would be allocated to the smaller service centres, comprising smaller towns and larger villages</p> <p><u>Alternative: a new hierarchy based on functional geography</u></p> <p>A revised spatial hierarchy, reflecting functional relationships between different villages. Focusing higher growth in the largest settlements and supporting organic growth of villages within defined 'functional clusters'</p> <p><u>Alternative: Focus new development along the A1 corridor</u></p> <p>This option seeks to maximise the potential of the A1 corridor as a driver for new employment, providing new housing clustered around the settlements with greatest access to the A1 – i.e. Harworth and Bircotes, Blyth, Gamston (airport), Tuxford, Ranby, East</p>	<p><u>Alternative: Maintain the current strategy (Bassetlaw District Council's Core Strategy)</u></p> <p>This strategy has reduced the land available to continue to pursue it with new growth targets, whilst large extant housing permissions around Worksop and Harworth & Bircotes mean that these places may be now less attractive for additional large scale growth in the coming years. This concentration of new development in places that have already seen significant new development may put pressure on land availability, and, in turn, on sites designated for environmental protection, particularly around Worksop and Retford.</p> <p>One of the main shortcomings of the existing strategy is the limited range of rural settlements that are allowed any residential development, hindering the long term sustainability credentials of many villages and reinforcing rural inequalities.</p> <p><u>Alternative: a new hierarchy based on functional geography</u></p> <p>Further detailed investigation of this model's application indicated that the cluster model was not sufficiently attuned to local geography. Most notably, it revealed that some settlements excluded from functional clusters based on a somewhat arbitrary proximity threshold</p>

Proposed policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach
<p>Proportionate growth through a careful mix of planned and managed organic development that will support the living, working and environmentally diverse landscape of the District, containing over 60 villages and hamlets located in a range of distinct landscapes, shaped by a legacy of agriculture, mining and historic Ducal estates.</p> <p>2 Worksop: sub-regional centre</p> <p>New development within and adjoining the largest town in Bassetlaw along with supporting town centre focused investment and regeneration to support Worksop's role as the main employment, infrastructure and service centre for the District. Economic investment and residential growth in Worksop will also support and benefit from the town's strong sub-regional links to South Yorkshire and widely connected through excellent proximity to both the A57, A1 and east-west rail links. This growth will significantly contribute to the delivery of new housing and economic development.</p> <p>3 Retford: rural-hub town</p> <p>New development within and adjoining the second largest town in Bassetlaw along with supporting town centre focused investment to support Retford's role as an important infrastructure and service centre for the District. Economic investment and residential growth in Retford will also benefit from the town's close proximity to the A1 and strong regional/national rail links. This growth will significantly contribute to the delivery of new housing and economic development.</p> <p>4 Harworth & Bircotes: local regeneration centre</p> <p>Focused investment and new developments to support the continued regeneration of the third largest town in Bassetlaw and strengthen its role as a local infrastructure and service centre for the northeast of the District. Development will also be supported where it can benefit from Harworth & Bircotes excellent connections to South Yorkshire and access to the A1. This growth will significantly contribute to the delivery of new housing and employment development.</p> <p>5 New Garden Villages</p>	<p>Markham, Markham Moor, Elkesley and Worksop (east)</p> <p><u>Alternative: New/expanded rural settlements</u></p> <p>This approach would concentrate new development in the rural parts of the District and would be achieved by seeking to expand one or more of the existing rural service centres, or local service centres, to become a small town, with associated improved infrastructure and service provision.</p> <p><u>Alternative: Large scale urban extensions</u></p> <p>This approach would see the majority of new housing and employment development directed to one or two strategic sites on the edge of Worksop and/or Retford, with limited small scale development in other settlements.</p> <p><u>Alternative: Hybrid option</u></p> <p>Utilising elements of the above options, this option would incorporate a new settlement hierarchy, based on functional geography with the scale of growth being commensurate with each settlement's sustainability and infrastructure capacity. This option would potentially include large scale</p>	<p><u>Alternative: Focus new development along the A1 corridor</u></p> <p>While the A1 corridor provides economic development opportunities which would be supported by new housing development, there is a need to distribute development more widely to ensure that all areas of Bassetlaw grow sustainably.</p> <p><u>Alternative: New/expanded rural settlements</u></p> <p>Although this option would provide the opportunity to deliver a step change in rural service provision, meeting rural housing needs and support the viability of rural bus services, as a more environmentally sustainable mode of transport, it also limits the range of social needs that could be met through planned growth, particularly those present in the District's towns.</p> <p><u>Alternative: Large scale urban extensions</u></p> <p>Given that approximately 35% of the population live in the rural areas, this approach is not considered appropriate. Research evidence indicates that large urban extensions take many years to commence and build out, therefore this approach is very unlikely to deliver the amount of development required in the early years of the Plan. Land availability is likely to limit the choice/range of options.</p>

Proposed policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach
<p>In line with the Garden City principles the high quality development of two new villages will commence in order to establish a sustainable community that will deliver a large number of new homes within Bassetlaw over the next 30 years with a significant number of new homes delivered within this plan's period. The new villages at Gamston airport and the former Bevercotes colliery will deliver the regeneration of two closely located brownfield sites where development will meet the needs to the wider area and collectively provide a scale of growth capable of delivering services, facilities and employment opportunities as well as delivering net environmental gains. These new villages will establish focal points for the wider rural area through infrastructure improvements that will increase the overall accessibility within this area of the District.</p>	<p>urban extensions around Worksop/Retford, a new or expanded rural settlement and allocating land for economic development and associated housing along the A1 corridor. In line with the existing Core Strategy, market-led employment growth outside of locations considered sustainable for residential growth this will be supported if the need to be in a specific location can be justified. This approach will allow farm diversification and other small scale rural enterprises.</p> <p><u>Alternative: Equitable distribution of growth</u></p> <p>This option moves away from a role-driven hierarchy approach to the spatial strategy. Instead, it ranks each settlement in Bassetlaw by size, based on the number of existing dwellings and would allocate planned growth commensurate to settlement size – i.e. all settlements could contribute to the District growth target up to a cap of 20%. As such, the larger settlements would still deliver the greatest number of new homes, but it would allow for a fairer spread of growth and thereby give potential for a degree of uplift for all settlements</p> <p><u>Alternative: Parallel strategies</u></p>	<p><u>Alternative: Hybrid option</u></p> <p>The preferred approach draws upon aspects of this, along with elements of equitable distribution and parallel strategies.</p> <p><u>Alternative: Equitable distribution of growth</u></p> <p>The preferred approach draws upon aspects of this, along with elements of the hybrid option and parallel strategies</p> <p><u>Alternative: Parallel strategies</u></p> <p>The preferred approach draws upon aspects of this, along with elements of the hybrid option and equitable distribution</p>

Proposed policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach
	Chosen approach	
<p>Policy 2 Strategic Growth</p> <p><u>1. Overall Housing Requirement 2018 to 2035</u></p> <p>Housing requirement = 6,630 (390 dpa)</p>	<p><u>Alternative: Standard method without an uplift (306 dpa)</u></p> <p>This option purely uses the Standard Method with no uplift – 2014-based household projections</p> <p><u>Alternative: SHMA Update (2017) 374 dpa</u></p> <p>This approach would adopt the OAN suggested by the Council's SHMA.</p> <p><u>Alternative: Experian economic growth midpoint scenario</u></p> <p>493 dpa based on the Experian economic growth midpoint scenario</p>	<p><u>Proposed approach: Housing requirement 6,630 (390 dpa)</u></p> <p>National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) indicates that the starting point for calculating a District's housing need is the standard method. This results in a housing need figure of 306 dpa. The PPG also identifies where a higher figure should be considered. It indicates that past trends and recommendations of a recent SHMA should be considered when determining the housing requirement. Where Councils are seeking a lower housing requirement figure than the SHMA, this should be justified. The proposal to adopt 390 dpa as the housing requirement supports the level of economic growth identified by the EDNA and it accords with the requirements of the NPPF (2018) and PPG.</p> <p><u>Alternative: Standard method without an uplift (306 dpa)</u></p> <p>This is the minimum housing need that must be delivered. It does not support economic growth and fewer affordable homes would be delivered if this was adopted as the housing requirement.</p> <p><u>Alternative: SHMA Update (2017) 374 dpa</u></p> <p>This would not support the level of economic growth identified by the draft EDNA (2018) but it</p>

Proposed policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach
		<p>would support the delivery of more affordable homes.</p> <p><u>Alternative: Experian economic growth midpoint scenario 493 dpa</u></p> <p>The Bassetlaw EDNA (2018) explores a range of growth options (baseline, midpoint, and high growth scenarios) using three economic models (Cambridge Econometrics, Oxford Economics, and Experian).</p> <p>The study interrogates a number of sectors as being potential growth sectors and the extent to which this is picked out in the forecasts. This identified two sectors to which some sensitivity scenarios were developed, those being manufacturing and transport and storage where the 2004-2017 growth rate has been applied. This correlates with the commercial property data.</p> <p>The conclusions from the Bassetlaw EDNA find that the OE forecasts (resulting in a housing requirement of 390 dpa) provide the most balanced reflection of the District's economy once uplifts are included to the transport and manufacturing sectors, which align with recent performance in the labour market and commercial property data.</p> <p>Experian's midpoint scenario (which results in a housing requirement of 493 dpa) identifies significant growth in government sector jobs. This is not considered to be realistic as there are no plans for growth in this sector in Bassetlaw.</p>
Policy 2 Strategic Growth	1. Rural Bassetlaw	1. Rural Bassetlaw

Proposed policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach
<p><u>2. Housing Distribution</u></p> <p>Rural settlements – 27% of overall growth</p> <p>Worksop - 24% of overall growth</p> <p>Retford – 13% of overall growth</p> <p>Harworth & Bircotes - 21% of overall growth</p> <p>New Garden Villages – 15% of overall growth</p>	<p><u>Alternative option: deliver fewer homes</u></p> <p>Deliver less development than proposed in the Local Plan.</p> <p><u>Alternative option: deliver more homes</u></p> <p>Deliver more development than proposed in the Local Plan.</p> <p><u>Alternative option: No change</u></p> <p>Growth across a more limited range of settlements as set out in the Core Strategy hierarchy.</p> <p>2. Worksop sub regional centre</p> <p><u>Alternative option: deliver fewer homes</u></p> <p>Deliver less development than proposed in the Local Plan.</p> <p>(Note that a higher figure is not considered to be a reasonable alternative, due to lack of land availability and viability issues.)</p> <p>3. Retford: rural-hub town</p> <p><u>Alternative option: deliver more development (housing and employment)</u></p> <p>Deliver more development than proposed.</p> <p>(Note that a lower figure is not considered to be a reasonable alternative, as this would not provide the critical mass necessary to support local</p>	<p><u>Proposed policy:</u></p> <p>The proposed policy is to grow 72 villages by 10%. This would equate to 27% of the District's housing requirement. Approximately 35% of Bassetlaw's population live in the rural areas of the District (Source: ONS, 2015 MYE). Growth has been stifled in many rural settlements due to policy constraints of the Bassetlaw Core Strategy (2011). The percentage share of growth proposed by the Local Plan (27%) will help to address this and deliver the homes needed in the rural settlements. This approach will require 105 dpa to be delivered across the rural area in 73 settlements (26 More settlements than the Core Strategy policies support). This approach accords with the NPPF (2018) which seeks to support and promote the vitality of rural communities (NPPF, paragraph 78).</p> <p><u>Alternative option: deliver fewer homes</u></p> <p>Lower growth would not support or enhance existing rural services. This would threaten the long term sustainability of services and facilities in the villages, and this is likely to affect the health and wellbeing of residents living in rural areas.</p> <p><u>Alternative option: deliver more homes</u></p> <p>Higher growth would fail to make effective use of brownfield land and the ease of access to services and employment in the larger settlements. It would also put a strain on existing</p>

Proposed policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach
	<p>services, infrastructure improvements or the local economy.)</p> <p>4. Harworth & Bircotes: local regeneration centre</p> <p><u>Alternative option: deliver less development (housing and employment)</u></p> <p>Deliver less development than proposed.</p> <p><u>Alternative option: deliver more development (housing and employment)</u></p> <p>Deliver more development than proposed.</p> <p>5. New Garden Villages</p> <p><u>Alternative option: deliver one new garden village</u></p> <p><u>Alternative option: deliver no new garden villages</u></p> <p><u>See also Appendix 8.</u></p>	<p>infrastructure as it would not provide the critical mass necessary to pay for improvements.</p> <p><u>Alternative option: No change</u></p> <p>This would result in a less sustainable pattern of growth that is not reflective of the dynamics that operate between rural settlements.</p> <p>2. Worksop sub regional centre <u>Proposed policy:</u></p> <p>This proposal will deliver the highest level of housing development of the three largest settlements, thereby supporting the status of Worksop as a sub-regional centre.</p> <p><u>Lower growth:</u></p> <p>As the largest town with the most services and facilities, Worksop requires a level of growth which will sustain it as a sub-regional centre. The town centre is in need of regeneration and the proposed level of housing development will help to support the local economy.</p> <p>3. Retford: rural-hub town</p> <p><u>Proposed policy:</u></p> <p>The proposed level of growth will help to support existing services and facilities, and deliver infrastructure improvements in Retford. This proposal provides the critical mass necessary to fund necessary infrastructure improvements. This may include infrastructure schemes relating to highways, flooding, education and health, and</p>

Proposed policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach
		<p>other necessary schemes to make development acceptable in planning terms.</p> <p>It is also at a level which will help to support the development of the two new villages to the south of Retford. Higher growth in Retford may result in a delay to the commencement of development of the new villages due to the availability of more housing within the local housing market area.</p> <p><u>Higher growth:</u></p> <p>Higher levels of growth in Retford could result in more development occurring in areas at risk of fluvial flooding or exacerbating existing surface water flooding issues. Also, higher levels of growth and potentially higher densities could have potentially adverse impacts on the historic environment and the prevailing character of this historic market town.</p> <p>4. Harworth & Bircotes: local regeneration centre</p> <p><u>Lower growth:</u></p> <p>Lower levels of growth would hinder the ongoing regeneration of the area.</p> <p><u>Higher growth:</u></p> <p>Higher levels of growth could generate the need for more significant infrastructure impacts and future costly needs. Higher levels of growth risk market saturation which could hinder aspirations to prioritise brownfield regeneration. If this were</p>

Proposed policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach
		<p>to occur, it would be contrary to the requirements of the NPPF.</p> <p>5. New Garden Villages</p> <p><u>Proposed policy:</u></p> <p>Two new villages provide the critical mass necessary to support infrastructure delivery. This approach enables the delivery of well designed, sustainable settlements which create a genuinely different offer in the local housing market. The needs of a wide range of people will be met, including existing residents, promoted by the holistic approach to the design and delivery of garden communities.</p> <p><u>Alternative option: deliver one new garden village</u></p> <p>One new garden village would deliver infrastructure but not to the same extent as two villages. The preferred option would deliver significant benefits to existing local settlements in the form of new services, in particular primary and secondary education, public transport, improved connections (footpaths and cycleways), and health service provision.</p> <p><u>Alternative option: deliver no new garden villages</u></p> <p>Development would need to be distributed across the District if the two garden villages were not delivered. This would not deliver significant improvements to infrastructure due to the lack of a critical mass of development.</p>
Policy 2 Strategic Growth	<u>Alternative option:</u>	<u>Preferred approach:</u>

Proposed policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach																					
<p><u>Economic Development</u></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Settlement</th> <th>District Share (%)</th> <th>Land Required for Economic Development 2018 to 2035 (Ha) (Gross)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Worksop</td> <td>33%</td> <td>45</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Retford</td> <td>15%</td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Harworth</td> <td>28%</td> <td>38</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rural settlements</td> <td>13%</td> <td>18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>New Villages</td> <td>11%</td> <td>15</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">TOTAL</td> <td>100%</td> <td>136 Ha (Gross)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Settlement	District Share (%)	Land Required for Economic Development 2018 to 2035 (Ha) (Gross)	Worksop	33%	45	Retford	15%	20	Harworth	28%	38	Rural settlements	13%	18	New Villages	11%	15	TOTAL	100%	136 Ha (Gross)	<p>An alternative option would be to set an overall target for the District and have a criteria based approach to sites. This would enable the market to deliver growth without allocating land.</p>	<p>The preferred approach identifies and allocates enough land to meet the needs of the District over the plan period. It seeks to distribute economic growth in line with the findings of the Bassetlaw EDNA (2018).</p> <p><u>Alternative:</u></p> <p>Allowing the market to deliver growth in areas in demand would not guarantee sites being delivered in locations that are accessible to the existing population.</p> <p>Historically the main towns have been where industry has developed. Therefore, it is the Council's aim to deliver economic regeneration where traditional industries have declined.</p>
Settlement	District Share (%)	Land Required for Economic Development 2018 to 2035 (Ha) (Gross)																					
Worksop	33%	45																					
Retford	15%	20																					
Harworth	28%	38																					
Rural settlements	13%	18																					
New Villages	11%	15																					
TOTAL	100%	136 Ha (Gross)																					
<p>Policy 3 Affordable Housing</p> <p><u>Proposed Affordable Housing Requirement</u></p> <p>20% on major development sites on greenfield land</p> <p>10% on major development sites on brownfield land</p>	<p><u>Alternative: Do nothing</u></p> <p>Work to the requirements of the NPPF.</p> <p>An additional alternative of setting a higher target was assessed, but this is now considered unreasonable as a higher target would not be viable.</p>	<p><u>Proposed approach:</u></p> <p>The affordable housing requirement has been tested for viability. This is the maximum figure that the Council can require based on viability.</p> <p><u>Alternative: Do nothing</u></p> <p>Whilst this option would deliver affordable homes, the proposed approach will meet the needs of more households.</p>																					

Proposed policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach
<p>Policy 4 Housing Mix</p> <p>In developing housing sites, developers will be required to adopt an approach that will establish sustainable communities, providing a choice of homes to meet a range of housing requirements. A mix of housing tenures, types and sizes should be provided, appropriate to the site size and needs of the area.</p> <p>Where applicable, development proposals should accord with the requirements of Neighbourhood Plan Policies.</p>	<p><u>Alternative: More prescriptive policy requirement that sets out the type, size and tenure of housing</u></p>	<p>The alternative, more prescriptive policy would restrict development and is likely to result in fewer homes being delivered overall.</p> <p>This is also likely to have a negative impact on viability and result in difficulties selling properties. Housing mix has to be market led to some extent.</p>
<p>Policy 5 Self and Custom Build</p> <p>1. The Council will support the delivery of self-build and custom-build plots as a proportion of larger developments in appropriate, sustainable locations, in accordance with the Spatial Strategy.</p> <p>2. As part of the development of a Neighbourhood Plan, the Council will work with Neighbourhood Plan Groups to assess the need for self-build and/or custom build plots in each area. Neighbourhood Plans will be expected to make provision for self-build or custom-build plots where there is an identified need.</p> <p>3. Proposals for 100% self-build or custom-build development will be supported where they accord with the spatial strategy and other policies.</p>	<p><u>Alternative: A more prescriptive policy</u></p>	<p><u>Proposed approach:</u></p> <p>The proposed approach is flexible and will support the delivery of self and custom build housing in areas in demand.</p> <p><u>Alternative: A more prescriptive policy</u></p> <p>A more prescriptive policy would deliver more self-build plots but it may be in areas where there is no demand. Evidence from the self and custom build register indicates strong demand for some areas but not for others.</p>
<p>Policy 6 Specialist Housing</p> <p><u>Specialist Retirement Housing</u></p> <p>1. The Council will support proposals for appropriately located, well designed specialist retirement housing schemes where they:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Have good access to services and facilities; provide adequate private amenity space, and will not have an adverse impact on residential amenity by means of overlooking/privacy, overshadowing, or by having an overbearing effect; and meet highway standards; and make appropriate provision for parking on-site. 	<p><u>Alternative: allocate land for specialist housing</u></p>	<p><u>Proposed approach:</u></p> <p>The policy will seek to deliver enough specialist homes to meet the needs of older people. This is a requirement of the NPPF and the other alternatives are considered inappropriate and therefore unreasonable.</p> <p><u>Alternative: allocate land for specialist housing</u></p> <p>Allocating land may result in a site remaining vacant as there is no known demand from the development industry or specialist providers at</p>

Proposed policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach
<p><u>Accessible Housing</u></p> <p>2. On Major Development Sites, a minimum of 60% of dwellings must be accessible, meeting M4(2) of the requirements in Building Regulations.</p> <p>3. On Major Development Sites, a minimum of 12% of homes must be wheelchair accessible, meeting M4(3) of the Building Regulations requirements.</p>		<p>this time. This also does not necessarily support the development of mixed, sustainable communities.</p>
<p>Policy 7 Residential Care Homes</p> <p>1. On major development sites⁸⁹ consideration should be given to residential care home provision.</p> <p>2. The Council will support proposals for appropriately located, well designed residential care homes where they:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Have good access to services and facilities; provide adequate private amenity space, and will not have an adverse impact on residential amenity by means of overlooking/privacy, overshadowing, or by having an overbearing effect; and meet highway standards; and make appropriate provision for parking on-site. 	<p><u>Alternative: Allocate land</u></p>	<p><u>Proposed approach:</u></p> <p>The policy will seek to deliver residential care homes to meet the needs of the communities in Bassetlaw. This is a requirement of the NPPF.</p> <p><u>Alternative: Allocate land</u></p> <p>Allocating land may result in a site remaining vacant as there is no known demand from the development industry or specialist providers at this time. This also does not necessarily support the development of mixed, sustainable communities.</p>
<p>Policy 8 Rural Bassetlaw</p> <p>The Council will support the delivery of sustainable development to meet the needs of Bassetlaw's rural areas over the plan period.</p> <p><u>1. Housing</u></p> <p>Rural settlements will accommodate a minimum of 1777 new dwellings (10% growth for 73 villages and an overall Districtwide share equating to 27% of the housing requirement) and deliver the necessary associated infrastructure from 2018 to 2035. This will be delivered through existing planning permissions and sites allocated through the Neighbourhood Plan process and Local Plan site allocation process. New housing will also be supported within</p>	<p><u>Alternative: Make the housing requirement 5% and the cap 10%</u></p> <p><u>Alternative: make 20% the target rather than the cap and keep the cap at 20%</u></p>	<p><u>Proposed policy approach:</u></p> <p>Approximately 35% of Bassetlaw's population live in the rural areas of the District (Source: ONS, 2015 MYE). Growth has been stifled in many rural settlements due to policy constraints of the Bassetlaw Core Strategy (2011). The percentage share of growth proposed by the Local Plan (27%) will help to address this and deliver the homes needed in the rural settlements.</p>

⁸⁹ In accordance with the NPPF glossary, a major development site consists of 10 or more dwellings or an area of 0.5 hectares or more.
Sustainability Appraisal Report for the Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication
Version Second Addendum May 2022: Appendices

Proposed policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach
<p>settlement boundaries on non-allocated sites where appropriate to the character of the area, and where amenity or highway safety is not adversely affected.</p> <p>Proposals are required to provide the type and mix of housing to address the identified need. The scale of development and housing densities should be appropriate to the character of the settlement. Greenfield extensions to the built-up area of the town must be designed so as to enhance the urban-rural interface.</p> <p>Housing development proposals on unallocated sites in made Neighbourhood Plan areas with site allocations which can deliver the Neighbourhood Plan adopted housing requirement will only be supported where the proposal accords with the criteria below.</p> <p>In areas without site allocations which address the housing requirement, housing in the defined rural settlements⁹⁰ will generally be supported where it does not harm the surrounding open character of the countryside and contributes the sustainability of that settlement alongside satisfying the following strategic criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The site is in or adjacent to the existing developed footprint* of the settlement; and b) It would not result in coalescence with any neighbouring settlement; and c) It would not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside and farmland; and d) The proposal is of a scale and in a location that is in keeping with the core shape and form** of the settlement and will not adversely harm its character and appearance; and e) The site retains where possible or mitigates for changes to natural boundaries such as trees, hedgerows, embankments, water courses and drainage ditches; and f) The site conserves and enhances local heritage and environmental characteristics; and g) It would not result in the loss of identified open spaces within the settlement that contributes to the character and form of the settlement; and h) It can be served by sustainable infrastructure provision such as surface water, waste water drainage and highways; and 		<p>The housing requirement for rural areas of Bassetlaw will deliver housing development to meet the needs of more rural settlements than currently planned for. Economic development will be supported in appropriate locations, and community facilities will be protected and supported.</p> <p>The Council has taken a proactive, positive approach by working with neighbourhood planning groups to encourage and help them address their own development needs through the development of a neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Allocating land removes the incentive for communities to plan for their own needs. It also removes a degree of flexibility from the plan by restricting where the market would choose to deliver development.</p> <p>The 20% cap will enable flexibility and choice in the market and support existing infrastructure or deliver new necessary infrastructure, which is advocated by the NPPF.</p> <p>The Council's aim is to work with neighbourhood plan groups to enable them to plan for their own areas. If the Council allocates land</p> <p><u>Alternative: Make the housing requirement 5% and the cap 10%</u></p> <p>Reducing the requirement to 5% would deliver fewer new homes than the current Core Strategy</p>

⁹⁰ See Lists below

Proposed policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach
<p>i) It can be served by existing social infrastructure (e.g. schools) or it can be demonstrated that the proposal is capable of funding any necessary improvements to mitigate for its impact; and</p> <p>j) It does not, through a single housing proposal, increase the number of dwellings in the settlement by 5% or more (baseline data will be used from the adoption of the Bassetlaw Plan to allow for the calculation of development increases)***</p> <p>k) It does not, through a housing proposal, cumulatively increase the number of dwellings in the settlement by 20% or more when in combination with other development built or committed in the settlement (baseline data will be used from the adoption of the Bassetlaw Plan to calculate cumulative development increases over the life of the document)****</p> <p>Defined rural settlements are considered appropriate areas to expand the base of rural business and enterprise given their existing sustainability. Therefore, economic development opportunities will generally be supported where they are appropriate to the defined settlement and particularly where they enhance community access to facilities and services.</p> <p>* <i>The development footprint of a settlement is defined as the continuous built form of the settlement and excludes:</i></p> <p>a) <i>Individual buildings and groups of dispersed, or intermittent buildings, that are clearly detached from the continuous built-up area of the settlement;</i></p> <p>b) <i>Gardens, paddocks, and other undeveloped land within the curtilage of buildings on the edge of the settlement where land relates more to the surrounding countryside than to the built-up area of the settlement</i></p> <p>c) <i>Agricultural buildings and associated land on the edge of the settlement</i></p> <p>** <i>The core shape and form of the settlement relates to its inherited character that will have evolved around a certain pattern of development for example a nucleated or linear structure.</i></p> <p>*** <i>The growth of a settlement will be compared to baseline data only, i.e. development growth will not be compounded over the life of the Bassetlaw Plan.</i></p>		<p>policy approach (880 over 17 years, equating to 52 dwellings per annum). Over the Core Strategy plan period an average of 92 dwellings per annum have been delivered. This is unlikely to provide the critical mass necessary to support local services.</p> <p><u>Alternative: make 20% the target rather than the cap and keep the cap at 20%.</u></p> <p>This would deliver 3281 dwellings if all settlements met the 20% cap. This would result in disproportionate growth across the District. It would reduce the requirement in the largest settlements where there is a need to support economic growth and the vitality and viability of the town centres.</p>

Proposed policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach
<p>**** <i>The 20% cumulative housing development cap in any defined settlement will operate in addition to site allocations made in the Bassetlaw Plan and/or relevant Neighbourhood Plans</i></p> <p><u>2. Economic Growth</u> The Council will support economic development proposals which enable the local economy to adapt in a sustainable way, both through new enterprise and the diversification of existing business, where appropriate. This includes the diversification of agricultural businesses and other rural businesses through the conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings.</p> <p>Development must be sensitive to its surroundings and not have an unacceptable impact on the environment. Proposals should exploit opportunities to improve access to sustainable modes of transport where possible.</p> <p>Proposals for economic developments within close proximity and easy access to the A1 corridor, or comprehensive redevelopment of a major brownfield site that will meet an unexpected demand, will be supported if it can be demonstrated to the Council's satisfaction that it will deliver a high quality, exemplary scheme that will increase the overall number, quality and skills level of local jobs.</p> <p><u>3. Community Services and facilities</u> In accordance with Bassetlaw Local Plan Policy 24, the Council will support the retention and development of community services and facilities. Proposals must comply with the criteria set out in Bassetlaw Local Plan Policy 24.</p>		<p><u>Economic Development Proposal:</u></p> <p>This policy provides the flexibility to support sustainable economic development in rural settlements.</p> <p>It promotes economic development on the A1 corridor in line with recommendations from the Bassetlaw EDNA (2018).</p>
<p>Policy 9 Workstop</p> <p>The Council will support the delivery of sustainable development to meet the needs of Workstop over the plan period. Where relevant to the to the type of development proposed, the following criteria must be met and the corresponding typology requirements satisfied.</p> <p>Where applicable, development must:</p>	<p>Alternatives considered relate to different levels of growth. These alternatives are set out above in relation to Policy 2.</p>	<p>Alternatives considered relate to different levels of growth. These alternatives are set out above in relation to Policy 2.</p> <p><u>Economic development</u></p> <p>Bassetlaw's EDNA (2018) indicates that Workstop is the dominant economic hub and Retford has a smaller influence. The proposed distribution of</p>

Proposed policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Exhibit good quality design that enhances character, protects amenity, increases resilience to climate change, and promotes healthy lifestyles; b. Improve access and connectivity across the town by sustainable modes of transport⁹¹; c. Not have significant adverse impacts on highway safety and capacity; d. Not prejudice the comprehensive development of an area; e. Not conflict with an adjoining or nearby land use; f. Conserve and enhance the historic environment; and g. Protect, or conserve and enhance Green Infrastructure, as necessary. <p><u>1. Housing</u> Worksop will grow to accommodate a minimum of 1600 new dwellings (24% of the overall Housing Requirement) and deliver the associated infrastructure from 2018 to 2035. This will be delivered through existing planning permissions and new site allocations (to be identified in the Site Allocations section of the Local Plan). New housing will also be supported within the development boundary on non-allocated sites where appropriate. This will deliver development in addition to the housing requirement.</p> <p>Proposals will be required to provide the type and mix of housing to address the identified needs of Worksop⁹². Opportunities should be sought to maximise densities where appropriate, particularly on brownfield sites and locations close to major transport nodes/hubs.</p> <p><u>2. Economic Development</u> At least 33% (45 Hectares) of the District's employment land needs and associated infrastructure will be delivered in Worksop from 2018 to 2035. Economic development proposals will be supported in appropriate locations within the existing settlement boundary and on site allocations.</p> <p>Proposals for economic developments within close proximity to Worksop, that will meet an unexpected demand, will be supported if it can be demonstrated to the Council's</p>		<p>economic development is reflective of the findings of the Bassetlaw EDNA (2018).</p>

⁹¹ Sustainable modes of transport principally include walking, cycling and public transport. However, advances in transport technology will be considered under this definition as they emerge.

⁹² Identified local needs contained within the most up-to-date evidence papers e.g. the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.

Proposed policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach
<p>satisfaction that it will deliver a high quality, exemplary scheme that will increase the overall number, quality and skills level of local jobs.</p> <p><u>3. Worksop Town Centre</u> Whilst there is no requirement for additional floorspace in Worksop Town Centre, there is a need to promote the town centre's role as a major retail, leisure and entertainment hub.</p> <p>In terms of retail hierarchy, Worksop is the largest Town Centre in Bassetlaw. Support will be given to appropriate town centre developments which maintain and enhance its vitality and viability. To enhance the vitality and viability of the centre, the Council will prioritise opportunities for the enhancement of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Accessibility and connectivity of the Town Centre to the wider area; ii. The Primary Shopping Area as the main focus for retail activity, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bridge Street, and; • The Priory Shopping Centre; iii. The town centre's role as a leisure, recreation and entertainment destination; iv. Chesterfield Canal's visual and functional relationship to the town centre; v. Accessibility and connectivity to the Canch Park and Gardens, Sandhill Lake and other public open spaces. <p><u>4. Local Centres</u> Celtic Point and Prospect Precinct are classed as Large Local Centres and Retford Road is classed as a Small Local Centre. Proposals within these Centres that will lead to the loss of a shop or service or that might individually (due to their size) or cumulatively (through over concentration of particular uses) adversely affect the success of the Centre as a convenience hub, will not be supported unless it can be demonstrated, to the Council's satisfaction, that it will not harm the vitality and viability of the Centres.</p> <p><u>5. Sequential Test and Retail Impact</u> A sequential test will be required for edge of centre or out of centre main town centre proposals, as defined and identified by the NPPF.</p>		

Proposed policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach
<p>A retail Impact Assessment will be required for Main Town Centre Use proposals, as defined by the NPPF (2018), for edge of centre and out of centre retail development in the Worksoop catchment area that meet or exceed a threshold of 929 square metres net⁹³</p>		
<p>Policy 10 Retford</p> <p>The Council will support the delivery of sustainable development to meet the needs of Retford over the plan period. Where relevant to the to the type of development proposed, the following criteria must be met and the corresponding typology requirements satisfied.</p> <p>Where applicable, development must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> h. Exhibit good quality design that enhances character, protects amenity, increases resilience to climate change, and promotes healthy lifestyles; i. Improve access and connectivity across the town by sustainable modes of transport⁹⁴; j. Not have significant adverse impacts on highway safety and capacity; k. Not prejudice the comprehensive development of an area; l. Not conflict with an adjoining or nearby land use; m. Conserve and enhance the historic environment; and n. Protect, or conserve and enhance Green Infrastructure, as necessary. <p><u>1. Housing</u></p> <p>Retford will accommodate a minimum of 853 new dwellings (13% of the housing requirement) and deliver the associated infrastructure from 2018 to 2035. This will be delivered through existing planning permissions and new site allocations located within the settlement boundary and on extensions to the urban area. New housing will also be supported within the development boundary on non-allocated sites where appropriate. This will deliver development in addition to the housing requirement.</p> <p>Proposals will be required to provide the type and mix of housing to address the identified need. Opportunities should be sought to maximise densities where appropriate, particularly</p>	<p>Alternatives considered relate to different levels of growth. These alternatives are set out above in relation to Policy 2.</p>	<p>The proposed policy approach will support the delivery of sustainable development, in line with the requirements of the NPPF (2018).</p> <p>Alternatives considered relate to different levels of growth. These alternatives are set out above in relation to Policy 2.</p>

⁹³ see Appendix A I of the 2017 Retail Study

⁹⁴ Sustainable modes of transport principally include walking, cycling and public transport. However, advances in transport technology will be considered under this definition as they emerge.

Proposed policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach
<p>on brownfield sites and locations close to major transport nodes/hubs. Greenfield extensions to the built-up area of the town must be designed so as to enhance the urban-rural interface.</p> <p><u>2. Economic Development</u> At least 20% (27 Hectares) of the District's employment land needs and associated infrastructure will be delivered in Retford from 2018 to 2035. Economic development proposals will be supported in appropriate locations within the existing settlement boundary and on site allocations.</p> <p>Proposals for economic developments within close proximity to Retford, that will meet an unexpected demand, will be supported if can be demonstrated to the Council's satisfaction that it will deliver a high quality, exemplary scheme that will increase the overall number, quality and skills level of local jobs.</p> <p><u>3. Retford Town Centre</u> In terms of retail hierarchy, Retford is classed as a Town Centre. Support will be given to appropriate town centre developments which maintain its role as a Core Service Centre and enhance its vitality and viability.</p> <p>Whilst there is no requirement for additional floorspace in Retford Town Centre, there is a need to promote it as a retail, leisure and entertainment destination.</p> <p>The Council will prioritise opportunities for the enhancement of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> vi. accessibility and connectivity of the Town Centre to the wider area, including Retford Station, Kings Park, River Idle and Chesterfield Canal; vii. the Primary Shopping Area as the main focus for retail activity; viii. the town centre's role as a leisure, recreation and entertainment destination; ix. River Idle and Chesterfield Canal's visual and functional relationship to the town centre; and, x. the town's historic and cultural environment. 		<p><u>Economic development</u></p> <p>Bassetlaw's EDNA (2018) indicates that Worksop is the dominant economic hub and Retford has a smaller influence. The proposed distribution of economic development is reflective of the findings of the Bassetlaw EDNA (2018).</p>

Proposed policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach
<p>Part of Retford Town Centre is in the highest flood risk area and there is a need to ensure flood risk is appropriately addressed. The Council will seek to implement schemes which alleviate flooding, particularly in relation to Retford Beck.</p> <p><u>4. Local Centres</u> Welbeck Road is classed as a small local centre. Proposals within the Centre that might individually or cumulatively prejudice the success of the Centre as a local convenience hub, or be detrimental to the local environment, will not be supported unless it can be demonstrated to the Council's satisfaction that they will not harm the vitality and viability of the Centre.</p> <p><u>5. Sequential Test and Retail Impact</u> A sequential test will be required for Main Town Centre use proposals in edge of centre or out of centre locations.</p> <p>Retail Impact Assessments will be required for proposals for edge of centre and out of centre retail development in the Retford catchment area (identified in Appendix A I of the 2017 Retail Study) that meet or exceed a threshold of 929 square metres (net).</p>		
<p>Policy 11 Harworth & Bircotes</p> <p>The Council will support the delivery of sustainable development to meet the needs of Harworth & Bircotes over the plan period. Prioritisation will be given to opportunities for the regeneration and enhancement of the former Harworth Colliery site. Where relevant to the to the type of development proposed, the following criteria must be met and the corresponding typology requirements satisfied.</p> <p>Where applicable, development must:</p> <p>Exhibit good quality design that enhances character, protects amenity, increases resilience to climate change, and promotes healthy lifestyles;</p>	<p>Alternatives considered relate to different levels of growth. These alternatives are set out above in relation to Policy 2.</p>	<p>The proposed policy approach will support the delivery of sustainable development and promote the regeneration of Harworth & Bircotes former colliery, in line with the Alternatives considered relate to different levels of growth. These alternatives are set out above in relation to Policy 2.</p> <p><u>Economic development</u></p> <p>Harworth & Bircotes shows stronger links with areas outside the District, in particular Doncaster which is approximately than 20 minutes' drive from the sub-area.</p>

Proposed policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach
<p>Improve access and connectivity across the town by sustainable modes of transport⁹⁵;</p> <p>Not have significant adverse impacts on highway safety and capacity;</p> <p>Not prejudice the comprehensive development of an area;</p> <p>Not conflict with an adjoining or nearby land use;</p> <p>Conserve and enhance the historic environment; and</p> <p>Protect, or conserve and enhance Green Infrastructure, as necessary.</p> <p><u>1. Housing</u></p> <p>Harworth & Bircotes will grow to accommodate a minimum of 1400 new dwellings (21% of the overall Housing Requirement) and deliver the associated infrastructure from 2018 to 2035. This will be delivered through existing planning permissions and new site allocations (to be identified in the Site Allocations section of the Local Plan). New housing will also be supported within the development boundary on non-allocated sites where appropriate. This will deliver development in addition to the housing requirement.</p> <p>Proposals will be required to provide the type and mix of housing to address the identified needs of Harworth & Bircotes⁹⁶. Opportunities should be sought to maximise densities where appropriate, particularly on brownfield sites and locations close to major transport nodes/hubs. Greenfield extensions to the built-up area of the town must be designed so as to enhance the urban-rural interface.</p> <p><u>2. Economic Development</u></p>		<p>There is a need to regenerate the area due to the closure of the former Harworth Colliery. This policy will support a significant level of economic growth to enable and support the regeneration aspirations of the community and the Council.</p>

⁹⁵ Sustainable modes of transport principally include walking, cycling and public transport. However, advances in transport technology will be considered under this definition as they emerge.

⁹⁶ Identified local needs contained within the most up-to-date evidence papers e.g. the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.

Proposed policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach
<p>At least 25% (34 Hectares) of the District's employment land needs and associated infrastructure will be delivered in Harworth & Bircotes and on land extending towards the A1 to the south from 2018 to 2035. Economic development proposals will be supported in appropriate locations within the existing settlement boundary and on site allocations.</p> <p>Proposals for economic developments within close proximity to Harworth & Bircotes, that will meet an unexpected demand, will be supported if can be demonstrated to the Council's satisfaction that it will deliver a high quality, exemplary scheme that will increase the overall number, quality and skills level of local jobs.</p> <p><u>3. Harworth & Bircotes Town Centre</u></p> <p>Although there is no requirement for additional retail floorspace in Harworth & Bircotes Town Centre, there is a need to promote its role as a shopping centre which provides for the day to day needs of the local community.</p> <p>In terms of retail hierarchy, Harworth & Bircotes is the third largest Town in Bassetlaw. Support will be given to appropriate town centre developments which maintain and enhance its vitality and viability. To enhance the vitality and viability of the centre, the Council will prioritise opportunities for the enhancement of:</p> <p>Accessibility and connectivity of the Town Centre to the wider area; The Primary Shopping Area as the main focus for retail activity; The town centre's role as a local retail and leisure hub.</p> <p><u>5. Sequential Test and Retail Impact</u></p>		

Proposed policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach
<p>A sequential test will be required for edge of centre or out of centre main town centre proposals, as defined and identified by the NPPF.</p> <p>A retail Impact Assessment will be required for Main Town Centre Use proposals, as defined by the NPPF (2018), for edge of centre and out of centre retail development in the Harworth & Bircotes catchment area that meet or exceed a threshold of 600 square metres (net)⁹⁷.</p>		
<p>Policy 12 New Garden Villages</p> <p>The Council will support the delivery of a new Garden Community in two new villages, located at Gamston Airport and the former Bevercotes Colliery, subject to the requirements below being fully met. These sites together will be expected to deliver a minimum of 1000 new homes within the Plan period (to 2035) with the remaining 3000 homes being delivered beyond this. These sites will also deliver associated community facilities and services, a range of local employment opportunities and supporting infrastructure.</p> <p>Alongside this Policy, a Supplementary Planning Document will be produced setting out a comprehensive Masterplan and Design Codes, for the design, development and delivery of both settlements.</p> <p><u>1. Good Quality Design</u></p> <p>Each new village will have a distinctive character with an innovative, unique design. With regard to the design of each new settlement, the Council will expect development to:</p> <p>Deliver new buildings which utilise contemporary construction techniques and exemplary construction standards, and mechanisms to reduce their energy demand;</p> <p>Promote character by responding to locally distinctive features of the sites, and patterns of development in rural settlements, taking account of local man-made and natural heritage;</p>	<p>Alternatives considered relate to different levels of growth. These alternatives are set out above in relation to Policy 2.</p>	<p>The proposed approach will deliver two new villages which will provide for a wide range of needs of people of different ages. This will meet the aspirations of the District and the Government.</p> <p>Alternatives considered relate to different levels of growth. These alternatives are set out above in relation to Policy 2.</p>

⁹⁷ Identified in the 2017 Retail Study
Sustainability Appraisal Report for the Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication
Version Second Addendum May 2022: Appendices

Proposed policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach								
<p>Be inclusive, having a permeable streetscape with interconnected routes and good access for all users. This will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> an attractive public realm, enhanced natural surveillance, ease of movement, and good connections to adjoining green infrastructure routes. <p>Greenspaces must be integrated into the <u>wider green network</u> of walkways, cycleways, open spaces and natural and river corridors;</p> <p>Have a transport user hierarchy applied within all aspects of street design which considers the needs of the most vulnerable users first:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pedestrians, including wheelchair users, cyclists, public transport users, emergency services, and finally motor vehicles. <p>Take account of landform, layout, building orientation, massing and landscaping to minimise energy and water consumption, and mitigate against flooding and overheating. It should permit good solar access to as many buildings as possible. Urban heat island effect should be reduced by allowing sufficient space between buildings, tree planting, shading and street layouts which encourage air flow.</p> <p><u>2. Housing</u></p> <p>a. Of the 4,000 homes, a minimum of 1,000 new homes (15% District share) will be delivered by 2035 (within the Local Plan period). This will be delivered as follows:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Site</th> <th>2018-2035 (Dwellings)</th> <th>Beyond 2035 (Dwellings)</th> <th>Total Dwellings</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Site	2018-2035 (Dwellings)	Beyond 2035 (Dwellings)	Total Dwellings						
Site	2018-2035 (Dwellings)	Beyond 2035 (Dwellings)	Total Dwellings							

Proposed policy in the Local Plan				Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach
Gamston Airport	625	1775	2500		
Former Bevercotes Colliery	375	1125	1500		
<p>b. A mix of housing types and tenures will be delivered to meet the needs of the community, taking account of the need to provide a choice of homes for a wide range of age groups, and financial affordability.</p> <p>c. A percentage of self and custom build plots will be provided on site to meet the needs of the community.</p> <p><u>3. Village Hub</u></p> <p>Each new village will provide an accessible village hub which provides an attractive, functional public realm, convenience retail, and other essential local services and mixed use community facilities that will sustain village life.</p> <p><u>4. Employment</u></p> <p>15 hectares of employment land will be allocated for the delivery of high quality employment space, the focus of which will be at Gamston Airfield adjacent to the existing business park, which will remain, in a highly prominent location adjacent to the A1(M). This will provide local employment opportunities for the new residents as well as the existing rural village working age population, orientated towards small scale B1c, B2 and B8 uses to meet local market demand.</p> <p>Dedicated starter units will be developed to support entrepreneurship. This will provide small and flexible workshops for new and growing businesses.</p> <p><u>5. Infrastructure: Community Services and Facilities</u></p>					

Proposed policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach
<p>Each new village will provide accessible services and facilities, phased early in the development, through provision of:</p> <p>Nursery and primary education within both new villages;</p> <p>Secondary education on the Gamston Airport site to meet the needs of both new settlements, and where possible, additional demand from villages within the catchment area;</p> <p>Appropriate health care facilities on both sites to meet the needs of both new villages and, where necessary from surrounding villages within the catchment area;</p> <p>Recreational space which will promote health and wellbeing, including parks, sports pitches, play areas, and allotments.</p> <p>High quality communications technology.</p> <p><u>6. Infrastructure: Transport</u></p> <p>Development of both new villages must maximise integrated sustainable transport choice and connections to services and facilities in neighbouring settlements through the preparation and implementation of a Travel Plan which seeks to achieve a modal shift.</p> <p>The new villages should include provision for:</p> <p>A network of dedicated all year, all weather pedestrian and cycle links throughout both settlements, with direct and clearly defined connections to neighbouring towns and villages, including Retford, Elkesley, Gamston and Eaton;</p> <p>A dedicated pedestrian and cycling green land bridge over the A1 linking both settlements as part of the new dedicated network identified above;</p> <p>A road network and transport facilities that enable the villages to be served by public transport services to key destinations, including Retford Town Centre and Retford Railway Station, at the earliest possible opportunity, with the ability to expand as the local population increases over the life of their development;</p>		

Proposed policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach
<p>Improvements to the highway network, including enhanced connections to the A1; Comprehensive infrastructure and incentives to facilitate the use of electric vehicles.</p> <p><u>7. Infrastructure: Flood Risk</u></p> <p>A detailed local area Strategic Drainage Study (SDS) is required for both sites which considers how the cumulative effects of potential peak rates and volumes of water from the sites would impact on peak flows, duration of flooding, and timing of flood peaks on receiving watercourses. The Council requires any necessary flood mitigation measures identified by the SDS to be delivered as part of the development of the new villages. Lifetime management of flood alleviation/drainage schemes should also be appropriately addressed.</p> <p>Where appropriate, the SDS should identify:</p> <p>opportunities within the sites to provide off-site betterment, for example online/offline flood storage, and where land should be safeguarded within proposed site allocations to fulfil this purpose.</p> <p>opportunities for Natural Flood Management, including river restoration.</p> <p>How each site will manage and address all foul and surface water run off onsite to avoid cumulative impact on the wider water network.</p> <p><u>8. Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure</u></p> <p>Development will only be supported where significant harm to biodiversity can be avoided, adequately mitigated, or, if either criteria cannot be achieved, compensated for.</p> <p>Development of both sites should:</p> <p>deliver a net gain in biodiversity by utilising and enhancing existing natural assets;</p> <p>increase connectivity of habitats by incorporating features which enlarge, connect or support existing green corridors and natural and semi-natural green spaces;</p> <p>where possible, restore and re-create priority habitats and other natural habitats within and adjacent to development schemes.</p>		

Proposed policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach
<p>9. Energy</p> <p>A bespoke energy strategy is required which should make provision for the production of heat and electricity from renewable and low carbon sources to provide a percentage of energy requirements onsite.</p>		
<p>Policy 13: Energy Efficiency</p> <p>New development should seek opportunities to improve energy efficiency. Development proposals should demonstrate that construction will be approached in a sustainable manner, utilising sustainably sourced materials, minimising waste and maximising the recycling of materials. Consideration should also be given to the durability of the construction materials.</p> <p>Development should seek to:</p> <p>Minimise CO2 emissions by maximising the efficiency and energy performance of the development</p> <p>Maximise the use of sustainably sourced materials;</p> <p>Utilise good quality durable materials;</p> <p>Minimise waste and maximise recycling;</p>	No reasonable alternative options	The proposed approach seeks to meet the energy efficiency targets set out in building regulations and the national targets in the Climate Change Act 2008. Therefore the proposed approach seeks to achieve the highest standards subject to viability on a case-by-case basis.
<p>Policy 14: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy</p> <p>The Council will support:</p> <p>Appropriately located low carbon and renewable energy schemes where it is demonstrated that they will not result in unacceptable impacts on environmental amenity or the character of the built and natural environment;</p>	No reasonable alternative options	Based on the evidence of energy opportunity mapping and given the clear direction in NPPF Chapter 14 ⁹⁸ , it seems prudent to allow community-led initiatives to be driven through neighbourhood plans, rather than at a strategic level. The only exceptions to this may be to safeguard former and existing coal-fired power station sites for energy infrastructure and where

⁹⁸ Specifically the approach to wind energy in footnote 49
Sustainability Appraisal Report for the Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication
Version Second Addendum May 2022: Appendices

Proposed policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach
<p>Development proposals which, where appropriate and viable, maximise local opportunities for District heating and decentralised energy.</p> <p>Where appropriate, proposals should include provision for decommissioning at the end of their operational life. Where decommissioning is necessary the site should be restored, with minimal adverse impact on amenity, landscape and biodiversity, and opportunities taken for enhancement of these features.</p> <p>The Council will support vehicle electric charging points where they are appropriately located and do not have an adverse impact on the character or amenity of the environment.</p>		<p>specific opportunities are identified as part of strategic housing or employment land allocations.</p>
<p>Policy 15: Flood Risk</p> <p>Development proposals are required to consider and, where necessary, address the effect of the proposed development on flood risk, both on-site and off-site, commensurate with the scale and impact of the development. Where necessary⁹⁹, a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) will be required. Proposals will be supported where the FRA demonstrates that development, including access, will be safe, without increasing flood risk both on site and elsewhere and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall. FRAs are required to maximise opportunities for flood mitigation schemes which incorporate new or existing green infrastructure, where appropriate.</p>	<p>No reasonable alternative options</p>	<p>The preferred approach follows national policy and guidance sets out a clear approach to flood risk.</p> <p>Bassetlaw District Council acknowledges that, at current, the Council has a good supply of land available to meet its future development needs without needing to allocate land in areas at higher risk of flooding.</p>
<p>Policy 16: Water Quality and Efficiency</p> <p>Maximising Water efficiency</p>	<p>No reasonable alternative options</p>	<p>The Council does not consider there to be any reasonable alternatives to the proposed policy approach.</p>

⁹⁹ On sites identified by National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance. In locations designated as Critical Drainage Areas, an FRA is required for all types of development regardless of size.

Proposed policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach
<p>1. New development should seek opportunities to improve water efficiency. To promote water efficiency, new developments will be required to minimise water consumption by meeting the tighter Building Regulations optional requirement of 110 litres/person/day (in additional to the 125 litres/person/day mandatory standard)</p> <p>B. Promoting Water Quality</p> <p>In line with the objectives of the Water Framework Directive, development must not result in any waterbody failing to meet the element and overall class status set out in the Humber River Basin Management Plan.</p> <p>1. Development will be permitted where proposals will not have a negative impact on water quality directly through pollution of surface or ground water.</p> <p>2. Where development is proposed within a Source Protection Zone, the potential for any risk to groundwater resources and groundwater quality must be assessed and it must be demonstrated that these would be protected throughout the construction and operational phase of development. Management of construction sites should ensure that contaminated surface water is prevented from leaving a site untreated.</p> <p>3. Proposals must be served by an adequate supply of water, appropriate sewerage infrastructure and there must be sufficient sewerage treatment capacity to ensure that there is no deterioration of water quality. Septic tanks will only be considered if it can be clearly demonstrated by the applicant that discharging into a public sewer is not feasible.</p> <p>4. Development will not be permitted where the drainage of surface water would adversely affect areas important for biodiversity.</p>		
<p>Policy 17: Landscape Character</p> <p>Development will be supported where it protects or enhances the character, local distinctiveness and quality of the landscape. Proposals will be expected to respond to the recommendations of the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone. Where</p>	No reasonable alternative options	The Council does not consider there to be any reasonable alternatives to the proposed policy approach set out in the Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan. The NPPF and national guidance provide a clear, hierarchical approach for planning policies to protect and enhance valued landscapes in a

Proposed policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach
<p>necessary, development proposals must show how landscape character has been taken into account, and should include mitigation measures appropriate to the character type.</p> <p>Development proposals that would have an unacceptable impact on landscape character, visual amenity and sensitivity will not be supported. The provision of alternative, replacement or additional landscape features either within the development site, or in an appropriate alternative location, may be appropriate in circumstances where the impact is demonstrated to be necessary to facilitate an otherwise acceptable scheme. Proposals to offset any loss or damage will be subject to the agreement of an appropriate management scheme by the Council where necessary.</p> <p>Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of or damage to the landscape, the prior condition of the landscape will be taken into account in the consideration of development proposals.</p>		<p>manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality, whilst also recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.</p>
<p>Policy 18: Green Infrastructure</p> <p>Where appropriate, development proposals must take advantage of opportunities to deliver qualitative enhancements or provision of new green infrastructure, subject to the requirements of other applicable policies of the development plan.</p> <p>All major development must demonstrate consideration for how proposals integrate with existing green infrastructure, making new or enhancing existing connections with identified nodes and corridors where there are clear opportunities to do so.</p> <p>Development schemes proposing provision of on-site open space or landscaping to mitigate the impact of development must demonstrate as far as possible how schemes provide multiple benefits for people and wildlife.</p> <p>The Council recognises the wider benefits of ecosystem services and supports the protection and enhancement of biodiversity at a landscape scale, including across boundaries with other local authorities, subject to the requirements of other applicable policies of the development plan</p>	<p>No reasonable alternative options</p>	<p>The Council does not consider there to be any reasonable alternatives to the proposed policy approach set out in the Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan because specific enhancement measures cannot be identified at this stage. Specific opportunities may, however, be identified in relation to individual sites.</p>

Proposed policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach
<p>Policy 19: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>New development in the District that will conserve, and where possible restore or enhance, biodiversity and geodiversity will be supported, subject to other planning policy considerations;</p> <p>Development likely to result in the loss, deterioration or harm to habitats or species of importance to biodiversity or geological conservation interests, either directly or indirectly, will not be permitted unless:</p> <p>the need for, and benefits of, the development in the proposed location outweighs the adverse effect on the relevant biodiversity interest;</p> <p>it can be demonstrated that it could not reasonably be located on an alternative site that would result in less or no harm to the biodiversity interests; and</p> <p>measures can be provided (secured through planning conditions or legal agreements), that would avoid, mitigate against or, as a last resort, compensate for the adverse effects likely to result from development.</p> <p>The habitats and species of importance to biodiversity and sites of geological interest considered in relation to the above comprise:</p> <p>Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs);</p> <p>Legally protected species;</p> <p>Local Wildlife Sites (LWSs);</p> <p>Regionally Important Geological Sites (RIGS);</p> <p>Local Nature Reserves (LNRs);</p> <p>Priority habitats and species listed in the national and local Biodiversity Action Plans;</p> <p>Ancient woodland;</p> <p>Protected trees and hedgerows;</p>	<p>No reasonable alternative options</p>	<p>The Council does not consider there to be any reasonable alternatives to the proposed policy approach set out in the Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan. The NPPF requires planning policies to protect and enhance sites of biodiversity or geological value in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality, distinguishing between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites. The NPPF also promotes minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including establishing coherent ecological networks.</p>

Proposed policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach
<p>Aged and veteran trees, and hedgerows; and</p> <p>Features of the landscape that function as 'stepping stones' or form part of a wider network of sites by virtue of their coherent ecological structure or function or are of importance for the migration, dispersal and genetic exchange of wild species.</p> <p>The level of protection and mitigation should be proportionate to the status of the habitat or species and its importance individually and as part of a wider network.</p>		
<p>Policy 20 Open Space</p> <p>A. Where development triggers the need for new open space, provision shall be made with regard to identified needs in the locality. Arrangements for future management and maintenance must be formally agreed with the Council.</p> <p>B. Proposals for provision of new and enhancement of existing open spaces will be supported, subject to the requirements of other applicable policies of the development plan.</p> <p>C. Development that would result in the loss of existing open space, sports pitches and other recreational land and facilities will only be supported where the loss would be replaced by equivalent or better provision, in terms of quality and quantity, in an appropriate location, within reasonably close proximity to the community it serves.</p> <p>D. Development directly affecting or occurring in close proximity to existing open space must not adversely affect its recreational or amenity value.</p>	<p>An alternative approach would be to not seek provision of additional new open spaces, but to prioritise developer contributions to facilitate off-site enhancements to existing public open spaces. This approach would prioritise qualitative improvements to facilities and accessibility, rather than using provision standards per 1000 population</p>	<p>The proposed approach to provision of new open space will ensure both qualitative and quantitative increases in open space, which integral to improving the health and wellbeing of both new and existing residents.</p> <p>The alternative approach would potentially restrict accessibility of open space and recreational facilities.</p>
<p>Policy 21 Heritage</p> <p>Support will be given for proposals that conserve or enhance the significance of the District's heritage assets or their settings. This shall be achieved by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Ensuring that the significance of a heritage asset or its setting is understood through Heritage Statements, Conservation Area Appraisals, Characterisation Studies and any other relevant study. Ensuring that there is a weighted approach to decision making between designated and non-designated heritage assets in decision-making. Ensuring there is a presumption against harm to, or loss of significance of designated heritage assets or their settings of the highest significance. Ensuring that the degree of harm, if any, to a heritage asset or its setting is identified in decision-making. 	<p>Further to the approach set out in the NPPF, the Council considers that a reasonable alternative approach to the historic environment would be to have more detailed policy criteria for the protection of local heritage (i.e. non-designated heritage assets). It is envisaged that this would be specifically with regard to exploring in more detail the justification for demolition.</p>	<p>The approach taken accords with the NPPF.</p> <p>The more detailed elements can be covered by the development management policies (to be consulted on in late summer 2019).</p>

Proposed policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach
<p>e. Ensuring that there is clear and convincing justification for any harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting.</p> <p>f. Ensuring that new development is of appropriate siting, layout, design and materials.</p> <p>g. Ensuring that strategies are identified to tackle heritage at risk.</p> <p>h. Ensuring that historic shopfronts are conserved or enhanced and new shopfronts in the historic environment are appropriately designed.</p> <p>Proposals that affect a heritage asset or its setting (whether designated or non-designated) should be informed by a proportionate heritage statement which identifies all heritage assets likely to be affected by the proposal, explains the significance of the heritage assets affected and the degree of the effect on the proposal on the elements that contribute to the significance of the heritage asset and provides an explanation and justification for the proposal in order for any harm to be weighed against public benefits.</p>		
<p>Policy 22: Design</p> <p>The Council will support development of a good quality design which positively contributes to the appearance of the area. Development should enhance the built, natural and historic environment.</p> <p>Development proposals are required to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Complement and enhance the character of the built, historic, and natural environment. b) Maximise solar gain c) Be visually attractive as a result of good architecture d) Be legible and well-integrated with the built, natural and historic environment e) Be inclusive, providing ease of movement and access for all users, which considers the needs of the most vulnerable users first f) Promote natural surveillance g) Be of a size appropriate to the existing settlement and surrounding area h) Meet or exceed the nationally described space standard for new homes i) Provide a qualitative improvement to the existing range of homes, services, facilities, open space and economic development opportunities j) In gateway, landmark or prominent locations, provide interest and an active frontage k) Explore opportunities to deliver innovative buildings 	No reasonable alternative options	The Council does not consider there to be any reasonable alternatives to the proposed policy approach set out in the Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan because the recently updated NPPF provides a much stronger steer on the requirement for good design. Although the NPPF gives scope to make greater demands on the density of development in some circumstances, it is felt that it is more appropriate to pursue this in settlement-specific policies.

Proposed policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach
<p>l) Provide well designed and appropriately located vehicle and cycle parking facilities</p> <p>Where neighbouring or functionally linked sites come forward together, applicants will be expected to work together and with the Council to ensure that proposals are, or can be, properly integrated.</p>		
<p>Policy 23: Community Services and Facilities</p> <p>Where necessary, the Council will expect development that creates additional demand for education, health facilities, open space, sports pitches or recreational land and buildings to make an appropriate contribution to meet local needs. This may be through on-site provision or a contribution towards improving existing facilities close to the development, or within the appropriate catchment for the community facilities.</p> <p>New Community Facilities</p> <p>1. The Council will support proposals which deliver appropriately located community facilities and services, in accordance with other policies in this Plan and national guidance. This includes, but is not limited to, schools, local convenience shops, post offices, sports pitches, recreational space, and health facilities.</p> <p>Proposals should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Prioritise and promote access by walking, cycling and public transport. Community facilities may have a local or wider catchment area: access should be considered proportionately relative to their purpose, scale and catchment area; b. Be accessible to all users, including people with a disability; c. Be designed so that they are adaptable and can be easily altered to respond to future demands if necessary; d. Be operated without detriment to local residents. This especially applies to facilities which are open in the evening, such as leisure and recreation facilities. <p>Existing Community Facilities</p> <p>2. The loss of an existing community facility to provide an alternative land use, which is not a community facility, will only be permitted if it is demonstrated that:</p>	<p>No reasonable alternative options</p>	<p>The Council does not consider there to be any reasonable alternatives to the proposed policy approach.</p>

Proposed policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach
<p>a. The facility is demonstrably no longer fit for purpose and the site is not viable to be redeveloped for a new community facility; or</p> <p>b. The service provided by the facility is met by alternative provision that exists within reasonable proximity: what is deemed as reasonable proximity will depend on the nature of the facility and its associated catchment area; or</p> <p>c. The proposal includes the provision of a new community facility of similar nature and of a similar or greater size in a suitable on or offsite location.</p> <p>3. The use or extension of existing community buildings, such as village halls and churches, to provide convenience shops or other local services, will be supported unless there is an overriding conflict with other policies in the Local Plan.</p>		
<p>Policy 24: Strategic Infrastructure</p> <p>The Council will work with developers and partner organisations to ensure the delivery of infrastructure, including community facilities and services necessary to develop and maintain sustainable communities. This will require provision of new infrastructure and infrastructure improvements which are necessary to make development acceptable. These improvements will be secured by planning condition, community infrastructure levy charges, and/or planning obligations, as appropriate.</p> <p>CIL contributions will be required for residential development and for food supermarket retail at the following rates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residential development - £30sqm • Food supermarket retail - £100sqm <p>Infrastructure contributions will be based on the demands created by the specific development. This includes provision of new, or enhancement of the existing infrastructure and facilities, including, but not necessarily limited to:</p>	<p>No reasonable alternative options</p>	<p>The Council does not consider there to be any reasonable alternatives to the proposed policy approach set out in the Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan, because specific infrastructure needs must be determined in relation to specific site allocations as they are identified and on a case-by-case basis as planning applications are submitted.</p>

Proposed policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach
<p>a. physical infrastructure, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. transport improvements, including highways, public transport, provision for cyclists and pedestrians; ii. drainage and surface water management, including SuDS maintenance where appropriate; iii. flood defences (where site specific requirements warrant such an approach). <p>b. Social infrastructure, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. education, including primary and secondary provision. ii. health facilities, including GP surgeries. <p>c. Green Infrastructure, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. green space, sport recreation and play space, including future maintenance; and ii. Habitat mitigation provision and maintenance. <p>Existing infrastructure, including community facilities, will be safeguarded except where there is clear evidence that it is no longer required to meet current or future needs, or can be delivered through alternative provision.</p> <p>The Council will seek to ensure that all development is commercially viable and deliverable. Where the delivery of development is threatened on the basis of viability, the Council may consider a reduction in the extent of the planning obligations required to be met. In such circumstances, developers will be required to submit a detailed Financial Viability Assessment on an 'openbook' basis.</p>		

Table A10.2: Audit trail of policy development for the Bassetlaw Local Plan (January 2020 – May 2022)

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
Bassetlaw Spatial Strategy						
Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy	<p>See explanation for Policy 1 in Table A10.1 above.</p> <p>In terms of housing distribution, the Strategy has not significantly changed since the draft Bassetlaw Plan was consulted on in January to March 10th 2019. The Council is still proposing to take forward two large new settlements in the rural area. Whilst the location has changed, the principle of delivering two sustainable new settlements remains unchanged. The Council is still proposing to distribute housing in a very similar way, with 60% of housing development delivered in the three main towns and 40% in the rural settlements</p>	<p>See explanation for Policy 1 in Table A10.1 above.</p> <p>Following the consultation on the draft Bassetlaw Plan in January to March 10th 2019, the Council has taken into consideration comments received from statutory and non-statutory consultees, and changes to national policy and guidance. Consequently there have been a number of changes to the strategy.</p> <p>With regard to Gamston and Bevercotes New Garden Village proposal, Government</p>	<p>The Spatial Strategy now follows a more traditional settlement hierarchy with the level of housing development reflecting the role of each settlement. A new settlement is still being proposed in the November 2020 Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan.</p> <p>The housing requirement has increased from 478 dwellings per annum from 2018 to 2037 to 589 dwellings per annum from 2020 to 2037. This is informed by evidence in the Bassetlaw HEDNA (2020) which has a base date of 1st April 2020.</p>	<p>Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy</p> <p>The Spatial Strategy follows the same identified settlement hierarchy with the level of housing development reflecting the role of each settlement. A new settlement is still being proposed in the Bassetlaw Local Plan.</p> <p>The housing requirement from 2020 to 2037 is 591 dwellings per annum. This is informed by evidence in the Bassetlaw HEDNA (2020) which has a base date of 1st April 2020.</p> <p>The housing growth for each sub- area as at 1st</p>	<p>Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy</p> <p>The Spatial Strategy follows the same identified settlement hierarchy with the level of housing development reflecting the role of each settlement. A new settlement is still being proposed in the Plan.</p> <p>The housing requirement from 2020 to 2038 is now 10,638 (591 dwellings per annum). The increase in the housing requirement results from the plan period being extended by a year so that the plan is covering</p>	<p>Policy ST1 Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy</p> <p>The spatial strategy follows the previous versions except with the proposed removal of the Garden Village.</p> <p>In response to the removal of the Garden Village and the updated HEDNA, the housing supply and distribution has been amended to</p>

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
	<p>(including new settlements). The Draft consultation plan proposed 58% to the three main towns and 42% to the rural settlements.</p> <p>In terms of employment, the Plan is much more ambitious, seeking to deliver a step-change in economic growth. This would see the allocation of large strategic employment sites of at least 199.6Ha. This has resulted in the need to review the housing requirement to support economic growth. The overall housing requirement has increased from 390 dwellings per annum to 478 dwellings per annum from 2018 to 2037. NB. The consultation draft Plan covered a shorter time period of 2018 to 2035.</p>	<p>policy (NPPF) on the protection of General Aviation Airports, and the lack of support for this proposal has resulted in the removal of the sites from the Plan. In response to the consultation, a new site at Morton was put forward to the Council for consideration as a new settlement. This site provides an opportunity for the creation of a new Garden Village which will provide new homes, facilities, employment and direct access to a rail service to Sheffield and Lincoln. The site is also in close proximity to the major employment hub to the south east of Worksop and to Clumber Park.</p>	<p>This has resulted in the need to amend the housing requirement in each area as follows:</p> <p>Worksop: Jan/Feb Plan: 2180 dwellings from 2018 and 2037 Nov 2020 Plan: 3104 dwellings from 2020 to 2037</p> <p>Retford: Jan/Feb Plan: 1303 dwellings from 2018 and 2037 Nov 2020 Plan: 1802 dwellings from 2020 to 2037</p> <p>Harworth: Jan/Feb Plan: 2000 dwellings from 2018 and 2037</p>	<p>April 2021 is as follows (the total supply for Reg. 19 without windfall is 10,998 providing a 9% buffer in accordance with NPPF): This includes all sources of supply.</p> <p>Worksop (including proposed allocations and commitments in the WC DPD): Nov 2020 Plan: 3104 dwellings from 2020 to 2037 Reg 19 Plan: 3269 dwellings from 2020-2037</p> <p>Retford: Nov 2020 Plan: 1802 dwellings from 2020 to 2037 Reg 19 Plan: 2128 dwellings from 2020-2037</p> <p>Harworth:</p>	<p>15 years from the likely date of adoption (as required by the NPPF). This is informed by evidence in the Bassetlaw HEDNA (2020) which has a base date of 1st April 2020.</p> <p>The housing growth for each sub- area as at 1st December 2021 is as follows (the total supply for Reg. 19 without windfall is 11,640 still providing for a 9% buffer in accordance with NPPF): This includes all sources of supply. With the 1300 dwellings Windfall the buffer increases to 18%.</p> <p>Worksop (including proposed allocations</p>	<p>reflect the latest evidence base.</p> <p>The amendments to the housing supply and distribution does not change the overall number of allocated sites nor the level of proposed growth on the proposed allocations.</p>

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
		<p>Development of the site would not result in the loss of a local wildlife site. Bevercotes is a designated Local Wildlife Site and it also provides habitat that has potential to support breeding bird species, including Nightjar and Woodlark.</p> <p>The Bassetlaw Economic Development Needs Assessment identifies that the A1M market to the north of the district is emerging and looks to serve a sub-regional market for distribution and industrial land that may exceed historic completions. Moving forward, the Council needs to support the continuing growth of this</p>	<p>Nov 2020 Plan: 1702 dwellings from 2020 to 2037</p> <p>Large Rural Settlements: Jan/Feb Plan: 1764 dwellings from 2018 and 2037 Nov 2020 Plan: 1402 dwellings from 2020 to 2037</p> <p>Small Rural Settlements: Jan/Feb Plan: 1090 dwellings from 2018 and 2037 Nov 2020 Plan: 1502 dwellings from 2020 to 2037</p> <p>Bassetlaw Garden Village: Jan/Feb Plan: 750 dwellings up to 2037 Nov 2020 Plan: 500 dwellings up to 2037</p>	<p>Nov 2020 Plan: 1702 dwellings from 2020 to 2037 Reg 19 Plan: 1758 dwellings from 2020-2037</p> <p>Large Rural Settlements: Nov 2020 Plan: 1402 dwellings from 2020 to 2037 Reg 19 Plan: 1496 dwellings from 2020-2037</p> <p>Small Rural Settlements: Nov 2020 Plan: 1502 dwellings from 2020 to 2037 Reg 19 Plan: 1773 dwellings from 2020-2037</p> <p>Other Villages/Countryside Reg 19 Plan: 74 dwellings from 2020-2037</p> <p>Bassetlaw Garden Village: Nov 2020 Plan: 500 dwellings up to 2037</p>	<p>and commitments in the WC DPD): Reg 19 Plan: 3269 dwellings (2020-2037). The Addendum changes to 3494 (2020-2038).</p> <p>Retford: Nov 2020 Plan: 1802 dwellings (2020-2037) Reg 19 Plan: 2128 dwellings (2020-2037). The Addendum changes to 2283 (2020-2038).</p> <p>Harworth: Nov 2020 Plan: 1702 dwellings (2020-2037) Reg 19 Plan: 1758 dwellings (2020-2037). The Addendum changes to 1881 (2020-2038).</p>	

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
		<p>market by ensuring the supply of new homes supports this strategy. As such, the Council is now proposing to deliver 478 dwellings per annum to support economic growth.</p> <p>The closure of Cottam Power Station in September 2019 also presents an opportunity to regenerate a large brownfield site which has experienced significant job losses. The creation of a large settlement with new employment, and new services and facilities will support villages to the east of Bassetlaw.</p>	<p>Employment distribution has remained unchanged.</p> <p>Cottam has been changed to a broad location rather than a new settlement. Further evidence is required to inform suitable and deliverable uses on the site.</p> <p>Updated evidence and comments received during the January/February consultation have informed this change.</p>	<p>Reg 19 Plan: 500 dwellings from 2020-2037 Employment provision has remained unchanged.</p> <p>Cottam remains a broad location rather than a new settlement. Further evidence is required to inform suitable and deliverable uses on the site.</p> <p>Updated evidence and comments received during the November 2020/January 2021 and June 2021 consultations have informed these changes.</p>	<p>Large Rural Settlements: Nov 2020 Plan: 1402 dwellings (2020-2037) Reg 19 Plan: 1496 dwellings (2020-2037). The Addendum changes to 1525 (2020-2038) Small Rural Settlements: Nov 2020 Plan: 1502 dwellings (2020-2037) Reg 19 Plan: 1773 dwellings (2020-2037). The Addendum changes to 1793 (2020-2038).</p> <p>Other Villages/Countryside Reg 19 Plan: 74 dwellings (2020-2037). This remains the same in the Addendum.</p>	

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
					Bassetlaw Garden Village: Nov 2020 Plan: 500 dwellings up to 2037 Reg 19 Plan: 500 dwellings (2020-2037). This increases to 590 in the Addendum.	
Policy ST2: Rural Bassetlaw	<p>See explanation for Policy 8 Rural Bassetlaw in Table A10.1 above.</p> <p>The response from consultation generally supported some growth in rural Bassetlaw and the approach to the distribution of growth hasn't changed.</p> <p>However, when looking at the settlements in rural Bassetlaw, it became clear that there is a clear distinction between certain settlements within the tier due to their size and the level of services they offer to the community.</p>	<p>See explanation for Policy 8 Rural Bassetlaw in Table A10.1 above.</p> <p>The justification for the change in approach to rural Bassetlaw is explained in the Bassetlaw Spatial Strategy Paper.</p>	Policy ST2 now sets the housing requirement as 20% growth for Large Rural Settlements and 5% growth for 34 small rural settlements. Updated evidence and comments received during the January/February consultation have informed this change.	<p>Policy ST2: Rural Bassetlaw</p> <p>No changes made to Policy ST2 which has retained the housing requirement of 20% growth for Large Rural Settlements and 5% growth for 34 small rural settlements.</p> <p>Updated evidence and comments received during the November 2020/January 2021 consultation indicated strong support to this proposed level of growth.</p>	No change proposed.	Policy ST2 has been changed to now include Ranby within the 5% housing requirement for small rural settlements due to the loss of the Garden Village. The Housing numbers have been updated to reflect those within Policy ST1. It is expected that the Large Rural Settlements will

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
	Therefore, it was proposed that the list of rural settlements to be split into two tiers 1) Small Rural Settlements 2) Large Rural Settlements.					deliver about 1538 dwellings over the plan period 1839 dwellings of the District's housing requirement will be delivered from the Small Rural Settlements during the plan period.
Policy ST3: Bassetlaw Garden Village	See New settlement site options table in Appendix 8. The public and statutory response to the consultation raised certain issues with the location of the proposed Garden Village, particularly with the size of the proposed village, the potential loss of employment at the airport, the lack of infrastructure and the potential impact it could have on the local environment. In addition, further sites were	See New settlement site options table in Appendix 8. The justification for the change in approach to rural Bassetlaw is explained in the Bassetlaw Garden Village Supplement Paper	The amount of housing expected to be delivered has been reduced from 750 dwellings to 500 dwellings. Updated evidence and comments received during the January/February consultation have informed this change.	Policy ST4: Bassetlaw Garden Village The amount of housing expected to be delivered remains at 500 dwellings. Updated evidence and comments received during the November 2020/January 2021 consultation have informed this decision.	Policy ST4: Bassetlaw Garden Village This Policy has been updated in response to new evidence and statutory feedback. The changes include more detail about the level of development and infrastructure expected within the plan period and that which is likely	Policy ST4 is now proposed to be removed from the Local Plan due to the change in circumstance on the availability of part of the site. The Garden Village is now proposed not to be an allocation

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
	also submitted through the consultation for consideration for alternative locations for the Bassetlaw Garden Village.			Alongside the consultation for the draft Local Plan November 2020/ January 2021, the Council also consulted on the Bassetlaw Garden Village Vision Statement which sets out the vision and key development principles, and how housing, employment and land use will be distributed across the site. It also includes key development and design principles.	to be delivered beyond 2038.	within the Local Plan.
N/A	No alternatives proposed. The policy accords with national policy and guidance.	Design principles is linked very heavily to the Garden Village principles. As it's a new settlement there is no existing settlement to base the design of develop on. This policy sets out the Spatial Design Framework for the land	N/A	ST3 Bassetlaw Garden Village Design Framework This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.	Policy ST3: Bassetlaw Garden Village Design Framework The changes to this Policy include the master planning principles that were originally including within ST4. These have been moved to ST3 as they are related to the	Policy ST3 is now proposed to be removed from the Local Plan due to the change in circumstance on the availability of part of the site. The Garden Village

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
		<p>allocated for a new settlement at Bassetlaw Garden Village.</p> <p>This Policy is closely linked with Policy ST3.</p>			wider design framework for the site and more appropriately sit in ST3.	is now proposed not to be an allocation within the Local Plan.
Policy ST4: Worksop Central Area	<p>See explanation for Policy 9 Worksop in Table A10.1 above.</p> <p>Since the consultation on the 2019 draft Local Plan, the District Council is progressing its commitment to regenerating the town centre. In 2019, the adopted Council Plan identifies Worksop as a key regeneration area and builds on the initial policy in the 2019 Local Plan. The priorities for the regeneration of the area includes diversifying the town centre's retail offer, increase local housing provision and encourage economic and environmental investment.</p>	<p>See explanation for Policy 9 Worksop in Table A10.1 above.</p> <p>Due to the Council prioritising the regeneration of Worksop, it was considered appropriate to produce a separate section within the revised Local Plan to secure the Council's ambitions for the town centre into planning policy.</p> <p>It was agreed that for the Council to have the greatest influence and for it to be plan-led</p>	<p>The Council is now proposing to identify land for up to 700 dwellings in and around Worksop Town Centre.</p> <p>This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in January/February 2020.</p>	<p>Policy ST5: Worksop Central</p> <p>The Council is still proposing to identify land for up to 700 dwellings in and around Worksop Town Centre.</p> <p>This Policy was part of the Focussed Consultation document in June/July 2021.</p> <p>The purpose of the Focussed Consultation was to ensure that the public and stakeholders had an opportunity to better consider the relationship between the policies in the draft</p>	No change proposed.	No proposed change.

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
		regeneration, a separate Development Plan Document would be produced for the area of the town centre identified in Policy ST4.		<p>Workshop Central Development Plan Document 2021 (DPD) and the draft Bassetlaw Local Plan.</p> <p>Sites were identified and included within the Draft Workshop Central Development Plan Document, which in total would deliver approximately 779 dwellings to 2040. The draft Workshop Central DPD formed part of a separate consultation that ran in tandem with the Focussed Consultation.</p> <p>Therefore, updated evidence and comments received during the November 2020/January 2021 and the June/July 2021 consultations indicated strong support to</p>		

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
				<p>this proposed level of growth.</p> <p>Additional evidence base is also being produced in relation to ST5, e.g. Flood Risk</p>		
Policy ST5: Cottam Priority Regeneration Area	See New settlement site options table in Appendix 8.	See New settlement site options table in Appendix 8. The site became available and was put forward through the call for sites. It has a great opportunity to provide better access to housing, employment and community facilities, which will address the increased need for services and employment in the eastern part of the District. It will provide for Bassetlaw's residents the opportunity to access a sustainable and high quality living	<p>Cottam is now a broad location rather than an allocation for a new settlement. The Council requires more evidence regarding the deliverability of development and suitability of development on this site. This can be provided during the first five years of the Local Plan.</p> <p>This approach has been informed by comments received during the Local Plan consultation in January/February 2020.</p>	<p>Policy ST6: Cottam Priority Regeneration Area</p> <p>No major changes to this Policy as Cottam remains a broad location rather than an allocation for a new settlement. The Council requires more evidence regarding the deliverability of development and suitability of development on this site. This can be provided during the first five years of the Local Plan.</p>	No change proposed.	No proposed change.

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
		and working environment.				
Promoting Economic Growth						
Policy ST6: Provision of Land for Employment Development	<p>See explanation for Policy 2 Strategic Growth (Economic Growth) in Table A10.1 above.</p> <p>The entire strategy of employment growth did not seem extensive enough and was deemed too general without the identified land allocations as well.</p>	<p>See explanation for Policy 2 Strategic Growth (Economic Growth) in Table A10.1 above.</p> <p>The previous plan only included strategic policies. It did not include any site allocations, which this policy deals with.</p>	<p>The site allocations selected will deliver the objectives of the Local Plan.</p> <p>This approach has been informed by comments received during the Local Plan consultation in January/February 2020.</p>	<p>Policy ST7: Provision of Land for Employment Development</p> <p>The site allocations list remains unchanged and will deliver the objectives of the Local Plan.</p> <p>This approach continues to be informed by comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.</p>	<p>Policy ST7: Provision of Land for Employment Development</p> <p>This Policy has been updated in response to statutory and developer/site promotor feedback. This includes the removal of the Marnham Energy Hub as a general employment site and the inclusion of Bevercotes Colliery (a site with planning permission for employment use). The changes include an up to date position of available developable employment land as at 1 December 2021 and clarify the appropriate</p>	<p>Policy ST7 proposed changes to some of the existing provision at Harworth and Bircotes. It also includes the addition of a new proposed allocated site at Manton Wood near Worksop. Since the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment was undertaken in 2020 the Covid pandemic has had an impact</p>

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
					use and catchment for the strategic employment site.	on the number of economically active workers; the HEDNA Addendum 2022 forecasts jobs growth in Bassetlaw to be slightly lower than previously assumed due to the number of residents with more than one job and the rate at which people are moving back into work. The evidence also suggests that efficiencies in the manufacturing sector may lead to less growth than had previously been

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
						envisaged in this sector over the plan period, despite Bassetlaw currently bucking the national trend. But since 2020 the employment land supply position has increased, with the inclusion of the former Bevercotes Colliery in the supply.
Policy ST7: Site SEM2: High Marnham Energy Hub	See Employment site options table in Appendix 8. There was support for Policy 14 in the 2019 draft Local Plan and it strongly encouraged the appropriate use of renewable energy development across the	See Employment site options table in Appendix 8. Following the availability of the land at High Marnham, the revised Local Plan has formally allocated it for	No change to Policy following the SA/HRA as the detailed will be provided in a LDO for the site. The LDO will need to undertake an EIA of its content.	Policy ST8: Site EM008: High Marnham Energy Hub No major change to Policy following the SA/HRA as the detail will be provided in a LDO for the site. The LDO will need to	Policy ST8: Site EM008: High Marnham Energy Hub This proposed site and policy has now been removed from the Local Plan as an allocation for general employment led	No proposed change.

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
	<p>District. However, at this time, there wasn't an available site to formally allocate for renewable energy use and it was agreed that a criteria based policy would be most effective. However, during the consultation the former High Marnham Power Station site became available for development and discussions began with the landowner about its proposed and intended uses.</p> <p>In addition, the Council Plan focuses heavily on promoting green energy and reducing the District's carbon footprint.</p>	<p>renewable energy related employment uses due to it having the potential to generate a significant level of clean energy and being able to connect directly to the national grid on site. The revised Local Plan follows the Council's Plan and take the opportunity for the planning system to lead the way in reducing the District's carbon footprint and to generate green energy.</p> <p>Policy SEM2 identifies the site area and the intended uses for each zone and is linked to low carbon employment uses.</p>	<p>This approach has been informed by comments received during the Local Plan consultation in January/February 2020.</p>	<p>undertake an EIA of its content.</p> <p>This approach has been informed by comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.</p>	<p>growth within the energy sector due to site promoter feedback. The site remains a focus for renewable energy generation led development and is now identified as an area of best fit for renewable energy through Policy ST51.</p>	
Policy ST8: Strategic Employment Sites	See explanation for Policy 2 Strategic Growth (Economic	See explanation for Policy 2 Strategic Growth (Economic	Policy removed from the Plan.	Removed in November 2020.	No change proposed.	No proposed change.

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
	Growth) in Table A10.1 above.	Growth) in Table A10.1 above. The previous plan only included strategic policies. It did not include any site allocations, which this policy deals with.				
Policy ST9: Site SEM1: Apleyhead Junction, Worksop	See Employment site options table in Appendix 8.	See Employment site options table in Appendix 8.	The site allocations selected will deliver the objectives of the Local Plan. This approach has been informed by comments received during the Local Plan consultation in January/February 2020.	Policy 9: Site SEM001: Apleyhead Junction, Worksop The site allocation selected will deliver the objectives of the Local Plan. This approach has been informed by comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.	No change proposed.	No proposed change.
Policy ST10: Existing Employment Sites	See explanation for Policy 2 Strategic Growth (Economic	See explanation for Policy 2 Strategic Growth (Economic	The site allocations selected will deliver the	Policy ST10: Existing Employment Sites	No change proposed.	No proposed change.

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
	Growth) in Table A10.1 above.	Growth) in Table A10.1 above. The previous plan only included strategic policies. It did not include any site allocations, which this policy deals with.	objectives of the Local Plan. This approach has been informed by comments received during the Local Plan consultation in January/February 2020.	This Policy was part of the Focussed Consultation document in June/July 2021. This was due to amendments to the allocation list. This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.		
Policy ST11: Rural Economic Growth	See explanation for Policy 8 Rural Bassetlaw (Economic Growth) in Table A10.1 above.	See explanation for Policy 8 Rural Bassetlaw (Economic Growth) in Table A10.1 above. This was policy added as a separate section from ST2, as the new local plan encourages sustainable growth in the rural areas around Bassetlaw specifically.	This approach has been informed by comments received during the Local Plan consultation in January/February 2020.	Policy ST11: Rural Economic Growth and Economic Growth outside Employment Areas No major changes. This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.	No change proposed.	No proposed change.

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
Policy ST12: Visitor Economy	See explanation for Policy 1 in Table A10.1 above.	See explanation for Policy 1 in Table A10.1 above. The new local plan includes this policy as Bassetlaw has the ambition to increase the existing visitor economy and become a more popular tourist destination. This policy will also encourage employment opportunities throughout different sectors.	No changes.	Policy ST12: Visitor Economy No major changes. This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.	No change proposed.	No proposed change.
Policy ST13: Town Centres and Local Centres	See explanation for Policy 9 Worksop (Worksop Town Centre), Policy 10 Retford (Retford Town Centre) and Policy 11 Harworth & Bircotes (Harworth & Bircotes Town Centre) in Table A10.1 above.	See explanation for Policy 9 Worksop (Worksop Town Centre), Policy 10 Retford (Retford Town Centre) and Policy 11 Harworth & Bircotes (Harworth & Bircotes Town Centre) in Table A10.1 above.	No changes.	Policy ST13: Town Centres, Local Centres, Local Shops and Service This Policy was amended to account for: - the production of the draft Worksop Central DPD	No change proposed.	No proposed change.

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
		This new policy introduces the settlement hierarchy and retail hierarchy within Bassetlaw. This was done to address national policy.		<p>- the designation of the Retford Town Centre Neighbourhood Area and the designation of the Retford Town Centre Neighbourhood Planning Group as the associated Neighbourhood Forum for the area.</p> <p>This has been informed by updated evidence, changes to national legislation and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021 and the June/ July 2021 consultation.</p>		
N/A	N/A	N/A	New policy in November 2020.	<p>Policy ST14: Management of Town Centres</p> <p>This Policy was amended to account for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the production of the draft Worksop Central DPD 	No change proposed.	No proposed change.

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
				<p>- the designation of the Retford Town Centre Neighbourhood Area and the designation of the Retford Town Centre Neighbourhood Planning Group as the associated Neighbourhood Forum for the area.</p> <p>Amendments were also made to the Policy to reflect the update to the Use Class Order.</p> <p>This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021 and the June/ July 2021 consultation.</p>		
Living Communities						
Policy ST14: Housing Distribution	See explanation for Policy 2 Strategic Growth (Housing	See explanation for Policy 2 Strategic Growth (Housing	Proposed allocations in the January/February	Policy ST15: Housing Distribution	ST15: Housing Distribution	Policy ST15 proposed changes reflect

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
	<p>Distribution) in Table A10.1 above.</p> <p>The previous proposal for the distribution of housing was for 58% to be delivered in the three main settlements of Worksop, Retford and Harworth and 42% to be delivered in the rural area. This has not significantly changed. The draft Plan is now proposing 60% of new homes to be delivered in the three main towns and 40% in the rural settlements (including the two new settlements).</p>	<p>Distribution) in Table A10.1 above.</p> <p>Housing Distribution has not significantly changed from the last draft Bassetlaw Plan.</p>	<p>2020 consultation Plan removed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Leaffields Allotments, Retford (30 dwellings) – other more suitable sites have been taken forward. - Sandhills, Retford (75 dwellings) – other more suitable sites have been taken forward. - Canal Road, Worksop (80 dwellings) – site to be considered through the Worksop Town Centre DPD. <p>Sites changed from allocation to housing commitment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Part of Trinity Farm now has outline planning consent for 196 dwellings. The other part 	<p>Proposed allocations in the November 2020/ January 2021 consultation Plan removed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Former Knitwear Factory, Worksop (54 dwellings) - planning permission granted and the S106 signed, this site is now under construction and has been removed as an allocation within the Local Plan. <p>Ordsall South was part of the Focussed Consultation June-July 2021. This included an increase in the overall housing numbers to 1250 dwellings to be delivered over two plan periods. The 800 dwellings for this Plan remain unchanged.</p>	<p>The changes to this Policy are as a result of statutory, developer and site promotor feedback to ensure that the Local Plan plans ahead for a minimum of 15 years from adoption (in accordance with the NPPF).</p> <p>Policy changes include updated housing figures to add an additional years-worth of delivery up to 2038 (previously 2037) and to make better use of land within the development boundary (at Trinity Farm). This is explained in the relevant site specific policy.</p> <p>Land for approximately 3334 new dwellings (previously 3011) will be</p>	<p>the update to the Council's HEDNA evidence base documents. The overall housing figures have changed to reflect the removal of the Garden Village, but the level of growth on the proposed allocations does not change.</p>

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
			<p>of the site has been retained as a proposed allocation for 244 dwellings plus new employment land.</p> <p>New sites proposed for allocation (See Appendix 8 for reasoned justification):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - South Ordsall a mixed development allocated for 800 dwellings plus supporting infrastructure. - Former Elizabethan High School proposed for allocation for 46 dwellings. - Former St. Michael's Care Home proposed for allocation for 20 dwellings. 		<p>allocated during the plan period, and a further 3810 (previously 4070) dwellings thereafter.</p> <p>Four sites have increased dwelling numbers. This is explained in each site specific policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - HS1 Peaks Hill Farm now 1080 dwellings (previously 1000 dwellings) - HS7 Trinity Farm now 305 dwellings (previously 244 dwellings) - HS13 Ordsall South now 890 dwellings (previously 800) - Bassetlaw Garden Village now 590 	

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Former Fairy Grove Nurseries proposed for allocation for 62 dwellings. - Station Road, Retford proposed for allocation for 5 dwellings. - Milnercroft, Retford proposed for allocation for 5 dwellings plus a community garden. <p>This approach has been informed by comments received during the Local Plan consultation in January/February 2020.</p>		dwellings (previously 500 dwellings)	
Policy ST15: Site HS1: Peaks Farm, Worksop	See Residential site options table in Appendix 8.	See Residential site options table in Appendix 8.	Increased delivery from 750 dwellings to 1000 dwellings by 2037. No change to total number of dwellings (1120 dwellings).	Policy 16: Site HS1: Peaks Farm, Worksop No major change. This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during	An additional years-worth of delivery has been added to the Policy (1080 dwellings, previously 1000) due to the end date of the Local Plan changing from 2037 to 2038. This	No proposed change.

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
			This has been informed by evidence of housing delivery at Gateford and through discussions and evidence submitted by the site promoter.	the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.	is required to ensure that the plan accords with national policy; Plans should plan for a minimum 15 year period from adoption (NPPF).	
Policy 16: Site HS2: Former Pupil Referral Centre, Worksop	See Residential site options table in Appendix 8.	See Residential site options table in Appendix 8.	Decrease from 23 dwellings to 20 dwellings due to part of the site being retained for offices. This approach has been informed by comments received from the site promoter.	Policy 17: Site HS2: Former Pupil Referral Centre, Worksop No major change. This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.	No change proposed.	No proposed change.
	See Residential site options table in Appendix 8.	See Residential site options table in Appendix 8.	This site is not being proposed as an allocation in the Local Plan but it will be considered for allocation in the Town Centre DPD.	Removed in November 2020 and consulted on as part of the draft Worksop Central DPD consultation June – July 2021.	No change proposed.	No proposed change.
N/A	See Residential site options table in Appendix 8.	See Residential site options table in Appendix 8.	Allocation proposed through the November 2020 Plan.	Policy 18: Site HS3: Radford Street, Worksop	No change proposed.	No proposed change.

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
				No major change. This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.		
Policy 18: Site HS4: Former Manton Primary School, Worksop	See Residential site options table in Appendix 8.	See Residential site options table in Appendix 8.	No change	Policy 19: Site HS4: Former Manton Primary School, Worksop Requirement for compensatory provision of lost sports pitches required. This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.	No change proposed.	No proposed change.
Policy 19: Site HS5: Talbot Road, Worksop	See Residential site options table in Appendix 8.	See Residential site options table in Appendix 8.	No change	Policy 20: Site HS5: Talbot Road, Worksop No major change.	No change proposed.	No proposed change.

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
				This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.		
Policy 20: Site HS6: Former Knitwear Factory, Retford Road, Worksop	See Residential site options table in Appendix 8.	See Residential site options table in Appendix 8.	Increase from 40 dwellings to 54 dwellings. Higher density development proposed by site promoter.	Due to planning permission being granted and the S106 being signed, this site is now under construction and has been removed as an allocation within the Local Plan.	N/A	N/A
Policy 21: Site HS7: Leafields Allotment, Retford	See Residential site options table in Appendix 8.	See Residential site options table in Appendix 8.	Removed	Removed.	N/A	N/A
Policy 22: Site HS8: Trinity Farm, Retford	See Residential site options table in Appendix 8.	See Residential site options table in Appendix 8.	Part of the site has outline planning permission for 196 dwellings. The remaining land is still proposed for allocation for 244 dwellings plus employment.	Policy 21: Site HS6: Trinity Farm, Retford Amount of green infrastructure has reduced but requirements for flood management strengthened	Policy 21: Site HS7: Trinity Farm, Retford This Policy has been changed as a result of statutory consultee and site promotor feedback, which indicates the site can accommodate 305	No proposed change.

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
				This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.	dwelling (previously 244). Reference has been made to the site making provision for a bus infrastructure as well.	
Policy 23: Site HS9: Sandhills, Retford	See Residential site options table in Appendix 8.	See Residential site options table in Appendix 8.	Removed	N/A – remains removed.	N/A.	N/A
N/A	See Residential site options table in Appendix 8.	See Residential site options table in Appendix 8.	Allocation proposed through the November 2020 Plan.	Policy 22: HS7: Milnercroft, Retford No major change. This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.	N/A	N/A
N/A	See Residential site options table in Appendix 8.	See Residential site options table in Appendix 8.	Allocation proposed through the November 2020 Plan.	Policy 23: HS8: Former Elizabethan High School, Retford No major change.	No change proposed.	No proposed change.

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
				This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.		
N/A	See Residential site options table in Appendix 8.	See Residential site options table in Appendix 8.	Allocation proposed through the November 2020 Plan.	Policy 24: HS9: St Michael's View, Retford No major change. This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.	No change proposed.	No proposed change.
N/A	See Residential site options table in Appendix 8.	See Residential site options table in Appendix 8.	Allocation proposed through the November 2020 Plan.	Policy 25: HS10: Fairy Grove, Retford No major change. This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan	No change proposed.	No proposed change.

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
				consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.		
N/A	See Residential site options table in Appendix 8.	See Residential site options table in Appendix 8.	Allocation proposed through the November 2020 Plan.	Policy 26: HS11: Station Road, Retford No major change. This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.	No change proposed.	No proposed change.
N/A	See Residential site options table in Appendix 8.	See Residential site options table in Appendix 8.	Allocation proposed through the November 2020 Plan.	Policy 27: HS12: Ordsall South, Retford Due to amendments since the November 2020/ January 2021 consultation, the site will deliver approximately 800 dwellings during the plan period to 2037, with a further 450 dwellings thereafter.	Policy 27: HS13: Ordsall South, Retford An additional years-worth of delivery has been added to the Policy (890 dwellings, previously 800) due to the end date of the Local Plan changing from 2037 to 2038. This is required to ensure that the plan accords with national policy;	No proposed change.

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
				<p>This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021 and the June/ July 2021 consultation.</p> <p>Changes to infrastructure requirements as a result of additional housing numbers and updated evidence include new primary school and nursery on site, and more details in relation to highways improvements, bus service provision and walking and cycling routes.</p>	Plans should plan for a minimum 15 year period from adoption (NPPF).	
Policy 24: Site NP04: Ollerton Road, Tuxford	See Residential site options table in Appendix 8. Tuxford was identified as a settlement that accommodate	See Residential site options table in Appendix 8. Since the 2019 draft Plan and the change to	No change	Policy 28: HS13: Ollerton Road, Tuxford Since the November 2020 draft the capacity for this	No change proposed.	No proposed change.

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
	<p>growth within Policy 8 of the 2019 draft plan.</p>	<p>how Rural Bassetlaw has been classified,</p> <p>Earlier in 2019, the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan Group undertook a 'call for land" consultation inviting landowners to submit areas of land in order to accommodate the necessary growth.</p> <p>In September 2019, the Council and the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan Group undertook a public consultation on all the sites identified through the call for land consultation and those that had been previously submitted to the District Council.</p> <p>The feedback from the consultation, along with</p>		<p>site has been reduced from 90 to 75 dwellings.</p> <p>This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.</p>		

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
		a desktop based assessment of the sites led to this site being the most suitable to accommodate a proportion of the proposed development for Tuxford over the plan period.				
Policy 25: Site NP11/NP18: Land at Ashvale Road, Tuxford	See Residential site options table in Appendix 8. Tuxford was identified as a settlement that accommodate growth within Policy 8 of the 2019 draft plan.	See Residential site options table in Appendix 8. See Residential site options table in Appendix 8. Since the 2019 draft Plan and the change to how Rural Bassetlaw has been classified, Earlier in 2019, the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan Group undertook a 'call for land" consultation inviting	Removed due to uncertainty regarding access. The Neighbourhood Plan process can consider allocation of the site through a review of Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. This approach has been informed by comments received during the Local Plan consultation in January/February 2020.	NA – remains removed.	N/A.	N/A

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
		<p>landowners to submit areas of land in order to accommodate the necessary growth.</p> <p>In September 2019, the Council and the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan Group undertook a public consultation on all the sites identified through the call for land consultation and those that had been previously submitted to the District Council.</p> <p>The feedback from the consultation, along with a desktop based assessment of the sites led to the said site being the most suitable to accommodate a proportion of the proposed development</p>				

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
		for Tuxford over the plan period.				
Delivering Quality Affordable Housing						
Policy ST26: Affordable Housing	<p>See explanation for Policy 3 Affordable Housing in Table A10.1 above.</p> <p>No change - See A10.1 above</p>	<p>See explanation for Policy 3 Affordable Housing in Table A10.1 above.</p> <p>No change - See A10.1 above. This policy is based on results of the viability assessment.</p>	<p>Affordable Housing need has increased from 134 dwellings per annum to 214 affordable dwellings per annum. This has been informed by the Bassetlaw Housing and Economic Needs Assessment (2020). The affordable housing requirement has remained unchanged at 20% of developments on greenfield sites and 10% on brownfield sites. This is based on evidence in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (2019).</p>	<p>Policy ST29: Affordable Housing</p> <p>Affordable Housing need has remained at 214 dwellings per annum. This has been informed by the Bassetlaw Housing and Economic Needs Assessment (2020).</p> <p>The affordable housing requirement has increased to 25% on greenfield sites and 15% on brownfield sites. This is based on evidence in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment 2021</p>	No change proposed.	<p>The affordable housing requirement has increased to 20% on brownfield sites but remained the same on greenfield sites. This is based on evidence in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment 2022.</p> <p>The policy also proposes the requirement for tenure split of affordable housing provided as the following:</p>

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
						<p>25% First Homes; and then the priority will be 25% social rent and 25% affordable rent with the remainder being for other affordable home ownership products.</p> <p>The policy also proposes the inclusion of exceptions to the requirement for onsite affordable housing provision.</p>
Policy ST27: Housing Mix, Type and Density	See explanation for Policy 4 Housing Mix in Table A10.1 above. This policy now combines the Housing Mix policy with the	See explanation for Policy 4 Housing Mix in Table A10.1 above.	The Policy has been updated to reflect the most up to date evidence contained in the	Policy ST30: Housing Mix The Policy reflects the most up to date evidence	No change proposed.	No proposed change.

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
	<p>self and Custom Build policy. The general context of the policy is very similar but there is now more detail, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It now provides more detail on the requirement for housing densities to reflect local character; • It has a requirement for the Masterplans of strategic sites to include information on densities. • It now sets a requirement for self-build plots on sites of 100 or more dwellings (2%) 	<p>The Housing Mix Policy in the January 2019 consultation draft Plan did not provide enough detail to inform planning decisions.</p>	<p>Bassetlaw HEDNA (2020).</p>	<p>contained in the Bassetlaw HEDNA (2020).</p>		
<p>Policy ST28: Specialist Housing</p>	<p>This policy now includes criteria for determining planning applications for specialist housing.</p>	<p>Viability evidence supports the changes to this policy.</p>	<p>The Policy has been updated to reflect the most up to date evidence contained in the Bassetlaw HEDNA (2020).</p>	<p>Policy ST31: Specialist Housing</p> <p>The Policy still reflects the most up to date evidence</p>	<p>No change proposed.</p>	<p>No proposed change.</p>

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
	The requirement for adaptable dwellings standards has been reduced to ensure a viable scheme can be delivered.			contained in the Bassetlaw HEDNA (2020). All market housing will be designed to meet the M4(2) for accessible and adaptable homes.		
Policy ST29: Sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	None. The Gypsy and Traveller Need Assessment has informed this policy.	Evidence from the Gypsy and Traveller Need Assessment (2019) supports the changes to this policy.	No changes proposed.	Policy ST32: Sites for Gypsies, Travellers No major change. This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.	Policy ST32: Sites for Gypsies, Travellers Policy change due to statutory consultee feedback and updated evidence (Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Need Assessment Addendum (2021)). The number of pitches proposed at two site allocations will be reduced: GT001 Hayton reduced to 10 pitches (previously 17 additional pitches) and GT004 East Drayton 1 pitch	Policy ST32 sites for Gypsies and Travellers. Policy change due to feedback from statutory consultees and the proposed removal of a proposed site allocations. The Policy also identifies the need for the first 5 years through allocations and the remaining need will be delivered

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
					<p>(previously 3 additional pitches) respectively. Two site allocations will be added at existing gypsy and traveller sites; Blyth for 4 pitches and Elkesley for 9 pitches.</p> <p>An additional years-worth of delivery has been added to the Policy (42 pitches, previously 40) due to the end date of the Local Plan changing from 2037 to 2038. This is required to ensure that the plan accords with national policy; Plans should plan for a minimum 15 year period from adoption (NPPF).</p>	through windfall developments.
Policy 30: Houses in Multiple Occupation	See explanation for Policy 1 in Table A10.1 above.	See explanation for Policy 1 in Table A10.1 above.	No changes proposed.	Policy 33: Houses in Multiple Occupation No major change.	No change proposed.	No proposed change.

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
	Not to introduce an Article 4 Direction to Worksop. This would enable the area within and adjoining the town centre to transform into an area with a higher proportion of single people due to the increase in the number of studio type accommodation. The Council is seeking to ensure the area contains a mix of properties which are suitable for families, couples and single people. This will support local services and the vibrancy of the Town Centre.	This policy is locality specific to Worksop. Worksop has experienced an upsurge of HMOs in recent years. In order to protect family housing needs, an Article 4 Direction now requires permission for the development of HMOs in the allocated area.		This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.		
Policy 31: Agricultural and Forestry Workers Dwellings	See explanation for Policy 1 in Table A10.1 above. No alternatives have been considered. There is a need to ensure that the rural economy is supported whilst also promoting sustainable development in areas with good access to services. This policy addresses the needs of	See explanation for Policy 1 in Table A10.1 above. A large portion of Bassetlaw is predominantly rural, so there are a large number of agricultural and forestry operations	No changes proposed.	Policy 34: Agricultural and Forestry Workers Dwellings No major change. This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan	No change proposed.	No proposed change.

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
	rural businesses whilst also promoting sustainable patterns of development.	that contribute toward the economy.		consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.		
Local Character and Distinctiveness						
Policy ST32: Design Quality	<p>There was general support for Policy 22 in the 2019 draft Local Plan. However, feedback from the public and from Neighbourhood Plan Groups suggested that the policy is too generic and is considered an important local issue that requires more detail.</p> <p>In addition, a number of communities have produced their own, more detailed guidance through character assessments as part of their neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>The National Design Guidance was published in October 2019 and this should also be referenced in the revised Local Plan.</p>	Following the feedback, the revised Local Plan is now proposing more detailed criteria through Policy ST32. In addition, this criteria will be further developed through the creation of the Design SPD.	No changes proposed.	<p>Policy ST35: Design Quality</p> <p>No major change.</p> <p>This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021. National Policy has also informed changes, e.g. National Design Guide.</p>	No change proposed.	No proposed change.

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
Policy 33: Shop fronts, Signage and Security	There was no specific policy for Shop fronts, Signage and Security in the 2019 Local Plan. However, issues have been raised about the impact of signage and shopfronts in town centres and how the frontages of premises creates a significant impact on the character of a location.	The supporting text to Policy 33 details the reasoning behind the development of the policy. This policy also supports ST37 and ST32 and seeks to appropriately manage the impact of future shop fronts and signage on the retail areas across the District.	No changes proposed.	Policy 36: Shop fronts, Signage and Security No major change. This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.	No change proposed.	No proposed change.
Policy ST34: Landscape Character	Policy 17 in the 2019 draft Local Plan was consulted on and the feedback raised issues with the existing evidence base and whether this needed to be updated to reflect the current picture across the District. In addition, the feedback from the consultation raised concern about the potential impact on local landscape character from large new developments on the edge of existing settlements.	Following the new evidence and feedback from the consultation in 2019, the Policy for Landscape Character has changed significantly. It includes 8 geographical Green Gaps and provides justification for the proposed boundaries, identifies their landscape features and qualities and makes policy recommendations	Changes in relation to the role of the Green Gap Study have been proposed. This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in January/February 2020. See Appendix 8 and the Bassetlaw Site Selection Methodology Report (November 2020) for an explanation of the	Policy ST37: Landscape Character No major change. This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.	No change proposed.	No proposed change.

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
	<p>Due to this, the Council commissioned some additional work on its evidence base, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Green Gap Study – this looked at areas around settlements that have either seen a significant level of growth over the past 10 year and those areas around settlements that could be vulnerable to change from development. 2) An update to the 2009 Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment – This looked at whether the existing document is still relevant in terms of 	<p>in order to appropriately manage development in those locations.</p>	<p>reasons why some sites within Green Gaps have been proposed for allocation.</p>			

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
	its policy recommendations.					
N/A	No alternatives proposed. The policy accords with national policy and guidance.	<p>Bassetlaw Landscape Study (2009) and through consultation concerns were raised about the impact of development on the edge of and between settlements, so the Council commissioned the Green Gap study (2019), which looked to justify this approach of Planning Policy.</p> <p>The Green Gap study proposes 8 Green Gaps around the District.</p>	N/A	<p>Policy ST38 Green Gaps</p> <p>The Green Gap Addendum 2020 indicates that, on balance, a housing scheme could be accommodated in the Green Gap provided that it is well planned and landscaped and addresses the principles of the Green Gap Study 2019, and the Green Gap Addendum 2020 and emerging Local Plan policy.</p> <p>No major change.</p> <p>This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.</p>	No change proposed.	No proposed change.

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
Policy ST35: Green and Blue Infrastructure	<p>Policy 18 was generally supported following the consultation on the 2019 Local Plan.</p> <p>The original policy provided a high-level approach to green infrastructure and support the provision of new and the enhancement of existing infrastructure networks.</p>	<p>Policy ST35 has developed into a more focused policy by identifying the green infrastructure network, including green corridors and open spaces. These spaces are identified on the policies map and also form part of the revised Bassetlaw Open Space Strategy 2019. This policy is closely linked with ST39, ST41, ST42, ST45 ST32.</p>	<p>This approach has been informed by comments received during the Local Plan consultation in January/February 2020.</p>	<p>Policy ST39: Green and Blue Infrastructure</p> <p>Amendments have been made to the approach taken to defining buffers around green corridors.</p> <p>This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.</p>	<p>No change proposed.</p>	<p>No proposed change.</p>
Policy ST36: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	<p>Policy 19 was generally supported following the consultation on the 2019 Local Plan.</p>	<p>There have been changes to national legislation following the previous version of the plan regarding net gain in biodiversity. The revised policy ST36 includes this and strongly encourages the enhancement of existing habitats and local wildlife. This policy is</p>	<p>This approach has been informed by changes to national legislation and national policy and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in January/February 2020.</p>	<p>Policy ST40: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>No major change.</p> <p>This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.</p>	<p>ST40 Biodiversity and Geodiversity:</p> <p>Reference to Recreational impact on the Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC, and Clumber Park SSSI will also be subject to new RAMS Policy.</p>	<p>Policy ST40 has been changed to reflect the removal of the Garden Village and the need to undertake recreational impact assessments. Proposed Policy ST40A is</p>

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
		closely linked to other policies in the Plan such as ST35, ST45, ST34.				proposed to be removed from the Local Plan as a result of the removal of the Garden Village.
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	ST40A: Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) New Policy and amended supporting text has been introduced to justify the need for Recreational Disturbance and Avoidance Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) and associated developer contributions for Clumber Park SSSI through a strategic RAMS solution. An interim case by case solution for site of 50 or more dwellings is	Policy ST40A is proposed to be removed from the Local Plan as a result of the removal of the Garden Village. However, elements of Policy ST40A have been merged with Policy ST40 to lead to a more consistent policy approach.

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
					identified to address mitigation from residential development expected to come forward in the interim.	
N/A	No alternatives proposed. The policy accords with national policy and guidance.	<p>Concern that allocations did not have tree preservation orders on, but have significant tree coverage on site. Therefore in order to manage trees through the design of the developments where possible the Policy was created.</p> <p>This Policy focuses on protecting existing trees, woodland and hedgerows, and securing additional planting that increases canopy cover. The policy accords with national policy and guidance.</p>	N/A	<p>Policy 41: Tress, Woodlands and Hedgerows</p> <p>No major change.</p> <p>This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.</p>	No change proposed.	No proposed change.

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
Policy ST37: Conservation and Enhancement of the Historic Environment	No alternatives proposed. The policy accords with national policy and guidance.	The policy accords with national policy and guidance.	No changes proposed.	Policy ST42: The Historic Environment No major change. This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.	No change proposed.	No proposed change.
Policy 38: Heritage Assets	No alternatives proposed.	The policy accords with national policy and guidance.	No changes proposed.	Policy 43: Designated and Non-Designated Heritage Assets No major change. This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.	No change proposed.	No proposed change.
Healthy Communities						
Policy ST39: Promoting Healthy and	See explanation for Policy 1 in Table A10.1 above.	See explanation for Policy 1 in Table A10.1 above.	New policy.	Policy ST44: Promoting Healthy and Active Lifestyles	No change proposed.	No proposed change.

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
Active Lifestyles	No alternatives considered.	This new policy reflects the Council's commitment to healthy lifestyles. The policy also reflects national policy.	This new policy reflects the Council's commitment to healthy lifestyles. The policy also reflects national policy.	No major change. This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.		
Policy ST40: Protection and Enhancement of Community Facilities	See explanation for Policy 23 Community Services and Facilities in Table A10.1 above. No alternatives considered.	See explanation for Policy 23 Community Services and Facilities in Table A10.1 above. This was not changed significantly from the original policy in the 2019 Draft.	No changes.	Policy ST45: Protection and Enhancement of Community Facilities No major change. This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.	No change proposed.	No proposed change.
Policy ST41: Delivering Quality, Accessible Open Space	See explanation for Policy 20 Open Space in Table A10.1 above. No alternatives considered.	See explanation for Policy 20 Open Space in Table A10.1 above. The original policy did not have target figures,	The open space Assessment 2020 is complete and provides a set of local standards that should be applied to new development. This has	Policy ST46: Delivering Quality, Accessible Open Space No major change.	No change proposed.	No proposed change.

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
		as the Strategic Open Space Report was not finished at that time. Therefore, previously there was no up-to-date evidence base. This policy has been informed by new evidence.	been reflected in the revised Local Plan, relevant planning policies and proposed site allocations.	This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.		
Policy ST42: Promoting Sport and Physical Activity	See explanation for Policy 1 in Table A10.1 above No alternatives considered.	See explanation for Policy 1 in Table A10.1 above. This new policy links in with the Council's priority of promoting healthy lifestyles and with the NPPF. The Play Pitch Strategy evidence base was also not complete until Summer 2019 so there was no sufficient evidence to inform policy at the time of the last consultation.	The Council has commissioned a Built Facilities Study which looks, in more detail, at the existing type and quantity of sport facilities across the District. This will inform future revisions to policy and investment decisions.	Policy ST47: Promoting Sport and Recreation No major change. This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.	No change proposed.	No proposed change.

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
Policy 43: Protecting Amenity	See explanation for Policy 1 in Table A10.1 above. No alternatives considered.	See explanation for Policy 1 in Table A10.1 above. The policy was introduced to make sure that development does not impose on already existing amenity and the overall quality of life.	No change.	Policy 48: Protecting Amenity No major change. This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.	No change proposed.	No proposed change.
Policy 44: Contaminated and Unstable Land	See explanation for Policy 1 in Table A10.1 above. No alternatives considered.	See explanation for Policy 1 in Table A10.1 above. As there are quite a few brownfield sites that are contaminated in Bassetlaw, this new policy was necessary to provide guidance.	No change.	Policy 49: Contaminated and Unstable Land No major change. This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.	No change proposed.	No proposed change.
Green Bassetlaw						
Policy ST45: Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation	See explanation for Policy 13 Energy Efficiency in Table A10.1 above.	See explanation for Policy 13 Energy Efficiency in Table A10.1 above.	No change.	Policy ST50: Reducing Carbon Emissions, Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation	No change proposed.	No proposed change.

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
	<p>There was support for Policies 13 and 14 in the 2019 draft Local Plan and it strongly encouraged the appropriate use of renewable energy development across the District. However, feedback also suggested that there should be a separate policy to cover climate change mitigation and adaption.</p> <p>In addition, the Council Plan focuses heavily on promoting green energy and reducing the District's carbon footprint.</p>	<p>Policy ST45 provides a strong focus on how new development can adapt and mitigate the impact of and from climate change. The policy provides criteria on how development and physically contribute towards reducing its impact on the climate.</p> <p>The planting of trees and the promotion of sustainable construction materials runs through the Local Plan and links to several other policies such as design, green infrastructure and renewable energy.</p>		<p>No major change.</p> <p>This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.</p>		
Policy ST46: Renewable Energy Generation	<p>See explanation for 14 Renewable and Low Carbon Energy in Table A10.1 above.</p> <p>There was support for Policy 14 in the 2019 draft Local</p>	<p>See explanation 14 Renewable and Low Carbon Energy in Table A10.1 above.</p>	No change.	<p>Policy ST51: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation</p> <p>This has been informed by updated evidence and</p>	<p>ST51: Renewable Energy Generation</p> <p>This Policy has been changed in response to site promotor feedback</p>	No proposed change.

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
	<p>Plan and it strongly encouraged the appropriate use of renewable energy development across the District.</p> <p>In addition, the Council Plan focuses heavily on promoting green energy and reducing the District's carbon footprint.</p>	<p>Policy ST46 provides a strong focus on how new development can become low carbon or accommodate renewable energy technologies. The inclusion of High Marnham Power Station as a Renewable Energy Generation site and the Bassetlaw Garden Village as a new sustainable community provides clear focus for development and contributes positively towards the local and national priorities for a low carbon economy by 2050.</p> <p>links to several other policies such as design, green infrastructure and climate change mitigation.</p>		<p>comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.</p>	<p>to provide in principle support for zero carbon energy generation at the former power station site at Marnham (instead of being identified as a general employment led site (see Policy ST7/Policy ST8). It also reflects national policy ambitions (in the NPPF) to identify land for renewable energy generation. The Policy now identifies an 'area of best fit' at the former power station site (Marnham) where renewable energy generation will be supported in principle because of its grid connectivity. The policy aims to direct renewable energy to this location before using other land</p>	

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
					across the District. The area of best fit is also now identified on the Policies Map.	
Policy ST47: Flood Risk	See explanation for Policy 15 Flood Risk in Table A10.1 above. No alternatives were considered. The policy complies with the NPPF and takes into consideration evidence from the SFRA.	See explanation for Policy 15 Flood Risk in Table A10.1 above. The policy aligns with national policy and takes into consideration evidence from the Bassetlaw SFRA Level 1 (2018).	No change.	Policy ST52: Flood Risk No major change. This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021 and June/July 2021 consultation.	No change proposed.	No proposed change.
Policy ST48: Protecting Water Quality	See explanation for Policy 16 Water Quality and Efficiency in Table A10.1 above. Whilst the text in the policy has been amended slightly, the policy requirements have not changed.	See explanation for Policy 16 Water Quality and Efficiency in Table A10.1 above. The policy complies with the requirements of the NPPF. No alternatives were identified.	No change.	Policy ST53: Protecting Water Quality No major change. This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.	No change proposed.	No proposed change.

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
Transport and Infrastructure						
Policy ST49: Transport Infrastructure	<p>Policy 24 was supported by the Part 1 of the Bassetlaw Transport Study. The feedback from the consultation raised concern about the impact new development could have on the existing infrastructure in Bassetlaw.</p> <p>As the 2019 Local Plan did not propose any site allocations, the policy was generic and less detailed about the requirement for transport migration.</p>	<p>Since the 2019 draft Local Plan, the Council has produced an updated Transport Study to support the revised draft Local Plan.</p> <p>This document identifies the existing issues associated to the transport network around the proposed site allocations and details the potential mitigation options and associated costs.</p> <p>This document will also support the development of the Bassetlaw Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>	<p>The Council has updated its 2019 Transport Assessment in response to comments made in January 2020. In addition, the Council has since commissioned additional transport work with a particular focus on the Bassetlaw Garden Village, Retford and some areas in rural Bassetlaw.</p> <p>It has also produced additional evidence on the feasibility of a new Railway Station at the proposed Garden Village.</p>	<p>Policy ST54: Transport Infrastructure and Improvement Schemes</p> <p>No major change.</p> <p>This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021 and the June/ July 2021 consultation.</p>	<p>ST54: Transport Infrastructure</p> <p>This Policy has changed in response to feedback from statutory consultees. It now includes a criteria based approach where new development should demonstrate that the proposal will include the necessary and relevant transport infrastructure identified within the Councils Infrastructure Delivery Plan to support the sustainability and deliverability of the proposed Local Plan development (previously the policy contained a list of transport infrastructure improvements). This approach is more in line</p>	No proposed change.

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
					with recent Government guidance and provides an up to date, flexible and appropriate basis for infrastructure delivery.	
Policy ST50: Promoting Sustainable Transport	<p>Policy 24 was supported by the Part 1 of the Bassetlaw Transport Study. The feedback from the consultation raised concern about the impact new development could have on the existing infrastructure in Bassetlaw.</p> <p>As the 2019 Local Plan did not propose any site allocations, the policy was generic and less detailed about the requirement for transport infrastructure.</p>	<p>Since the 2019 draft Local Plan, the Council has produced an updated Transport Study to support the revised draft Local Plan.</p> <p>This document identifies the existing issues associated to the transport network around the proposed site allocations and details the potential mitigation options, associated costs and opportunities for sustainable travel.</p>	No change.	<p>Policy ST55: Promoting Sustainable Transport and Active Travel</p> <p>No major change.</p> <p>This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.</p>	No change proposed.	No proposed change.
Policy ST51: Safeguarded Land	There was no specific mention of safeguarded land in the 2019 Local Plan due to	Associated with the inclusion of site allocations and areas for	Additional or updated evidence has informed	Policy ST56: Safeguarded Land	No change proposed.	Policy ST56 has been amended to reflect the

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
	<p>sites not being included in that version.</p> <p>No alternatives considered.</p>	<p>regeneration, there is a need to safeguard some land for infrastructure improvement to aid the sites delivery.</p>	<p>any revisions to the Local Plan and relevant policies.</p>	<p>Policy has been updated and includes additional areas of land on some of the allocations.</p> <p>This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021 and the June/ July 2021 consultation.</p>		<p>removal of the Garden Village and the need to safeguard land for infrastructure. All proposed safeguarded land to support the Garden Village delivery has been removed.</p>
N/A	<p>No alternatives proposed. The policy accords with national policy and guidance.</p>	<p>The Policy supports the delivery of the most up-to-date digital infrastructure through the site allocations.</p> <p>Manage and enhance the digital infrastructure in the District where there is low provision.</p>	N/A	<p>Policy ST57: Digital Infrastructure</p> <p>This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021.</p>	No change proposed.	No proposed change.
Policy ST52: Provision and Delivery of Infrastructure	<p>See explanation for Policy 24 Protection and Delivery of Infrastructure in Table A10.1 above.</p>	<p>See explanation for Policy 24 Protection and Delivery of Infrastructure in Table A10.1 above.</p>	<p>Additional or updated transport related evidence has informed any</p>	<p>Policy ST58: Provision and Delivery of Infrastructure</p>	<p>Policy ST58: Provision and Delivery of Infrastructure</p>	No proposed change.

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
	No alternatives considered.	The policy was re-worded to reflect international legislation and national legislation. It also includes a new CIL charging schedule, which is being consulted on alongside the local plan in 2020.	revisions to the Local Plan and relevant policies.	This has been informed by updated evidence and comments received during the Local Plan consultation in November 2020/ January 2021 and the June/ July 2021 consultation.	The policy has changed in response to statutory consultee feedback. It clarifies that, where relevant, developer contributions may be used to retrospectively contribute towards delivery of infrastructure and contributions may be sought on a phased basis. This is consistent with national legislation	
Policies from the Part 1 Bassetlaw Local Plan (Jan 2019) not included in the Draft Local Plan (Jan 2020)						
Policy 5: Self and Custom Build	This policy has been combined with the Housing Mix policy. Policy ST27 now includes housing mix and self-build.	The policy addresses the requirements of the NPPF and legislation. The current policy format provides more detail and will enable more informed decision making.	Updated evidence Bassetlaw HEDNA (2020) informs the new policy.	No change.	No change proposed.	No proposed change.
Policy 7: Residential Care Homes	Policy ST28 sets out the requirements for residential care homes.	The SHMA provides details of the requirements for residential care (Land Use Class C2).	Updated evidence Bassetlaw HEDNA (2020) informs the new policy.	No change.	No change proposed.	No proposed change.

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
Policy 10: Retford	Covered by Policies ST1, HS9, HS7 and HS8 in the 2020 Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan.	Covered by Policies ST1, HS9, HS7 and HS8 in the 2020 Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan. The current policy format provides more detail and will enable more informed decision making.	No change.	No change.	No change proposed.	No proposed change.
Policy 11: Harworth & Bircotes	Whilst the Harworth & Bircotes Policy has been removed from the draft Plan, the requirements of the policy are included in other policies in the 2020 consultation draft Plan. Policy 1 Spatial Strategy; Policy 6 Employment; Policy 13 Town Centres; Policy 27 Housing Mix; and Policy 50 Safeguarded Land set out specific requirements relating to the town. Other policies relate to all areas of the district, including Harworth & Bircotes.	Whilst the strategy for Harworth & Bircotes has not significantly changed, the previous format was repetitive. The current policy format provides more detail and will enable more informed decision making.	No change.	No change.	No change proposed.	No proposed change.

Proposed policy in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan (January 2020)	Reasonable alternative options considered	Bassetlaw District Council's justification for selecting preferred option approach	Changes made in the November 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version (August 2021) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version Addendum (January 2022) and the Council's justification	Changes made in the Regulation 19 Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038: Publication Version (May2022) and the Council's justification
Policy 24: Strategic Infrastructure	Covered by Policy ST52 in the 2020 Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan.	The current policy format provides more detail and will enable more informed decision making. The policy also received feedback that deemed it difficult to understand. Thus, Policy ST52 includes the new CIL charging schedule that is going to be consulted in with the Local Plan.	No change.	No change.	No change proposed.	No proposed change.